

Pima County Community College District

HLC ID 1012

STANDARD PATHWAY: Mid-Cycle Review

Visit Date: 12/3/2018

Mr. Lee Lambert
President

Linnea Stenson
HLC Liaison

Joan Costello
Review Team Chair

Tonya Buttry
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Della Burt-Bradley
Team Member

Sean Hill
Team Member

Phillip Pena
Team Member

Angela Sivadon
Team Member

Phil Speary
Team Member

Susan Wood
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

12/3/2018

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Mid-Cycle Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit

- Federal Compliance 2018
- Northwest Campus
- Community Campus
- Downtown Campus

Institutional Context

The citizens of Pima County, Arizona, voted to establish Pima College in 1966. The construction of the first campus began in 1969. Today, Pima County Community College District (PCC) serves the Tucson metropolitan area at six campus locations offering 53 Associates degrees and 103 certificates. Designated an “Hispanic-Serving Institution,” 45 percent of students self-report as Hispanic/Latinx, 40 percent as White/non-Hispanic, 4 percent as Black/non-Hispanic, 3 percent as Asian/Pacific Islander, 2 percent as American Indian or Alaskan, 1 percent as non-resident Alien, and 6 percent as Unknown or Two or More Races. Because of its diversity, its multiple campuses, its recent loss of State funding, and its redesign of academic programming to meet declining enrollment and student success concerns, PCC faces unique challenges and possibilities.

As the data demonstrates, PCC benefits from a wealth of cultural and racial diversity. It works to respect this diversity. But such richness does not come without challenges. The college has retention and success gaps between groups; while the college has grant funding, it faces the resource needs of English Language Learners (ELL) and the under-prepared; and it faces the issue that its employees do not mirror either the student-body or the diversity of its community. (For example, the faculty are 73 percent White.) To address these concerns PCC has developed a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan (2017-2020) and has recently hired a Director of Diversity, Equity and

Inclusion.

As a multi-campus district, PCC benefits from shared expertise, central budget management, and a wide reach. However, being part of such a singly accredited district can also create tensions and unclear lines of authority between the central administration and the campuses. PCC is working to navigate these situations, to facilitate shared governance, and to center itself on its mission as “an open-admissions institution providing affordable, comprehensive educational opportunities that support student success and meet the diverse needs of its students and community.” The college has restructured its administration, has redesigned its governance to facilitate shared governance and communication amongst its internal stakeholders (faculty, staff, and students), is working to standardize policies and procedures across all campuses and all departments, is trying to align academic departments and academic scheduling with a goal of a multi-term schedule, and through all of these processes, is working to reduce redundancy and inefficiency.

Until recently, PCC was funded through State allocation, real estate tax dollars from Pima County, tuition, and grants. In 2016, the State of Arizona stopped providing funding to community colleges. The slashing of state funding from the budget created a financial crisis for the College. The recent decline in enrollment and accompanying lost tuition increased shortfalls. Initially, the College went through a period of reduction in force accomplished through cutting administrative positions and not replacing departing employees. The college has now moved to layoffs and a redesign of its Program Review process to help it identify program viability in order to close or downsize programs. It has also identified a campus for closing.

PCC also is taking steps to stabilize or increase enrollment. Two key initiatives in these efforts is joining the Pathways initiative and designing Centers of Excellence. Through the Pathways programming, the college is hoping to retain students, reduce students enrolling in the wrong courses for their program of study, and provide a clear path with support resources to graduation. Further, PCC did an environmental scan and has been holding conversations with business and industry in order to identify programs that meet regional training needs and which are or can be supported with facilities and resources to become Centers of Excellence. The college’s Facilities and Educational Master Plans address the strategies needed to create these centers. One of PCC’s first actions in moving toward the reality of these centers was the recent purchase of four parcels of land adjacent to the college’s Downtown Campus.

Besides coming to an understanding of how the Criteria of Accreditation are met within these unique opportunities and the general operation of the College, the team worked to deal with a large Formal Complaint from a sitting Board of Governors member which it received just prior to the visit. Several of the concerns are addressed within the report and the applicable Core Components. The team found that the legal services model chosen by the Board, the handling of court judgments, and the conducting of the current harassment investigation are outside the scope of the team’s responsibilities and outside the scope of HLC’s concerns.

Interactions with Constituencies

BOARD OF GOVERNERS

- 4 Board Members
- Board Chair

ADMINISTRATORS

- Chancellor
- Provost and Executive Vice Chancellor

- Executive Vice Chancellor of Finance and Administration
- Vice Chancellor of Educational Partnerships and Campus President
- Vice Chancellor of External Relations
- Vice Chancellor of Facilities and Police
- Vice Chancellor of Workforce Development and Campus President
- Assistant Vice Chancellor
- Assistant Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs
- Assistant Vice Chancellor of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness; Chief Strategist
- Associate Vice Chancellor of Accreditation and Academic Quality Improvement
- Chief Information Officer, IT
- Vice President of Adult Basic Education
- Vice President of Desert Vista Campus (Acting)
- Vice President of Distance Education
- Vice President of Instruction and Academic Operations
- Vice President of International Development
- Vice President of Northwest Campus
- Vice President of Student Affairs
- Vice President of Workforce Development
- Dean of Business and IT
- Dean of Critical Care
- Dean of Developmental Education
- Dean of Distance Education
- Dean of Education and Biomedical Sciences
- Dean of Enrollment Management
- Dean of Sciences
- Dean of Social Sciences (Acting)
- Dean of Students
- Dean of Workforce Development
- Executive Director of Faculty Affairs
- Executive Director of Human Resources (Acting)
- General Counsel
- Special Assistant to the Chancellor

COMMUNITY/EXTERNAL CONSTITUENTS

- Director Human Resources, JW Marriott Starr Pass Resort and Spa; Hospitality Advisory Committee
- Director of HR, The Westin La Paluma
- Director, Tucson Electric Power Co.
- Industry Partner, CAD Advisory
- Industry Partner, First EMS Advisory Committee Chair
- Machine Tool Technology Advisor, South Arizona Manufacturers Partners
- PPGP CEO

STUDENTS

- Associate of Science Transfer, Club Officer of Student Interaction Club, Global Peer
- Associate of Science, Senate, Honors
- Business, Phi Theta Kappa Treasurer
- Engineering

- Law major, Student Senator
- Nursing, Honors, Phi Theta, Kappa, SAB
- Pharmacy, Phi Theta Kappa President
- President of Student Advisory Board
- Prospective Student from Ghana, Africa
- Secretary of ASAB
- Vice President of SHPE, Phi Theta Kappa, Former Student Worker in International Office

FACULTY

- ACC, Department Head
- ACCFG, Department Head
- Adjunct Faculty, Clinical Research, Analyst Academic Quality Improvement
- Biology, Department Head
- Biology, General Education Committee, Faculty Senate
- Biomedical Sciences, Faculty Program Director
- Building and Construction, Discipline Coordinator
- Chemistry, Department Head
- Chemistry, Science Lead for East Campus
- CIS, Department Head, PimaOnline, General Education Committee
- Clinical Research, Adjunct
- Clinical Research, Analyst Academic Quality Improvement
- Clinical Research, Program Director, General Education co-Chair
- Computer Science, Adjunct
- Counseling Coordinator
- Counseling, STU, Online Department Head
- Counselor, Educational Support Faculty
- Department Head
- Department Head (Online)
- Department Head (Online)
- DHE, Grant Project Manager
- History, Adjunct
- Learning Center Manager
- Learning Centers Manager, Assessment Academy
- Library Department Head, Distance Education
- Library Services Specialist, Staff Council
- Math, Department Head
- Math, Faculty Senate President
- Nursing, College Curriculum Committee
- Nursing, Department Chair
- Physics, Physics Department Head
- Post-Degree Teacher Certification, Discipline Coordinator
- Teaching and Learning Center Coordinator, Faculty Senate
- Welding and Machine Tool, Department Head
- Writing, Faculty Senate Governing Board Representative

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

- Academic Services, Advanced Program Manager

- Access and Disability Department Director
- Adult Basic Education, Director
- Adult Education Services, Director
- Distance Education, Advanced Program Manager
- District Grants, Director
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Officer
- Dual Enrollment and High School Participation, Academic Director
- Employer Engagement and Career Services, Program Manager
- English and International Students, Associate Director
- Environmental Health and Safety, Director
- Financial Aid and Scholarships, Director
- Financial Aid, Advanced Fiscal Analyst
- Financial Aid, Advanced Fiscal Analyst
- Fiscal and Operations Management, Director
- Global Engagement, Associate Director
- IT Enterprise Systems, Director
- Learning Center Coordinator
- Police Commander
- Public Safety and Security, Program Manager
- Registrar and Director of Enrollment Services
- Research Project Manager
- Student Affairs Supervisor, Downtown Campus
- Student Affairs Supervisor, West Campus
- Title IX, Advanced Program Manager
- Upward Bound, Program Manager
- Web Systems, Director

STAFF

- 29th Street Coalition Center, Director
- Academic Quality Improvement, Analyst
- Academic Quality Improvement, Assessment Director
- Academic Quality Improvement, Support Specialist
- Academic Quality Improvement, Support Specialist
- Academic Quality Improvement, Support Tech
- Academic Quality Improvement, Support Technician
- Academic Services DV Campus, Program Manager
- Academic Services, Advanced Program Advisor, Staff Council
- Academic Services, Program Manager
- ADA, Director
- Advanced Program Manager
- Advisor, Financial Aid
- Advisor, International Student
- Assistant Registrar
- Center for Transportation Training, Program Manager/Department Head
- Class, Comp, Talent Acquisition, APM
- Curriculum and Articulation, Director
- Curriculum Coordinator, District Curriculum Services
- Curriculum Coordinator, Former Exempt Staff President, Former Staff Council Chair

- Curriculum Program Manager
- Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion, Program Coordinator
- Educational Technology, IT Manager
- Environmental Health and Safety, Environmental Program Coordinator
- Environmental Health and Safety, Program Coordinator
- Facilities Business Analyst
- Facilities Business Analyst Advanced
- Finance and Administration, Executive Assistant
- Financial Aid and Scholarships, Director
- Financial Aid, Advanced Fiscal Analyst
- Financial Aid, Advanced Fiscal Analyst
- Financial Aid, Coordinator
- Financial Aid, Coordinator
- Financial Aid, Student Services Coordinator
- Fiscal Principal Analyst
- Human Resources, Program Manager
- Human Resources, Senior Consultant
- Human Resources, Senior Consultant
- Human Resources, Senior Consultant
- Instructional Designer
- Instructional Designer (Online)
- International Development, Program Coordinator
- International Programs and Recruitment, Deputy Director
- International Programs, Deputy Director
- International Recruitment and Programs, Deputy Director
- IRPE
- IT, Business Systems Manager
- IT, Business Systems Manager IT, Business Systems Manager
- IT, Principal Analyst
- IT, Principal Analyst IRPE
- Learning Center Adult Education, Director (El Rio)
- Marketing Communications, Advanced Program Manager
- Master Scheduler
- Non-Credit and Continuing Ed Youth Program, Advanced Program Coordinator
- Operations Workforce Talent Raytheon, Manager
- Prison Programs, Advanced Program Manager
- Program Advisor, Art, Performance and Design
- Program Advisor, Nursing
- Program Advisor, PimaOnline-Student Affairs
- Program Advisor, STEM/Fitness
- Program Advisor/Coordinator, CDY, ECE, and EDU
- Program Manager
- Public Safety and Security, Academic Director
- Research Project Manager
- Research, Advanced Analyst
- Research, Advanced Analyst
- Research, Advanced Analyst and PISA
- Research, Program Manager
- Staff Council/Academic Services, Advanced Program Manager

- Staff Council/Admissions and Recruitment
- Staff Council/Adult Education, Assistant Manager
- Staff Council/Assistant Registrar
- Staff Council/Human Resources Specialist
- Staff Council/Learning Centers
- Staff Council/Library Services Specialist
- Student Affairs, Program Developer
- Student Service Financial Aid Coordinator
- Teacher Certification, Manager
- Transportation and Support Services, Manager
- USO Support Services, Director
- Workforce and Continuing Education Program Manager

MULTI-CAMPUS VISITS

DOWNTOWN CAMPUS

ADMINISTRATORS

- Campus President
- Vice President of Instruction
- Vice President of Student Affairs
- Dean of Applied Technology
- Dean of Communication
- Dean of Enrollment Management
- Dean of Students
- Director

STUDENTS

- AA, Paralegal
- Building and Construction Technologies
- Education
- Liberal Arts
- Logistics/Business Management, Veteran, Work Study
- Radiology Technologies, Veteran
- Translation and Interpretation Program
- Translation and Interpretation Program, Art and Humanities Department
- Welding

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

- Facilities Operation, Manager
- Finance and Business Services, Director
- Military and Veteran Services, Director

STAFF

- Advisor, Veteran Center
- Computer Aided Design

- Support Coordinator, President's Office
- Support Technician, FRC
- Upward Bound Coordinator

FACULTY

- Accounting, Discipline Coordinator
- Arts and Humanities Online, Department Head
- Building Construction, Department Head
- Computer Aided Design
- Computer Aided Design, Department Head
- Counseling Coordinator
- Counseling, Educational Support Faculty
- Ethnic, Gender, and Transgender Studies, Department Head
- Learning Center Coordinator
- Librarian
- Mathematics, Department Head
- Paralegal, Program Director, Department Head
- Spanish, TRS Director
- Welding
- World Languages, Department Head
- Writing, Discipline Coordinator
- Writing, Reading, Communication, and Literature, Department Head
- Writing/English, Faculty Senate Office

COMMUNITY CAMPUS

ADMINISTRATORS

- Campus President
- Vice President PimaOnline
- Vice President of Workforce
- Vice President of Student Affairs
- Vice President of Adult Basic Education
- Dean of Developmental Education
- Dean of Distance Education
- Dean of Enrollment Management
- Dean of Students
- Dean of Workforce Development

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

- ABE CC Program Manager
- Adult Education Services, Director

STAFF

- ABECC Program Coordinator
- Academic Services, Program Manager
- Adult Education Instructor

- Adult Education Instructor
- Adult Education Instructor/CCR Navigator, ABE CC
- College and Career Transitions Manager, ABE CC
- Employer Engagement and Career Services, Program Manager
- Facilities Manager C.C. East Campus
- Instructional Designer, Center for Learning Technology
- Instructional Web Designer
- Program Advisor, ABECC
- Program Advisor, PimaOnline
- Public Safety/Security, Academic Director
- Virtual Student Services, Enrollment and Advising Liaison

FACULTY

- Biology Online, Department Head Sciences Online
- Center for Transportation, Program Manager/Department Head
- Counselor/Student Success, Educational Support Faculty
- English Online, Department Head
- Faculty
- Faculty
- Math Online, Department Head
- Online, Department Head

STUDENTS

- ABECC Student Representative
- Adult Basic Education
- El Rio Campus
- El Rio Campus
- Fire Science/ EMT
- Fire Science/Paramedic
- Social Work
- Trucking School
- Trucking School

COMMUNITY

- Support Coordinator Chancellor's Office

NORTHWEST CAMPUS

ADMINISTRATORS

- Campus President
- Campus Vice President
- Vice President of Student Affairs
- Dean of Enrollment Management
- Dean of Sciences
- Dean of Students

MIDDLE MANAGEMENT

- Facilities Manager (Acting)
- Facilities Operations Manager

STAFF

- Academic Support, Program Manager
- Fiscal Support Specialist, Accounts Receivable
- IT Supervisor, Campus IT
- Library Services Specialist
- Military and Veteran Services Coordinator
- Program Advisor, Liberal Arts
- Science Lab Supervisor
- Student Life Supervisor

STUDENTS

- ABUS
- AOA
- General Studies
- General Studies, Veteran, Work Study
- Graduated with AA; Psychology/French
- Liberal Arts
- Licensed Massage Therapist
- Licensed Massage Therapist
- Licensed Massage Therapist
- Licensed Massage Therapist

FACULTY

- American Indian Studies, Discipline Coordinator
- Chemistry, ASCEND Program Dean
- Clinical Research, Program Director
- Counseling
- Counseling Coordinator
- Department Head
- Librarian
- Library, Department Head
- Mathematic, Discipline Coordinator Business/Mathematics
- Mathematics, Department Head
- Therapeutic Massage, Discipline Coordinator
- Writing, Department Head

Additional Documents

MATERIALS RELATED TO FORMAL COMPLAINT:

Letter from Luis A. Gonzales, Board Member District 5, to Barbara Gellman-Danley, President HLC, November 2,

2018

Letter from Sylvia M. Lee, Board Member, to Barbara Gellman-Danley, President HLC, November 9, 2018

Letter from Barbara Benjamin, Retired Adjunct Faculty, to Gellman-Danley, President HLC, November 11, 2018

Letter from Luis A. Gonzales, Board Member District 5, to Barbara Gellman-Danley, President HLC, November 27, 2018

Formal Complaint of Luis A. Gonzales, Board Member District 5, Pima Community College District, including 24 Exhibits:

- Ex 1 PCC Board Blocks Discussion Before Raising Tuition Rates Again, Arizona Daily Independent (ADI)
- Ex 2 2013-03-20 BOG Transcript
- Ex 3 Pima Boss Could Face No Confidence Vote (Arizona Daily Star, 11/07/1015)
- Ex 4 Ana Jimenez no confidence
- Ex 5 Agenda 11/02/2015 Board Study Session (PCCEA All-Faculty Survey on agenda)
- Ex 6 Letter to HLC President 2 Lee
- Ex 7A Benjamine November 2 BOG Meeting
- Ex 7B Alfred Montes November 2 Meeting
- Ex 7C Affidavit of Luis A Gonzales
- Ex 8 Minutes 2015-11-02 Study Session
- Ex 9 Gorsuch Response
- Ex 10 Faculty--All Draft 2 from 2015-11-02
- Ex 11 Board Members Attack Shows PCC Leaders Committed to Controversy, ADI 2017-03-20 (Reference to Katz and Cuyugan case)
- Ex 12 Board Transcript 2017-03-08 (Due process, evaluation of Chancellor, confrontation between Lee and M. Gonzales)
- Ex 13 Gmail FWD Thank you for your passion from Sylvia M. Lee
- Ex 14 Meet and Confer old policy
- Ex 15 Could not open
- Ex 16 2018 Facilities Master Plan
- Ex 17 Arizona Corporations Commission Frontier Consulting (Member Demion Clinco 2008))
- Ex 18 Demion Clinco: A 28-year-old who is into preserving historic Tucson, Inside Tucson Business, April 24, 2009
- Ex 19 Tucson Historic Preservation Foundation (President Demion Clinco 09/10/2009)
- Ex 20A Tucson Inn (listing on National Register of Historic Places--form completed by Demion Clinco
- Ex 20B El Rancho (Historic Preservation form completed by Demion Clinco)
- Ex 20C Frontier (Historic Property Inventory Form completed by Demion Clinco)
- Ex 21 PCC Legal Letter (Gonzales requesting a review of PCC's "current legal services model" 2017-04-12
- Ex 22 Silvyn Contract (this document was blank)
- Ex 23 Katz No CV-14-02515-TUC-CKJ (07-25-2016)
- Ex 24 Cuyugan v. Pima Community College No. CV-15-00260-TUC-RCC (03-02-2017)

PACKET FROM THE GOVERNING BOARD:

Part 2: PCC Student Breakdown Compared with Pima County—Table 2.1 (2014)

College Employee Satisfaction Survey (CESS) Results (2015-2017)

CCSSE: Benchmarks of Effective Educational Practice (2018)

Bond Timeline (2018-2021)

Race/Ethnicity of Pima Community College (PCC) Permanent Employees in 2012-2016

PCC Governing Board's Finance and Audit Committee Meeting Notice and Agenda, Friday, April 20, 2018

PCC Governing Board's Finance and Audit Committee Meeting Minutes, Friday, April 20, 2018 and documents from meeting

- College Rebranding Project
- Educational and Facilities Master Plans: Revenue Bond Projects
- PCC Football Program Discussion
- Arizona Colleges Resources and Reserves
- Pima County Community College Finance and Audit Committee Presentation (John Utter, Head of U.S. Institutional Client Service, Including Investment Policy Statement)

ADDITIONAL DOCUMENTS RESEARCHED BY THE TEAM :

AAS Clinical Research Coordinator Program Map

Academic Advising Syllabus

Access and Disability Resources

ADA Fiscal Year 2017 Report

Adult Education Services Report -2017

Advisor and Counselor Information from Irene

Annotated Syllabus Templates

Arizona Transfer System

Aztec Athletics Link

Career Café Flyer

CCSSE 2018 Key findings

Co-Curricular Assessment Template

Code of Conduct pyramid of process

College Committee Structure (Governance Bodies , Standing Committees) 2017-18

Counseling Links

Course Content Forms –2018-19 ACC 205; 2017-18 BIO 205IN; Fa2016 MAT 151, 2017-18 WRT 101

Cultural Diversity Course Criteria

Curriculum Procedures Manual

Downtown Campus Expansion (privileged and confidential document)

Dual Enrollment Discipline Coordinators Checklist Form

Dual Enrollment Handbook

Dual Enrollment Partnership Development Flow Chart

Dual Enrollment Site Visit Report and Course Dialogue form

Faculty Evaluation Rubric

Faculty Professional Development Program

Faculty Qualifications Requirements

Faculty Review Forms—Full Cycle

Financial Aid Website

GELO Fall 2017 Report

GELO Spring 2017 Pilot Report

General Education Board Policy BP 3.35

Global Awareness Course Criteria

Guided Pathways

Guidelines for College Discipline Area Committees

HLC Interim Report on Developmental Education 10/1/2018

HLC Multi-Campus Report – Community Campus

HLC Multi-Campus Report – Downtown Campus

HLC Multi-Campus Report – Northwest Campus

Honors Program Website

Interim Report on Developmental Education (2018)

Learning Center End of Year Report 2017-18

Mission Framework

Net Tutor Ad

Pima College Catalog

Pima Connection

Pima Online Course Development Guide

Pima Online Quality Review Rubric

Program Accreditations/Certifications

Program Reviews

Reduction in Force Framework and Implementation

Student Affairs Friday Meetings Schedule

Student Club and Organization Handbook

Student Clubs Links

Student Complaint Log with Trends and Recommendations

Student Complaint Process

Student Resources Web Page

Student Senate By-laws

Syllabi (21 total): face-to-face, online, self-paced, web-hybrid, dual enrollment offered in multiple locations

Technology Infrastructure and Resources Chart

Thirty-three online courses reviewed

Training Schedule for Financial Aid Personnel

Transfer Course Equivalency Guide

Tutoring Links and Schedule

Workforce Development . . . Contract Credit Course Checklist

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

In 2014, Pima Community College (PCC) began a revision of its mission, vision, and values statement under the purview of the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Effectiveness. PCC incorporated core themes, objectives, and key performance indicators. The process involved a broad range of internal and external constituents, i.e. faculty, staff, administrators, students, community members, and governing board.

After the Governing Board approved the recommendations in August 2015, the Board reopened the process at the request of a community organization concerned about the failure of the new mission statement to recognize the college's role as an open admissions institution. Subsequently the Board approved a revised version clearly affirming PCC as an open admissions institution. At a meeting during the visit related to Criteria 1 and 2, college employees and individuals from the community confirmed their participation in the process to create the mission statement. The mission fulfillment framework includes an institutional vision, mission, values, core themes, objectives, and key performance indicators. The KPIs related to the mission received final approval in April 2016.

The Mission states that "PCC is an open-admissions institution providing affordable, comprehensive educational opportunities that support student success and meet the diverse needs of its students and community." The college fulfills its mission by offering an array of credit and non-credit courses and programs, including workforce development and adult basic education. The college also offers placement tests in order to identify which courses are most appropriate for students. Tutoring services are available at all campus locations and online. College programs are grouped into ten program types including Arts, Humanities, and Communication; Business Careers; Computer Information Technology; Education Careers; Health-Related Professions; Public Safety Careers; Science and

Engineering; Social Sciences; Trade Professions; and General Studies. These courses and programs are accessible on six campuses as well as other locations throughout the college's service area. Additionally, the college serves students through online courses and some fully online programs. Higher achieving students (with a GPA of 3.5 or above) are given the opportunity to participate in the Honors Program, which includes an Honors Colloquium course.

PCC is a Hispanic Serving Institution (HSI). Beyond this designation, PCC's commitment to diversity is apparent through its mission statement and development of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan. The goals of the diversity plan include developing and hiring diverse faculty and staff as well as retaining and recruiting a diverse pool of students. While most of the goals are still being pursued, the college has hired an Executive Director for Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Although the college has many of the same issues with hiring and retaining diverse faculty and staff that are faced by other colleges and universities, the institution intentionally addresses diversity with potential hires during the interview process to insure a good fit between the institution and the potential hire. The college also offers several student clubs that are related to diversity and personal identity and supports and offers diverse programming for students and the community. Community participation is in part measured through the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).

Additionally, PCC has Upward Bound, Educational Talent Search, and Student Support Services TRIO programs. In 2017, the college also received a \$3.1 million HSI-STEM grant to attract Hispanic and low income students to STEM fields.

A mission fulfillment framework is in place to guide budgeting and planning. Specifically, the Mission Fulfillment Progress Report highlights improvements in various key indicators including student success and retention. The budgeting process begins with a review of the mission and institutional priorities. A budget is developed to support long range and short range plans, which is informed by the Strategic Plan, the Educational Master Plan, and the Facilities Master Plan. However, prioritization for items within the budget is somewhat unclear as most items can be linked to the college mission. The college might bring more clarity to the budgeting process by having all budget requests be submitted with identification of the specific strategic, educational, and/or facilities goal(s) as well as the portion of the mission which the funds will address.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Pima Community College articulates its mission in several documents, including the college catalog, public website, and printed brochures. The mission fulfillment framework includes the following: vision, the college's aspiration; mission, the college's role and capabilities; values, guiding areas of importance; cores themes, priorities with the mission; objectives and measurable goals with each core theme; and key performance indicators and data to monitor and assess its performance and improvement.

The mission documents are current with the mission fulfillment framework having been developed between 2014 and 2017. Within this framework, the college addresses various aspects of its mission. PCC's seven core themes include student success; access; teaching and programming excellence; student services; community engagement; diversity, inclusion and global education; and institutional effectiveness.

The mission identifies PCC as an open admissions institution that provides affordable, comprehensive opportunities that support student success and meet the diverse needs of its students and community. This diversity within the students and community focuses on interests, ability, identity, and career goals. The college fulfills this mission by offering numerous degree and certificate programs and student support services, such as advising, counseling, and tutoring. The college also offers programs for non-native English speakers, GED instruction, developmental courses, and honors courses.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Pima Community College addresses its role in a multicultural society through its diversity policies and mission. In October 2017, the PCC Board amended Board Policy 2.01 Diversity and Inclusion to connect it to the college's goal of assuring that its students and employees reflect the community's diversity. One of the explanations for the revision is that it could be inferred from the original wording of the mission statement and some of the college's actions that the college would not remain an open-door institution. The Mission statement includes a commitment to address the "diverse needs of its students and community," and the core themes and objectives include domestic and global topics.

Recent actions of the college demonstrate its commitment to being an open door institution. One area of such dedication is that PCC is designated an Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) by the Hispanic Association of Colleges and Universities. Beyond this designation, PCC's commitment to diversity is apparent through its mission statement and development of a Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Strategic Plan. The goals of the diversity plan include developing and hiring diverse faculty and staff as well as retaining and recruiting a diverse pool of students. While most of the goals are still being pursued, the college has hired an Executive Director of Diversity, Equity and Inclusion. Although the college has many of the same issues with hiring and retaining diverse faculty and staff that are faced by other colleges and universities, the institution intentionally addresses diversity with potential hires during the interview process to insure a good fit between the institution and potential hire. All job descriptions also include the following statement: "We value the diversity of our workforce and seek to hire and support employees who consistently and actively embrace diversity, equity, and inclusion." The college also offers several student clubs that are related to diversity and personal identity, which includes racial, ethnic, and sexual identity, and supports and offers programming for students and the community. Community participation was measured through the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).

In Fall 2017, the college began offering a concentration in Ethnic, Gender, and Trans-border Studies, leading to an AA degree and a Bachelor's in the social sciences. PCC provides resources for students with disabilities and seniors. It recognizes students with diverse abilities by offering a range of programs and services, for example, the Adult Basic Education for College and Career program, which provides basic skills instruction and GED testing, developmental education courses, certificates, and transfer and career programs. The college is also establishing a student center for

immigrants and refugees to provide support for a range of students including DACA participants.

Further evidence of the open door at Pima can be found in review of Core Components 3.C and 3.D and the evidence presented in the embedded report on the Developmental Education plan and activities.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Pima Community College recognizes its role to serve the public. This is evident in numerous statements of commitment to the community and in its mission fulfillment framework, which is meant to be actualized through its strategic plan. It is also evident in programs, such as adult education and dual enrollment programs. Significantly, in PCC's 2017-21 strategic plan, one of its strategic directions is to enrich the community through engagement. The plan also commits to Achieve 60 Pima with a goal to increase the percentage of Pima County residents 25 and over who hold a post-secondary degree or certificate to 60 percent by 2030.

Although there is some controversy over the recent purchase of property in order to expand the Downtown Campus, this acquisition serves the institution and the public. PCC needs to expand instructional space for some of its CTE programs - specifically Automotive Technology and Building & Construction Technologies. This expansion aligns with the college plan to create Centers of Excellence. The college and public are both served because the properties are largely in a state of disrepair and the area attracts a large number of homeless residents, which contributes to high crime rates in the immediate area. There have also already been discussions with the city regarding additional development in the area.

Tuition costs for students is in the mid-range for Arizona community colleges. Additionally, property tax rates are in the lower half of Arizona community college districts.

PCC is a public-funded, non-profit community college and as such has no investors and does not operate under a sponsoring agent; therefore, it has no financial obligations to any external interests. It operates according to state statutes governing educational institutions.

The college hosts numerous community events, including the LULAC Youth Leadership Conference, the Arizona STEM Adventure, a Career and Technical Education signing day, Tucson Japanese Festival, and the Air Guard career weekend. It also participates in a non-partisan effort to raise the voter registration rate. The college is working to establish Centers of Excellence in areas that have an

increased need for quality workers. The college also supports the local United Way. In its Facilities Master Plan, the college proposes that it will work collaboratively with the Arizona State Historic Preservation Office to respect and honor historic locations in its planning. This is seen at the Downtown Campus where signage has been preserved that was declared to have historical significance.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Evidence

According to the mission of Pima Community College, the college is "an open-admissions institution providing affordable, comprehensive educational opportunities that support student success and meet the diverse needs of its students and community. This mission was created in a multi-year process involving a broad range of internal and external constituents. The mission is present in multiple locations on the college's website and on several different forms of documentation presented by the college. The various educational offerings, programming and services provided by the college are consistent with the college mission.

The college's commitment to diversity and multicultural society is most evident in the college's official designation as an Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI). The college sponsored a large number of college and community programs related to multicultural interests, has developed a diversity plan, and has hired an administrator to specifically guide diversity initiatives.

The college uses a mission fulfillment framework to guide budgeting and planning. Specifically, the Mission Fulfillment Progress Report highlights improvements in various key indicators including student success and retention. The budgeting process begins with a review of the mission and institutional priorities. The budget is developed to support long range and short range plans.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, Pima Community College meets Criterion One.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - 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.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

Pima Community College (PCC) provided information in its assurance argument documenting its operations related to finances. The documents provided demonstrate in part a commitment to being transparent and accountable to stakeholders. To this end, the Board formed the Finance and Audit Committee made up of two board members and eight community members expert in the field of finance. This committee posts its minutes on a public website. PCC also asserts that its Finance and Administration department adhere to generally accepted accounting principles. Key pieces of evidence that demonstrate a commitment to accountability and transparency include:

- Web pages that link to key budget documents
- Publication of a Finance Newsletter
- Link to the Finance and Audit Committee

However, information provided about financial audits conducted by the Arizona General Auditor is of concern to the visiting Team. The audits conducted in 2017 found significant discrepancies:

- Internal control over financial reporting
- Internal control over major programs
 - Student Financial Assistance Cluster - meeting deadlines for reporting any change of status of students
 - TRIO Cluster - eligibility of participants

The Arizona General Auditor also found that PCC needs to improve its processes related to Information Technology security and resources.

It is not clear from the narrative nor from the site visit that consistent, long-term corrections have been effected in response to these deficiencies, though there is a claim that action has been taken. There was some conversation that students receiving federal financial aid were interviewed but the details as to how that addressed the deficiency noted in the audit is not clear. Also, several of the

proposed corrective actions will not take effect nor have evidence of sustained correction until 2019 and 2020.

PCC provides evidence that through Board Policies and other key documents that it operates with integrity related to academic matters. Key pieces of evidence include:

- Publication of compliance with FERPA
- Policy outlining appropriate faculty credentialing requirements that meet HLC criteria
- Policy providing commitment to shared governance
- Policy statement making clear faculty duties and code of ethics
- Code of conduct for students published in the PCC Catalog

In conversations with faculty, department chairs, and deans it was clear that PCC adheres to the policies and allows subject matter experts the autonomy to conduct the academic affairs of the institution.

PCC also provides evidence that through Board Policies and other key documents it operates with integrity related to administration, faculty, and staff. Key pieces of evidence include:

- Information and policy related to conflict of interest
- Publication of policies complying with the Equal Employment Opportunity, ADA, and Non-Discrimination, and Anti-Harassment laws
- Code of conduct for all employees
- Information on how to file complaints or grievances and how they are resolved
- Policies and procedures to ensure Due Process is followed.

The Human Resources Department is under new leadership and is introducing new processes related to complaints/grievances and disciplinary action that hold employees and supervisors accountable. This includes the development of policies and procedures to guarantee that employees experience Due Process. The Director of Human Resources also explained that all employees now have the opportunity to bring forward concerns through the All Employee Representative Council (AERC). These changes have increased opportunities for shared governance at the college, and the processes and new or revised policies are documented in Human Resources documents. PCC indicated that it will organize the policies into what will become a single Employee Handbook. Board policies are maintained and posted in electronic format on a public web page.

PCC provides evidence that through Board Policies and other key documents it operates with integrity related to auxiliary functions. Key pieces of evidence include:

- Policies governing athletics, including position statements on ethics, best practices, and eligibility requirements
- Contracts with vendors over \$250,000 must be approved by the Board (BP 1.05)

PCC provides sufficient evidence that its Board of Governors has policies to which it adheres that outline ethical behavior. Key pieces of evidence include:

- Board by-laws
- New board member orientation materials that include information on fiduciary responsibilities and conflict of interest
- Open meetings laws to which they must comply

The Board also conducts an annual self-assessment and asserts that it is with the intent to improve its performance and effectiveness. A report from the last self-assessment is posted on the college's website. In the report, the Board notes that the overall rating increased in the last year. There is no mention, however, that the Board made any changes or adjustments based on the results of the self-assessment. The Board is encouraged to use its self-assessments as a way to identify what it might do to engage in continuous quality improvement.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team found that Pima Community College Met Core Component 2.A with Concerns and recommends that Pima Community College be monitored for Criterion Two in relation to Arizona Auditor General audit findings.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The Team recommends that PCC submit a monitoring report no later than June 2021 to address the significant discrepancies findings in the 2017 Audit from the Arizona Auditor General. The monitoring report should provide a timeline and plan to address the following concerns:

- Internal control over financial reporting

- Internal control over major programs

 - Student Financial Assistance Cluster

 - TRIO Cluster

- Issues related to Information Technology

 - Risk-assessment process to include information technology security

 - Access controls over its information technology resources

 - Configuration management processes over its information technology resources

 - Security over its information technology resources

 - Contingency planning procedures for its information technology resources

 - Internal control over purchasing

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

PCC presents itself clearly to students on its website and catalog. It also provides information to students on its academic advising website. Furthermore, the college provides information to students on cost of attendance through a net-price calculator and a website titled "Paying for School." A student code of conduct is published in the catalog and linked to syllabi.

Students have access to information about faculty and administrators on the college's website.

Board minutes are published, providing students and other stakeholders information about Board meetings, decisions, and actions taken. The internal and external community can also attend Board meetings in person or through a live-stream.

Information about HLC accreditation and other specialized accrediting agencies is appropriately published on the college's website. The Statement of Affiliation Status with the Commission, along with contact information, is published on the college's accreditation web page.

Each of these pieces of evidence provides sufficient documentation that PCC meets this sub-component.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met

Evidence

PCC's Board of Governors is responsible for approving the college's strategic direction, approves the college's Strategic Plan, and periodically reviews the college's mission, vision and values statements. It is responsible for authorizing the expenditure of funds to meet the college's needs as presented in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan, the Educational and Facilities Master Plans, and the Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan. The Board is the final approval entity for activating new programs and deactivating programs that are no longer viable.

The Board provides means whereby stakeholders can submit concerns and invites attendance at board meetings. It is committed to transparency and as such makes meeting minutes available online. The community can attend meetings in person or through live-stream and there is an opportunity during meetings for public comment. The Board also ensures that it follows open meeting laws.

The All Employee Representative Council (AERC) and the All College Council (ACC) have published the guidelines on their web pages on how to submit concerns on personnel and college issues. PCC also has a formal policy and established procedures for submitting concerns/complaints and suggesting revisions to the Administrative Procedures manual.

The Board's Finance and Audit Committee and the Human Resources Advisory Committee, which include Board members and external community stakeholders, participate in making recommendations. Furthermore, the budget is presented to the Finance and Audit committee for review before it goes to the Board for the approval. In the spirit of transparency, these committees' reports and meeting minutes are available on their respective web pages.

Board members are elected to six-year terms and are subject to state ethics and conflict of interest laws. The Board's bylaws outline expectations related to ethical behavior and conduct.

The Board by policy does not make decisions related to academic affairs except for activating or deactivating programs; academic and pedagogical decisions are the responsibility of the provost, per the Board by-laws. The day-to-day functioning of the college is delegated to the Chancellor. The duties of the Board and the chancellor are codified in the Board by-laws. The Board has done a 360 evaluation of the Chancellor, demonstrating that it is responsive to its duties. Board members have also attended board training to improve their understanding of their roles and duties.

Faculty responsibilities are codified in the Curriculum Procedures Manual. Faculty have the authority to make curricular and pedagogical decisions. During the site visit faculty reported that they also have oversight of dual enrollment and online courses.

The documentation provides sufficient evidence that the Board is autonomous and that it delegates day-to-day governing of the college to the chancellor.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

PCC has a freedom of speech policy in place for faculty members that protects their rights to teach and present materials that will support learning and help students achieve proscribed outcomes. Freedom of speech was specifically discussed during the Open Forums. At the Forums as well as during other sessions and the multi-campus visits, attendees asserted that they felt safe expressing their ideas and opinions. The Team found the responses of session attendees to be thoughtful with employees and students willing to explain areas in need of improvement and to offer suggestions. While the assurance argument does not reference Board Policy 1.17, the Visit Team found in its conversations with over 300 constituents that the college demonstrates a commitment to freedom of expression for all stakeholders, not only faculty, through this policy.

The Governing Board invites public comments from stakeholders while also providing a means to submit anonymous complaints or grievances.

The narrative for this sub-component focuses on faculty. PCC might consider how to document that it has extended the conversation to staff and students, who also have the need to have their rights protected to speak freely in the pursuit of learning on the campus and in the classroom.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

PCC has resources in place to ensure that faculty and students adhere to and understand ethical practices related to research and use of information. For faculty this is accomplished in part through the Institutional Research, Planning & Effectiveness department. This department ensures through what appears to be an IRB process that all research projects involving human subjects are conducted ethically and protect the human subjects involved. An example of a project that has undergone this review would help readers of this assurance argument better determine how this is done and the college's commitment to enforcing ethical research practices.

Students have access to tutorials through the library that offer guidance in the ethical use of information. The Student Code of Conduct published on the college's website and linked to syllabi communicates to students the expectations related to academic honesty. Students also learn about and receive guidance in how to evaluate and use information in the Writing 101 course. The linked course content guide does not, however, list the ethical use of information as an outcome. Therefore, it is not clear how this is taught or assessed. The college - specifically the writing program - might consider revising the outcomes for this course to include the ethical use of information to ensure that all faculty who teach this course understand that teaching this skill is a required component of the course and, as such, should be assessed.

In the event that a student plagiarizes intentionally or unintentionally, the team learned during the visit that there is a training module on how not to plagiarize for both face-to-face and online students. Students also have access to Turnitin to check for possible and/or unintentional plagiarism.

The Student Code of Conduct is the means by which the college communicates to students expectations of academic honesty and integrity. The master syllabus provides a link to a syllabus supplement webpage that also links to the Student Code of Conduct.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

PCC has presented evidence in this argument and during the site visit that they act with integrity. The college has policies and practices that ensure integrity and has published policies related to this criterion on web pages, in minutes, and in the catalog. The Board, administration, faculty, and staff follow established policies and procedures. New human resource processes have been instituted to ensure due process.

Issues related to the significant deficiencies reported in the audits have not been sufficiently addressed. Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team finds that Pima Community College Meets Criterion Two with Concerns. The Team recommends that the College submit a monitoring report outlined in 2.A.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

The Pima Community College demonstrates that its courses and programs are current and require levels of performance appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded through both external and internal processes.

PCC offers transfer courses and programs, certificates, and career and technical education (CTE) programs. Transfer courses and programs are kept current through the Arizona Transfer System, which includes 40 discipline-specific Articulation Task Forces and a Course Equivalency Guide. Significantly, the Task Forces, which include discipline faculty from the three state universities, Arizona community colleges, and tribal colleges, discuss curriculum as well as transferability and applicability of community college courses to the universities' courses. University requirements inform revisions, updates, and deletions of courses and programs.

In addition, the college examines post-transfer outcomes with University of Arizona since this university receives the greatest number of PCC students. The average success rate of the student cohort of 2014-15, who took courses, was only three percentage points lower than the average rate of University of Arizona students. The college lists articulation agreements with 19 universities on its website. Detailed program articulations exist for the major receiving institutions - Arizona State, University of Arizona, and Northern Arizona - through the Transfer Admissions Guarantee (TAG) program. Some students, however, complained that many of their courses do not transfer into a program, and the college acknowledges that previously it only required that 75 percent of required courses in the AA degree meet requirements of the bachelor's degrees at state universities. The college notes that it has addressed this issue in the 2018-19 catalog, which states clearly that the

requirements only align as closely as possible to the first two years at the University of Arizona. The college also plans to indicate clearly to which university(ies) Pima degrees align both in its online information and in next year's PDF catalog. Moreover, PCC is working to improve transfer advising, especially through its Guided Pathways program, an approach which can complement the tools the three state universities make available to transfer students.

CTE programs are kept current in several ways. Advisory committees composed of local employers, discipline faculty, and program deans make recommendations about student learning outcomes and about the development and revision of courses and programs to address industry requirements. Industry representatives who attended sessions during the Team's visit praised the college for its responsiveness, flexibility, and excellent programs. Advisory committee meeting minutes confirm these interactions. One improvement effort underway is developing a recommendations form and formalizing the process for advisory committees to make recommendations. The rigor and currency of programs are also attested to by Special Accreditation. Twenty-four programs have specialized accreditation which requires adherence to standards related to curriculum, facilities, resources, and student support. Data for 2015-17 indicate that students achieved pass rates above 90 percent on most licensure examinations and other technical skills assessments.

In Fall 2018, the college initiated the Guided Pathways framework to improve students' educational experience from entry through graduation. The Pathways includes advising, student support, and program mapping for transfer or careers. As a result, several PCC courses and programs were benchmarked with other community colleges and state universities. These include the Associate of Arts in Liberal Arts Communications Concentrations, Automotive Technology Associate of Applied Science, Dental Assisting Education Certificate with plans to modify or develop plans for the remaining 33 programs. This initiative also resulted in modification of course credits, prerequisites, and learning outcomes. Discipline faculty, the College Curriculum Council, and Academic Quality Improvement regularly review courses and programs. Courses must be reviewed every five years and programs every four years, fewer if necessary.

The college articulates associate degree and certificate programs in its catalog and online and differentiates learning goals for each program. The college offers career and technical programs as well as transfer programs. The Career and Technical (CTE) programs are designed for employment in a program-related area. The transfer programs are designed to match the first two years of a bachelor's degree. More specific descriptions are also available on individual program web pages. For example, it is noted that under transfer programs, the Associate of Arts (AA) degree prepares students to transfer into university majors in the liberal arts, humanities, social and behavioral sciences, and education; the Associate of Science (AS) prepares students to transfer into majors in science or health-related programs. In addition to program learning outcomes, also noted on individual program pages are course requirements, career and academic options indicating what a student can do upon completing a certificate or degree program.

PCC offers courses in a variety of modalities - face-to-face, self-paced, online, dual enrollment, and through contractual arrangements - on campus and at numerous locations. All modalities subscribe to a centralized curriculum reviewed and approved by discipline faculty, the College Curriculum Council, the District Curriculum Office, the Office of Academic Quality Improvement, and the provost. All modalities are required to use a standardized syllabus template, which includes a course content section requiring information such as course description, outline, and learning outcomes. A template for each course is posted on the Intranet. Discipline Coordinators and Department Heads review syllabi for consistency.

Online courses are taught using a master course developed by faculty subject-master experts (SME) in conjunction with the PimaOnline department chair and a design team from the Center for Learning Technology. Modifications must be cleared through the PimaOnline department chair. Online courses must adhere to the PimaOnline Course Development Guide. The guide is detailed, clear, and covers both design and delivery of online courses. PimaOnline is also a member of the Quality Matters statewide consortium. Thirty three courses have been Quality Matter reviewed and nine additional courses are being reviewed this fall.

Processes and procedures are in place to oversee dual credit. There is a coordinator for the district; faculty qualification requirements are the same as for campus faculty; and faculty liaisons review and approve syllabi and course materials for dual credit offerings. Program documents also include a dual enrollment handbook, a checklist, and a site visit report.

PCC also uses a checklist to ensure that contractual arrangements are also equivalent.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

The general education program is appropriate to Pima Community College's mission, educational offerings, and degree levels. Its requirements vary by degree and certificate. Students in the Associate in Arts, Business, Fine Arts, Arts, and Science degree programs complete a statewide general education block requiring 35-37 credit hours in English Composition, Humanities, Fine Arts, Mathematics, Biological and Physical Sciences, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and other requirements as articulated by individual programs. Students in the Associate of Applied Science degree programs must complete 15 credit hours in general education in Communications, Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Science, Science and Mathematics, and other requirements. The college catalog identifies specific requirements by program, which students can access on their degree or certificate web page.

The philosophy of General Education is articulated on the website and in Board Policy 3.35 General Education, noting that "General Education helps students to gain an understanding of themselves; history and culture; and the principles and impact of mathematics, science, technology, and effective communication." The description further notes that General Education develops thinking skills, such as comparing, interpreting, reasoning, problem solving, imagining and creating, and decision making.

The content of the program for transfer students is guided by the student's major. To fulfill the General Education requirements, students may select from one of three Arizona General Education

Curricula (AGEC) pathways: AGECE-A Arts, AGECE-B Business, and AGECE-S Sciences. Each pathway requires completion of courses in the following categories: English Composition, Mathematics, Arts and Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences, and Physical and Biological Sciences, which fulfill the lower-division requirements for all Arizona community colleges and state universities. Within these categories, students must take at least one course that fulfills the Intensive Writing and Critical Inquiry requirement, one that fulfills the Cultural Diversity requirement, and one that fulfills the Global Awareness requirement.

The General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) were developed by the General Education Committee and are aligned with the college's definition of general education. These outcomes are in the following areas:

1. Communication: Effectively communicate information, ideas and/or arguments appropriate to the audience and purpose.
2. Critical and Creative Thinking: Identify and investigate problems and develop creative, practical, and ethical solutions by evaluating information and using appropriate methods of reasoning.
3. Quantitative And Scientific Literacy and Analysis: Use mathematical and scientific processes, procedures, data, or evidence to solve problems.
4. Information Literacy: Locate, evaluate, and use information from diverse sources in an effective and ethical manner.
5. Diverse Cultural, Historical, and Global Perspectives: Demonstrate understanding of the values and influence of diverse cultural, historical, and global perspectives.

The GELOs are integrated in AA, AAS, and AGS degree programs, and in some certificate programs. The faculty are in the process of including them in all appropriate certificate programs. These outcomes are included in course and program assessment; however, it is not evident that all students in degree programs will be exposed to each outcome. The college also acknowledges that all degree programs do not yet assess general education outcomes, but the college is in the process of curriculum mapping to achieve this goal. As the faculty continues to map learning outcomes to courses and programs, the Team recommends that attention be given to students in all degree programs achieve and are assessed for all GELOs.

In a report on GELO assessment results for Fall and Spring 2017 reported on more completely in 4.B, Communication and Information Literacy either surpassed the 75% benchmark or was only slightly below it.

Through the Arizona General Education Core (AGEC) distribution requirements, students engage in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments. The GELOs also include this aspect of students' academic development in the communication, quantitative and scientific literacy and analysis, information literacy, and critical and creative thinking outcomes. The libraries offer tutorials on scholarly practices for discovering information resources. In the Honors Program, students are exposed, for example, to scholarly research, writing, and critical reflection. In a report of the Fall and Spring 2017 results, however, Critical & Creative Thinking and Quantitative & Scientific Literacy and Analysis were below the 75% benchmark with the former scoring 62% and the latter scoring 44%. As a result, one response by faculty members is to begin work on revising the rubric. The college is also encouraged to review these outcomes in course and program assessments and to significantly increase faculty participation.

The education that the college offers recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world through course requirements and diversity activities. In fact, the Team commends the PCC for its recognition of the importance of diversity in the world. PCC has a diversity statement online. Board Policy 2.01 affirms the college's commitment to diversity (Rev. 2014). The college has also developed a Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan (2017-2020) and recently hired an Executive Director of Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion.

The Arizona General Education Curriculum (AGEC) as well as the applied science and general studies degrees require students to complete courses in cultural diversity and global awareness. One of the General Education outcomes is an appreciation of cultural and global diversity. In Fall 2017, the institution began offering a concentration in Ethnic, Gender, and Transborder Studies in the Associate of Arts degree. The college has also indicated an intent to recruit more international students, thus increasing the number from 259 students enrolled in Fall 2015. Approximately 45 students studied abroad in the last two years, and the college continues to develop study abroad opportunities. According to the Center for International Education and Global Engagement, PCC offers 132 courses with "Cultural and Global Diversity" content. According to the college's Argument, evidence of an internal audit shows that this office has been evaluated and recommendations for continuous improvement efforts are noted. These improvements, however, appear to be more procedural than content based. This program is encouraged to assess its goals also. To its credit, the Center will be recognized by the Association of International Education Administrators (AIEA) for its programs. Other activities include a program for Latino middle school girls and another for high school students from underprivileged backgrounds. The hiring of a diversity officer, who has begun outreach to various community organizations, will no doubt increase diversity activities. Diversity activities also include workshops, such as Implicit Bias, Universal Design, Teaching with a Social Justice Lens, Creating an Inclusive Organization, and Micro-aggressions.

Student clubs represent the diversity of the student body, and they sponsor a variety of activities, such as celebrations of Filipino-American heritage month and the lunar new year as well as diversity-related workshops. Greater participation might be gained if the college increased outreach efforts across campuses and explored various technological avenues to improve communication with students.

PCC still faces challenges, however, as it implements its plan to achieve its goals to improve recruitment and retention of employees, especially faculty, from underrepresented populations, build diversity and inclusion competencies of employees, and increase student diversity and inclusion. Although the college is designated a Hispanic-serving institution, it still has to address service requirements for other identified constituencies, such as other ethnic/racial groups as well as ESL and under-prepared students. It is noted that the reduction in force, while necessary, might adversely affect the last hired and future hiring decisions. In its diversity plan, the college states that it aspires to a student body and workforce that reflects the Pima County community. One objective under strategic goal number two is to "create applicant pools that reflect the diversity of the community," which is aligned with Strategic Direction 5.3 of the 2014-17 Strategic Plan. The college also states that it will focus on underrepresented and marginalized communities. Yet, the college also notes that it will not use demographic data for hiring preferences and leaves it up to individuals to self-identify. Thus, PCC's challenge is to find ways to fulfill its goals and objectives for diversity despite these realities.

Faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative endeavors, and the discovery of knowledge.

Many faculty contribute original scholarship within their fields. The Faculty share their research at a Faculty Speakers Series, teaching strategies workshops, and professional development days. Their creative endeavors are evident in *Cababi*, an art and literary magazine featuring work from PCC faculty and staff. Students are also involved in scholarly and creative work. For example, students have an opportunity to present original research at an annual Social Science Symposium; creative works in *SandScript*, a journal featuring poetry, prose, and art; and other creative work in plays, concerts, and performances. Faculty, staff, and students have also had the opportunity to interact with and learn from Fulbright scholars.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team finds Pima Community College Meets with Concerns Core Component 3.B and recommends monitoring for Criterion 3.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a required follow-up interim report on Criterion 3, Core Component 3.B, submitted no later than June 2021. The report will demonstrate that PCC has maintained its focus, clearly identified GELOs through all courses designated as meeting general education requirements, has mapped and consistently assesses GELOs through all degree programs, and has increased the participation of all general education faculty in the assessment of GELOs.

Further details for this report will be found in Criterion 4, Core Components 4.A and 4.B and in the Summary of the report.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The college has a sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out academic responsibilities, employing 285 full-time and 763 adjunct faculty. In one forum, faculty noted that Chemistry does not have enough full-time faculty and that, although there is a sufficient number of adjuncts, it is difficult to maintain those numbers. The majority of dual enrollment courses are taught by adjunct faculty. The college has demonstrated that it has improved its student to faculty ratio from 27:1 to 25:1. Faculty are involved in curricular development and review mainly through the College Curriculum Council and Discipline Area Committees using the Curriculum Procedures Manual as a guide. They are also involved in college-wide committees, academic advising, assessment, and developing student learning outcomes and instruments to assess these outcomes. Some adjuncts are involved in these processes. The college is in the process of Reductions In Force (RIFs) resulting in nine faculty lay offs. Two positions have been saved temporarily because faculty agreed to give up some professional development funding and release time for a year. The effect of the loss of ELL (English Language Learner) faculty is not yet apparent. These reductions have been made with faculty involvement, including establishing criteria. The reductions were in areas of low enrollment, and the college has stated that it will make any future cuts in a responsible way.

The college has identified minimum qualifications for faculty, and the requirements are the same for full-time, adjunct, dual enrollment, and online faculty as well as for those who teach in all other modalities. Information about applying for a faculty position can be found on the Pima website, and

all applicants must go through a certification process. A review of faculty records by the Team indicates that faculty meet the required qualifications. There is a concern about dual enrollment faculty qualifications, however. Some lacked 18 hours in their teaching field: however, the Higher Learning Commission has granted an extension until September 1, 2022, for them to reach compliance. The Team reviewed plans for compliance and determined that faculty member progress to date suggests that this will be accomplished on or before that date.

Both full- and part-time faculty are evaluated. Full-time faculty are evaluated in three-year intervals, new full-time faculty at two-year intervals, and those on a performance improvement plan, annually. All faculty must submit annual goals. Full-time faculty evaluations include peer-to-peer classroom observation or materials review, a consideration of student evaluations, and a self-reflection form. The evaluation concludes with a collegial conference with the supervisor to review goals and evaluation for the minimum requirement relative to teaching and service. A Faculty Evaluation Rubric is used in this phase. Department heads evaluate part-time faculty using an Adjunct Faculty Evaluation. In 2017-18, two changes occurred to improve the evaluation process: an online portal called MyCareerCenter is being used, and department heads, rather than a Dean or Vice President, will evaluate full-time faculty.

Pima establishes its expectation that instructors remain current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles, and to that end, supports their professional development with generous professional enrichment funds. Each full-time faculty member is allocated up to \$1,000 each year (with a cap of \$4,000) to cover coursework, professional materials, memberships, training, attendance at workshops, seminars, and conferences. PCC also provides its own professional development activities, including an annual All Faculty Day. Full-time faculty may apply for a semester-long sabbatical with full pay or a year-long sabbatical with half pay after seven years of employment. As an added incentive, faculty may be honored with the Professional Enrichment Recognition Award.

Full-time faculty are required to hold at least five office hours per week for teaching a 15-hour load in 16 weeks. Upon approval, they may hold up to 20 percent of their office hours electronically. Faculty teaching in other modalities, such as online and hybrid, may hold up to 80 percent electronically upon approval, and some hours may be offsite, but faculty must respond to student emails within 24 hours during the work week. Adjunct faculty are not required to hold office hours. Adjunct faculty reported that they do not have office space. The Team found that, in fact, adjuncts do not have their own offices, but each campus has a Faculty Resource Center that is dedicated to adjunct faculty and provides them with desk space for working and meeting with students as well as their own mailbox. Full-time faculty stated that they meet with some of the students of adjuncts to provide them advising. All full-time and adjunct faculty have PCC email accounts through Google Gmail and list office telephone numbers and email addresses on their syllabi so that students may contact them.

Student support services staff are qualified and supported in their professional development. Staff are hired according to district standards, screened for minimum job qualifications, and evaluated according to core competencies. Candidates must provide evidence of educational credentials and pass a background check. The Team reviewed a random selection of staff credentials, especially in the advising area, and found them to meet defined credentials.

The majority of Financial Aid Advisors hold college degrees; counseling faculty hold master's degrees; program advisors hold a bachelor's or higher degree; and student life coordinators and program developers hold a bachelor's or higher degree. Over 100 tutors are certified through the College Reading and Learning Association's International Tutor Training Program (CRLA) in over

20 subject areas. The tutoring centers are also CRLA certified.

Exempt and non-exempt staff groups receive \$100,000 each annually to attend conferences and to participate in other educational endeavors. PCC also provides professional development in-house. It provides education and training to make sure that staff are knowledgeable about new regulations, new policies, and new or updated technologies. Staff are cross-trained in financial aid, advising, records and registration, customer service, and co-curricular activities through weekly training sessions. Training for Title IV, Veterans Services, Title IX, and the Clery Act are provided annually to assure adherence to federal compliance. On the second and fourth Fridays of the month, student affairs staff meet to stay abreast of regulations or to address current issues. Topics include working with DACA students and reviewing prior learning assessment documents from CAEL.

The college requires newly-hired staff to participate in an orientation session; newly-hired faculty attend the Faculty Learning Academy. In spring 2018, a comprehensive mandatory training program was implemented for all employees.

The Criterion 5 summary indicates plans to begin in 2018-2019 a compensation and classification study and an institution-wide staffing analysis to take steps to ensure that all staff and faculty are appropriately trained. These areas include leadership development, customer service, and continuous quality improvement.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

PCC provides a wide range of student support services typical of community colleges. These include career and academic counseling, financial aid advising, counseling, college success, referrals for personal challenges, testing centers, Accessibility and Disability Resource (ADR) services, and veterans services. Student service centers on PCC campuses are each open over 40 hours per week, and virtual support is available 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Learning Centers offer tutoring, learning skills workshops, study space, and other student supports. Findings indicate that students have improved their persistence rates and also indicate a slightly higher level of course success for those who use the learning centers than those who do not. Student satisfaction surveys indicate that students are very satisfied with the centers' services. The centers have received a five-year renewal of their College Reading and Learning Association (CRLA) certification. Information about accessing tutoring services is readily available. Students can go online to find tutoring schedules and locations. Since only about 25 percent of students use the services of the learning centers however, the staff are trying to provide services to more students by engaging faculty through a learning center advisory committee and seeking referrals through the early alert system.

The college has used nationally-normed surveys, the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), and the Survey of Entering Student Engagement (SENSE) to measure student satisfaction with its support services. Students also completed the HLC student survey, and the Team met with student leaders on campus. Their main areas of dissatisfaction were with academic and financial aid advising, especially in terms of inaccurate and inconsistent information, and to a lesser extent, programming/scheduling and teaching. Student leaders complemented TRIO advisors. To improve services, the staff have been diligent in planning and making change. For examples, they have created an advising syllabus and plan to provide students with assigned advisors, to implement

a case management system, to increase use of Starfish, which provides technology support, and to improve advisor training in the Guided Pathways model. When fully implemented, such changes could have a significant impact on the advising process.

Online support services include NetTutor, Grammarly, learning centers access, Turnitin, and video assignments. In lab science courses, students may perform experiments at home, and Labster, a virtual reality lab in Biology, is being piloted. This lab was created by a Biology faculty member to improve instruction.

PCC has been responsive to previous concerns about placement and developmental education as confirmed by an Interim Report on Developmental Education (10/1/2018) and the Team's observations. The report indicates the following: the college continues to work on the Development Education Redesign; students are now directed to a clearly defined process to assess students' abilities for placement and advisement; an early alert system is now in use; developmental math and writing courses are current with adequate resources and faculty professional development support. The Team also confirms that the redesign is being successfully implemented. The college directs entering students to the appropriate courses and provides learning supports and preparatory courses for those who do not qualify for college-level courses. Entering students are first evaluated on high school data or high school equivalency to determine placement into developmental or credit-level courses. They are placed in courses through multiple measures as well as course prerequisites. Multiple measures placement is moving from the pilot phase into full implementation Fall 2018. If necessary, students take a placement test (Accuplacer). Their placements range from preparatory to college-level coursework. Preparatory courses in mathematics, reading, and writing are offered at multiple levels. For example, Adult Basic Education for College and Career (ABECC) provides courses for high school equivalency. Developmental courses in mathematics, reading, and writing are offered on each campus. The mathematics division offers courses in three modalities—face-to-face, online, and a self-paced computer laboratory known as an emporium. Reading is a two-semester sequence, and writing is a one-level course, with a new, integrated reading and writing course for the lowest level students. The college also developed Integrated College Skills courses for entry-level students, which combine student success application skills, basic skills in mathematics, reading, writing, digital literacy, and interdependence. The college is also measuring the effectiveness of the program. For example, course success rates in the face-to-face elementary algebra increased from 40 percent in Fall 2014 to 55 percent in fall 2017.

PCC provides academic advising through program advisors, counselors, program information sessions, and guidance tailored to student subgroups. Full-time enrollment advisors provide general and program advising. Counselors advise undecided students and conduct new student orientations. The Veterans Center staff advise active military and veterans. The Center for Training and Development staff advise students in career training programs. The program advisor concept began in the fall of 2017, and as part of the program, some faculty advise in their disciplines. Student concerns about inconsistent and incorrect information as well as confusion about the best staff person to see for advice are apparent in surveys and discussions with student leaders. To address these concerns, some programs have academic advisors; have considered embedding advisors with the Pathways model; and have assigned students to a specific advisor in student services. The Team encourages the college to consider academic advisors for all programs. The college also plans to implement a case management system in which students are expected to meet with their instructors at least twice in a semester, and, if an intervention is necessary, a study plan will be developed, and the student will be referred to tutoring. PCC also uses Hobson's Starfish software in an initiative called Pima Connection to improve communication with the students who are most vulnerable. This

initiative was piloted in Fall 2017 and fully implemented in Spring 2018. Scheduling was also an issue for students. The college is urged to move forward in implementing Guided Pathways processes that would address this issue so that students are not forced to enroll in courses at multiple campuses to complete degree requirements. Some students stated that moving from campus to campus is a hardship because of poor or lack of transportation.

PCC provides adequate infrastructure and resources to support effective teaching and learning, identified and prioritized through its Educational and Facilities Master Plans. Instructional technology is available at each campus and is enhanced by desktop computer labs, active learning classrooms, and smart boards. Tech Corner provides just in time support for students and staff who have technical problems. Wireless internet is available at each campus. The online student portal and learning management system are available 24 hours. IT is in the process of bringing technology up to date on all campuses. Forty-seven science labs, libraries, performance arts spaces, and over 60 clinical sites support the teaching and learning experience. Adult learning centers have adequate resources.

Some areas have combined program resources, which expands the resources for both programs. Some CTE programs receive donated resources; one program uses a fire academic training facility to promote familiarity with equipment. Some faculty expressed a need for more space for active learning, a requirement covered in the Master Educational Plan. The college has expressed a need to increase and improve space for the trades and automotive programs, both planned for in the Master Facilities plan and one of the motivators behind the purchase of four pieces of land adjacent to the Downtown Campus.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Several co-curricular programs contribute to students' educational experience. The Emerging Leaders Program helps students identify their strengths and ways to interact with others. Service learning is incorporated in some courses, and the Honors in Action Project requires students to conduct research on specific topics that can transform into a project that provides for the public good. CAD students create housing designs that assist the Habitat for Humanity Tucson chapter. The J.A.D.E. program students participate in a three-day retreat to increase their awareness of social justice. The Aztec Gold Program is an advanced leadership program in which students learn principles of leadership theory and apply them to social change projects. Other co-curricular activities include the Commit to College Welcome Event, Suicide Awareness and Prevention Event, Hispanic/Latinx Heritage/Anzalduua Celebration, 14 athletic teams, 30 active student clubs, and arts productions.

The CAD Program, the Aztec Gold Program, and the Honors in Action Project, a service learning project, are examples of students engagement in the community. Student clubs participate in clothing drives, clean-up campaigns, mentoring high school students, and helping to prepare Thanksgiving dinners for the needy.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

Pima Community College's courses and programs are appropriate for its degree and certificate levels with differentiated learning goals at each level. Courses are offered as follows: face to face, online, hybrid, dual enrollment, and self-paced with required oversight to assess quality. A general education program, philosophy, and outcomes have been articulated and are being measured primarily through articulation and outcomes assessments in courses and programs. The college addresses diversity through its diversity plan, hiring a diversity director, course requirements, workshops for faculty and staff, activities of the Center for International Education and Global Engagement, and student clubs.

Although the college is undergoing RIFs, there currently appears to be sufficient faculty and staff, who are appropriately qualified, supported, and evaluated. One exception is several dual enrollment instructors need additional hours in their teaching field; however, the Team confirmed that they are working towards compliance. Faculty and staff support students through personal, course, and program advisement. Advising complaints are being addressed through professional development, assigned advisors, and technological access and improvement. Issues related to placement and developmental education have been adequately addressed through a clearly defined placement process, appropriate course placement, and course success rate assessments. Co-curricular programs such as Emerging Leaders and Honors and club activities are in place to contribute to students' educational experience. A co-curricular assessment instrument has been designed to confirm their contributions.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team found Pima Community College meets Criterion Three with Concerns. The Team found that integration and assessment of general education learning outcomes (GELOs) is not complete in all degree programs and faculty participation in the assessment effort is spotty. The Team recommends monitoring to document full implementation of assessment and participation of faculty members.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

PCC reviews programs on a four-year cycle at a minimum. The Office of Academic Quality Improvement (AQI) is responsible for facilitating the process and recently implemented a new program review process in fall 2017. Evidence is presented for a completed review of the Anthropology Associate's in Arts program and the Behavioral Health Studies programs. The visiting team heard from faculty for the Associate's in Science program that they completed its program review this fall. Conversations revealed PCC has completed reviews on 25 percent of its programs since inception of the new process with a goal of all programs being reviewed by Fall 2019. The Team is concerned that it saw no clear linkage of the new Program Review to the budgeting process.

PCC offers 32 programs (degrees or certificates) that are accredited, approved, endorsed, or certified by specialized agencies. Many of these programs complete an annual program review as required to maintain good standing with the specialized agencies.

During the 2017 initial work in preparation of implementing the Guided Pathways model in 2018, PCC reviewed all programs on a high level for viability as it created program pathways. This process resulted in the recommendation to inactivate seven certificates, 12 degree programs, three certificate concentrations, and three degree concentrations. These decisions were based on the three-year average of program graduates.

PCC evaluates prior college-level course work and training utilizing the American Council on Education (ACE) for corporate/military experience/training, Advanced Placement (AP), CLEP, and International Baccalaureate (IB) guidelines/recommendations for College Credit. The Team confirmed that faculty are also involved in evaluating these processes and also are compensated for proctoring challenge exams or completing portfolio reviews for prior learning credit assessment.

Transfer student instructions are clearly displayed on the Pima webpage, including a link to the State of Arizona transfer system. There is also a link to a list of the state higher education institutions that have articulation agreements with PCC. Arizona also has common general education requirements for all public institutions and PCC utilizes a Course Equivalency Guide that is maintained for all in-state universities. However, the team heard from students that it has been unclear to them what courses transfer for their specific degrees and Academic Advisors confirmed that there have been challenges in the past with consistent advising of students. To address this, program specific advisors have been assigned and program pathways have been developed under the Guided Pathways model recently adopted by PCC. The Team encourages PCC to complete Guided Pathways for all of its programs as a way to guide students to effective transfer and efficient completion of programs.

Full-time faculty members, as well as administrators, advisory council members from the community, adjunct faculty, students, and the College Curriculum Office may be initiators of curriculum. Faculty are responsible for the development of the curriculum under the guidance of the Pima Curriculum Procedures Manual, presented as evidence, which was developed in 2018. This manual includes a step-by-step guide to curriculum development, including all required elements. Faculty work closely with Advisory Committees to make improvements in the curriculum. There is a strong working relationship with industry partners to ensure that program learning outcomes align with community needs. The Team heard from Advisory Committee members who described how they have provided feedback for curriculum which was implemented.

After review of faculty transcripts in HR, it was determined that faculty are qualified. Faculty who teach dual enrollment are not PCC faculty; however, high school faculty who teach the dual enrollment courses are required to maintain the same qualifications as PCC faculty. A sampling of transcripts confirmed this. The exception was two dual enrollment faculty who have submitted plans to complete the necessary 18 graduate credit hours in their subject areas. Both faculty members are currently enrolled in graduate courses and are expected to complete their necessary hours by the summer of 2019, well within the deadline established by HLC.

PCC has 24 programs with specialized accreditation which are listed on their website. The Strategic Plan Strategic Direction 2.5 focuses on reviewing existing advisory boards and advisory committee structure and ensuring programs are using evidence-based practices in order to meet accreditation standards. The visiting Team confirmed with faculty and program directors that there are strong relationships with industry partners and advisory committees. The Team heard from a variety of

advisory committee members about the available opportunities to have input on program learning outcomes. Many advisory committee members expressed their satisfaction with the relationships between PCC and industry partners.

To evaluate the success of its graduates, PCC uses the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) metrics, a national system of accountability specifically for community colleges, sponsored by the AACC. The VFA reports six-year outcomes, comparison of IPEDS graduation rates to VFA Outcomes, developmental education progress, and student two-year progress.

Institutional Research, Planning and Effectiveness (IRPE) department administers a Graduate Exit Survey approximately three weeks before the end of each term to measure four main sections, including student intent, employment status, continuing education, educational experience, and student success. The survey also includes open-ended questions soliciting feedback relating to how PCC could have made the responder's experience better and giving students an opportunity to share a favorite memory or any thoughts about their college experience. The 2016-17 exit survey report presented as evidence included 909 responses of 3504 graduates (26 percent response rate).

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a required follow-up interim report on Criterion 4, Core Component 4.A, submitted no later than June 2021. The report will demonstrate that PCC has developed a direct process for data and data analysis resulting from Program Review to be used in the budgeting process. It will be able to demonstrate the funding results from implementing that process, and the metrics that will be used to close the loop.

Further details for this report will be found in Criterion 3, Core Component 3.B and Criterion 4, Core Components 4.B and in the Summary of the report.

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

Evidence is presented that reflects goals and measurable activities are being developed at PCC, although consistency and quality varies. The evidence file and website reveal that all of their courses and most all Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs (AAS and Certificates) have learning outcomes that are determined by the faculty and informed by the program advisory boards. It is important to note that some of the programs have a large number of learning outcomes, which may present challenges for ongoing assessment (e.g., 10 learning outcomes for AAS – Computer Aided Design, 10 learning outcomes for the Emergency Medical Technician Certificate program). Program learning outcomes gaps identified include the Machine Tool Technology AAS has PLOs but has incomplete information published on learning outcomes for the seven concentrations within the program; the CAD Technician certificate has no learning outcomes; and the Dental Hygiene AAS program has one PLO listed which is not a measurable learning outcome. The evidence presented and the website do not show there to be program learning outcomes for all of the transfer degrees. For instance, no evidence demonstrates program learning outcomes for the General Studies degree although General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) might serve part of this function.

PCC has begun to create a consistent process for assessing learning outcomes. Evidence presented includes an Assessment Handbook for faculty guidance developed by the Office of Academic Quality Improvement (AQI), an assessment flowchart outlining the assessment cycle at PCC, an Assessment Workshop meeting minutes, and a post-SLO workshop survey for faculty feedback. The college also created the Student Learning Assessment Workgroup (SLAW) in the spring of 2016 to provide support to faculty in determining learning outcomes, developing good assessment practices, analyzing data results, and designing improvement plans informed by the data collected. AQI also created a Program Assessment Evaluation & Plan document that guides program assessment. This form includes the PIMA (Plan, Implement, Measure, Act) model for assessment. A completed plan report was submitted as evidence for the Accounting AAS program.

Embedded report for "Goals and activities implemented by the new staff charged with oversight of

assessment activities" is addressed in the remaining narrative.

PCC has demonstrated a commitment to improved assessment practices by providing release time for faculty to participate in assessment-focused activities, such as serving on the HLC Assessment Academy team. PCC joined the HLC Assessment Academy in 2016 to focus on integrating assessment practices across the college and currently has 23 faculty participating.

PCC has begun the implementation of eLumen, an assessment management system, in order to track assessment data and activities. On-site conversations confirmed eLumen is being utilized by approximately 300 full- and part-time faculty with a goal of 100 percent of faculty using the system by fall 2019. Approximately 50 percent of programs are using the eLumen system at this time.

The General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) Assessment Project report for fall 2017 in the evidence file reflects that three of the five GELOs remain below the 75 percent benchmark for success in the spring and fall 2017 semesters (spring – below 60 percent and fall below 70 percent) with no fall data available for the GELO of Diversity and Global Perspectives (see Criterion 3.B.3). Interviews of the assessment team and faculty revealed the rubrics for assessing GELOs were created in-house; however, a survey in fall 2017 indicated 70 percent of faculty were dissatisfied with the assessment rubrics being used for GELOs and there is a revision in process. Interviews with assessment faculty and staff confirmed there is not a GELO assessment rubric in place at this time and evidence is not presented that GELOs are being assessed college-wide.

All courses have course learning outcomes with assessment being performed sporadically using the Course Assessment Evaluation & Plan form that is submitted to the Office of AQI. Evidence submitted includes the completed form for HCA100: Strategies for Academic Success. Conversations with faculty revealed the Chemistry program has completed assessment of courses with data results leading to the adoption Open Educational Resources, a significant monetary savings to students. However, there is no evidence that results of course assessments are used consistently across the institution to make improvements in curriculum and/or pedagogy.

Co-curricular assessment is just beginning at PCC with some work accomplished on aligning Student Life learning outcomes with GELOs. Evidence presented includes a Student Affairs Co-Curricular Assessment Report Template and survey instrument. However, evidence of comprehensive assessment of learning in co-curricular activities is not presented and was not articulated in on-site forums.

Non-academic assessment activities have begun but are not pervasive at this point in time. However, evidence is presented that includes one Unit's assessment of goals such as "X number of errors in a printed document." The college might consider expanding such assessment to all units as a way to encourage and assess continuous quality improvement.

Although the processes in place for supporting and gathering assessment plans and results seem promising, particularly the inclusion of Student Affairs in the ongoing assessment of student learning, the evidence presented did not indicate a process for ensuring that general education learning outcomes (GELOs), course learning outcomes, program learning outcomes, and co-curricular learning outcomes are assessed on a regular and consistent basis. Indeed, on-site interviews confirmed that assessment is voluntary at this point. It was noted that the intention of this flexible approach is to make the assessment process meaningful for all faculty and staff, rather than forcing them to assess particular outcomes. The motivation to encourage meaningful assessment and engagement in the process is admirable, yet the current process does not ensure all learning outcomes

are assessed in a manner to inform continuous improvement nor to verify that students are, in fact, achieving the outcomes.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team found that Pima Community College meets Core Component 4.B with concerns and recommends a monitoring report for Criterion Four.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a required follow-up interim report on Criterion 4, Core Component 4.B., submitted no later than June 2021. The report will demonstrate that PCC has maintained its focus, has implemented established practices, and has documented the results in order to achieve a meaningful process for the assessment of the general education (GELOs), course, and program learning outcomes and that those practices are being used to improve student learning.

1. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of GELOs:
 1. Detailed documentation of faculty training on the eLumen system, faculty work with the office of AQI, and participation in the Assessment Academy events during 2019 and 2020.
 2. The rubrics used for GELOs assessment.
 3. Detailed assessment that has been completed up to the reporting time for GELOs, including a list of courses, programs, and co-curricular activities utilized for the assessments.
 4. Several representative examples, data, and analysis of results from GELO assessment.
 5. A detailed summary providing specific examples of how analysis of assessment data has been used at the program and course levels for focused improvement of content delivery and student learning.
2. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes:
 1. Documentation of measurable program outcomes for all degrees, including Transfer Degree Programs.
 2. Detailed documentation of program assessment of those outcomes, including samples of the assessment of program learning outcomes.
 3. Several representative examples of how analysis of assessment data has been used at the program level for focused improvement of content delivery and student learning.
3. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of Course Learning Outcomes:
 1. Documentation of measurable course learning outcomes for all courses.
 2. Detailed documentation of course assessment of those outcomes.
 3. Several representative examples of how analysis of assessment data has been used at the course level for focused improvement of content delivery and student learning.
4. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of learning outcomes in co-curricular activities.
 1. Documentation of measurable learning outcomes for co-curricular activities (ideally connected to GELOs and/or program learning outcomes).
 2. Detailed documentation of assessment of the outcomes in activities.
 3. Representative examples of how analysis of assessment data is being used to improve activities.

4.C - 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.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

PCC has clearly articulated goals for student retention and completion that are ambitious, attainable, and appropriate for the institution. These goals are presented in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan (SEMP) 2016-2021 that was created by the Enrollment Management Standing Committee composed of a diverse representation across the college, including instructional faculty, program coordinators, counselors, academic deans, and administrators.

This SEMP presents targets of a one percent annual increase for enrollment, persistence, and retention for years 2015-2021 and a two percent annual increase in completion by degree/certificate-seeking cohorts for years 2015-2022. There are 27 KPIs listed in the Plan including focus areas of Student Success; Access; Teaching & Program Excellence; Student Services; Community Engagement; Diversity, Inclusion, and Global Education; and Institutional Effectiveness. Evidence provided contains comparison metrics for IPEDS and the Voluntary Framework for Accountability. The goals of the SEMP rely heavily on the recent implementation of Guided Pathways, specifically, Strategic Initiative Two states "Improve student persistence and retention rates utilizing Guided Pathways data." As Guided Pathways becomes more institutionalized across the college and data become available, it may be advantageous to review the large number of KPIs to identify areas for a more concentrated focus.

PCC uses the Voluntary Framework for Accountability (VFA) in its collection and analysis of student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs. The VFA Public Outcomes Report includes data that colleges are required to report and share publicly. These data include two-year cohort progress measures; six-year cohort developmental education progress measures; six-year outcomes

measures (completion of degrees/certificates, transfer, and persistence); Career & Technical Education measures (completion, employment, licensure pass rates, and continued education); and Adult Basic Education measures (completion, enrollment in more education, and gainful employment). Evidence presented includes a report for VFA data collection cycle 2016-17.

PCC also collects and analyzes data gathered from Graduate Exit Surveys which seek student feedback on goal attainment, intent to transfer, and employment post-graduation. Documents in the evidence file include an extensive Graduate Exit Survey Report for 2016-2017 graduates and a Non-returning Student Survey Report that is used to better understand why students do not continue their enrollment at PCC and what improvements PCC can make to assist current students in achieving their goals.

In the 2016-2017 Student Survey Report, PCC identifies areas in which the college has "important leverage," including quality of instruction, academic advising, and class scheduling. The argument states this feedback has also led to restructuring of the academic advisor model to focus on Guided Pathways for students and supports for at-risk students. Interviews with academic advisors and faculty confirm the implementation of program-based advising and adoption of the Starfish early-alert system, branded as Pima Connection. Pima Connection is being piloted with developmental courses with a plan to scale it to all courses in fall 2019. The Team heard input from academic advisors and faculty that scaling up of program-based advising to include all advisors and developing Pima Connection caseloads would be beneficial for students.

The college acknowledges in the Assurance Argument that its processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs has some weak points, but it does have some good practices in place to begin improvement in this area. With PCC's recent implementation of Guided Pathways, it seems now is an ideal time to begin discussing student outcomes data on a regular basis to raise awareness of the needed changes and to support the Pathways work that is forthcoming. The new program review process, as described in 4.A, will help as well as it includes tracking and analysis of student success data at the course and program level.

Currently, the college relies heavily on the Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA) reports to identify areas of weakness and opportunities for improvement of student success outcomes, particularly data on students' two-year progress and six-year outcomes. Student progress and completion outcomes metrics from VFA reports were utilized in the strategic planning process to develop Strategic Direction 1: Student Success. The Strategic Direction 1.9 specifically speaks to increasing the number of students who successfully meet the benchmark outcomes at course, program, and general education level. PCC also participates in the Community College Survey of Student Engagement, most recently in spring 2018 cycle.

The evidence file and interviews during the site visit indicate that PCC is beginning to make improvements to programs and courses based on student success data gathered from these two sources. For example, based on recent CCSSE data, PCC implemented the practice of proactive advising, an early-alert system (Pima Connect), online tutoring, and online library services and has expanded on-campus tutoring services.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

PCC demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs. The Team was concerned that the findings of the Program Review process are not clearly used as evidence for resource needs in the budgeting process. After review of faculty transcripts in HR, it was determined that faculty are qualified. The college evaluates the success of its graduates by surveying them for employment as well as satisfaction with their educational experience at PCC. The Team recommends a monitoring of 4.A in order for the college to demonstrate that the data analysis in Program Review is used to acquire needed funding for improvement of curriculum and pedagogy to improve student learning.

PCC clearly has stated goals, collects and analyzes information, and uses that information to make informed decisions and improvements related to retention, persistence and completion rates. The college uses data in planning for strategic plan initiatives and also uses analysis methods that are meaningful to the college.

In general, PCC has shown it values assessment of student learning and has a fairly new structure in place for effective assessment. However, the infancy of this assessment program is evident by the lack of college-wide participation and fully completed assessment cycles. The recent implementation of Guided Pathways should be instrumental in moving the process forward. The Team recommends a monitoring report for 4.B in order for the college to demonstrate its integration of learning outcomes assessment courses, programs, and general education requirements and its use of data for improvement of curriculum and pedagogy in order to help improve student learning.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team finds Pima Community College Meets Criterion Four with Concerns.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

Based on review of the Assurance Narrative, the documents provided and interaction with a broad range of college employees and Board members, the Team has determined that Pima County Community College's resource base may be able to continue to support its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

Given the college's current commitment to strategic allocation of its resources, PCC has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.

As documented in the Assurance Argument and corroborated through meetings with college personnel, Pima follows established financial and budgeting processes. A Chief Financial Officer, who met with the Team, oversees the college's financial operations according to expectations articulated in the Pima County Community College District Board Policy for Financial Controls and Institutional Budget. The CFO uses a documented structure to facilitate all financial and business operations. The CFO submits an annual budget proposal to the PCC Governing Board. The budget

proposal as formulated with input from the college's units, is intended to support the college's educational mission by advancing mission fulfillment, strategic improvement, fiscal stewardship, and statutory compliance. According to the Budget Development Calendar for FY 2019, "the College [works] with the Board's Finance and Audit Committee to review proposed budget actions, and feedback [is] obtained through presentations to students, faculty, staff, administrators, and community members." The Governing Board reviews and adopts the annual budget and sets tax levies and rates. The narrative provides a comprehensive budget model used to calculate the impact of changes to revenues and expenditures, with respect to the college's strategic priorities, market rates, stewardship, and financial ratios. Numerous PCC employees, particularly mid-level administrators familiar with the budgeting process, expressed confidence in the budgeting process.

As acknowledged in the Argument and discussed by college employees and Board members, Pima is currently facing significant fiscal challenges. The State of Arizona has provided zero appropriations since FY16 resulting in an annual loss of approximately \$7 million in funding. This loss of revenue combined with declining enrollments and the state's constitutionally mandated Expenditure Limitation, which restricts the college's operating expenditures, results in PCC facing what they term in the Argument as "significant reduction in operating expenditure capacity" in FY21. Thus far, Pima has addressed lost state revenue through increased property tax revenues, tuition increases, and expenditure controls. As explained by the Chancellor, Board members, and several budget officers, the Governing Board considered three potential budget reduction scenarios and determined to mandate a middle-ground option that will involve an annual \$5 million reduction in the college's operating budget for FY18 through FY20. This Budget Reduction Scenario B calls for the beginning of phasing out programs for elimination, reduction of infrastructure/staffing, and implementation of most of the first 5 years of the Educational Master Plan(EMP) and Facilities Master Plan(FMP) with reliance on GO Bonds for some of the EMP/FMP projects. According to a reduction plan update to the Governing Board for FY19, these expenditure limitation efforts include elimination of fifty staff positions, three administrator positions, and ten instructional faculty positions, and reduction of other targeted operational expenses. The RIF document provided the Team acknowledges that there were deficiencies in the process including the need for a more detailed action plan, greater stakeholder input, and a more comprehensive study of staffing levels. The ongoing process being used to determine faculty reduction reflects an improved, more data-informed process, which demonstrates lessons learned from the staffing reduction. The Team discussed the consequences of these reductions with a wide-range of employees including faculty, staff, and administrators, who expressed regard for the "pain" involved in personnel reductions, but also recognized the necessity of the measures. PCC stakeholders cited the rationales used in reduction decision-making including elimination of program inefficiencies and reduction through attrition and retirement rather than lay-offs.

As documented in the Argument and cited by the CFO, PCC retired all bond debt in FY13. This opens the possibility for the college to rely on bonds revenue to fund the first phase of the FMP, given the debt service for bonds to be issued in January 2019 will be at what the college and its Board consider a manageable level. The college currently relies on 38 active grant programs (totaling over \$38 million) serving almost twelve thousand students and providing for 161 staff and faculty to finance many critical educational processes including student support services to targeted populations, curriculum redesign and development, professional development opportunities for faculty, and resources for classroom redesign. The PCC Foundation, which operates as a separate non-profit organization, provided more than \$1.1 million for Pima students between Fall 2017 and Fall 2018. The Team suggests it might be beneficial for the college to plan carefully for the sustainability of these grant-funded programs and services once the grants end, given the ongoing fiscal challenges for PCC's operations.

The Facilities Master Plan provided in the Evidence File and cited in interactions with PCC employees provides data about space needs and utilization and projections of student FTE levels to inform allocation of physical resources necessary to meet the educational priorities on the college's six campuses, three learning centers, and twenty plus additional locations. The CIO described the college's provision of technology resources and infrastructure to the Team. Employees including faculty and staff affirmed consistently that IT resources and support are a major strength at PCC.

The Assurance Argument, documents provided, and employees and Board members interviewed attested that PCC's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a super-ordinate entity in that no resources are allocated to any super-ordinate entity. Pima makes an annual allocation of \$1.25 million to strategic initiative needs that are brought forward by college units and "goal owners," individuals responsible for the advancement of strategic goal action plans. The purchase of Ad Astra Scheduling Software to improve scheduling formulation processes is a recent example of the use of those funds. A Project Coordinator for the college's Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan, which aligns with the Strategic Plan, was handled through the Hiring Justification Process by reallocation of a Provost staff position.

The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities. The Team determined through examination of the guiding documents for the college's various plans (Strategic, Educational Master, Facilities Master, Strategic Enrollment Management, and Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion) that the goals contained in those plans constitute the elaboration of PCC's mission through alignment with the college's Mission Statement. PCC monitors KPIs for each of its articulated priorities in the annual mission fulfillment framework documentation provided to the Team and referenced by numerous "goal owners." College employees involved in the advancement of strategic goals give input to periodic review of the strategic plan for the purpose of refinement and potential redirection. The college posts periodic updates on strategic goal updates. A Comprehensive Planning Process Flowchart studied by the Team demonstrates an intentional integrated approach to planning processes which are informed by environmental scans. The Chancellor's Goals, Objectives, and Timelines document, which is informed by the various major constituent groups, gives direction to short-term priorities. A recent example cited of an adjustment of the Strategic Plan is the Executive Leadership Team's decision to defer a community engagement goal because of a staffing issue.

The Assurance Argument, employee files sampled, Human Resources personnel, and various employees queried affirm that PCC's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained. Human Resources maintains documentation of class specifications for all non-faculty positions. The CornerStone Applicant Tracking software used in the recruitment and hiring process addresses documentation of qualifications. The Office of Faculty Certification oversees verification of faculty qualifications. The Evidence File provides documentation of mandatory orientation and a comprehensive mandatory training program for all Pima employees implemented in Spring 2018. HR administrators acknowledged that there has been confusion as to the timing of the mandatory training which is currently being resolved. PCC uses MyCareerCenter to facilitate the setting and tracking of professional development goals and training.

PCC has an articulated process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense. The narrative provides documents identifying processes for various processes' expenditures which were discussed by a range of college administrators. Various mid-level administrators attested that the operating budget is generated annually by senior administration informed by input from unit leadership. The

Evidence File provided the document used for submission of capital budget requests which includes criteria used for justification of those requests. As cited earlier, processes for the mid-budget year requests for strategic goal needs are defined and utilized according to multiple employees. The college's current approach to budgeting in which the operating budget is rolled forward from year to year with additional resources needed for strategic goal initiative dependent on mid-cycle allocation may not be the most effective option for the long-term. The Team encourages the College to consider integrating budget allocations for specific projected strategic initiative expenses more directly into the annual operating budget process whenever possible.

The District's Fiscal Services monitors expenses using the readily available database Pima Reports including the Budget Management Reports by Organization and Account sample provided to the Team. The Governing Board receives monthly monitoring reports and the Board's Finance and Audit Committee regularly reviews Pima's financial activities. PCC uses the Concur system to monitor expenditures and is currently implementing Concur Invoice Management to ensure complete spending visibility.

One area of fiscal and business management raised concerns for the Team. This concern came to the Team's attention in completing the Federal Compliance report. In reviewing the Fiscal Year 2017 Single Audit Report for year ending June 30, 2017 as produced by the Arizona Auditor General's office, several financial statements findings are of concern. The Student Financial Assistance Cluster has been out of compliance all the years (Fiscal Year 2017 – 2012) the reviewer has examined. The TRIO Cluster and the Higher Education – Institutional Aid program have reappeared for Fiscal 2017 and have been identified on and off in past audits. New to the Fiscal 2017 audit are concerns over information technology security risk-assessment, information technology access controls, information technology configuration management, information security policies and procedures, information technology contingency planning, and internal controls over purchasing.

For the past several years (reviewer examined Fiscal Years 2017 – 2012), Pima Community College District has been out of federal compliance for the Student Financial Assistance Cluster reporting student enrollment status change. (The Fiscal Year 2018 audit has not been released; nevertheless, it is anticipated that the Student Financial Assistance Cluster will continue to be out of compliance.)

For Fiscal Year 2017, both Material Weakness and Significant Deficiency has been identified for the Student Financial Assistance Cluster as well as other major programs managed by the college. Since Fiscal Year 2015, the college has been implementing incremental fixes to address the ongoing Student Financial Assistant Cluster issue. In Fiscal Year 2018, the college established a steering committee to ensure enhanced review of student records and reporting to address the continuing reporting issue. However, in documentation outlining corrective actions provided to the review team, a majority of the remedial activities were not started until October 2018 (Fiscal Year 2019). The auditor's verification of the corrective measures results will not take place until the Fiscal Year 2019 audit which will not be presented to the college's Governing Board until the end of 2019 or early 2020.

The college has implemented policies and procedures to correct TRIO Cluster audit findings in Fiscal Year 2018. The college submitted information regarding the findings and verified with the Federal Department of Education (DOE) compliance with the Department's regulation. The DOE notified issues were resolved in May of 2018.

Information technology concerns are being addressed by the college. All of the information technology related concerns identified by the audit are currently being addressed and are scheduled to

go into the production environment during the Calendar Year 2019.

Also, in the Fiscal Year 2017 audit, the college was cited to improve their purchasing internal controls. At the end of Fiscal Year 2018, the college implemented a new Purchasing Administrative Procedure. The procedure developed product and services acquisition guidelines and parameters to ensure compliance with the Federal Procurement Requirements. The Purchasing Department consolidated all of their purchasing activities campus-wide under a single director. The college is currently testing a new purchasing system they are anticipating will go into production at the end of June 2019.

While the college appears to have begun addressing many of these issues with completion dates as late as December 2019/early 2020, the Team was unable to verify their effectiveness and resolution of what seem to be long-standing problems.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit, the Team finds Pima Community College Meets with Concerns Core Component 5.A and recommends monitoring for Criterion Five

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a required follow-up interim report on Criterion 5, Core Component 5.A submitted no later than June 2021. The report will demonstrate that PCC has maintained commitment to addressing the following issues identified in Fiscal Year 2017 audit, has implemented corrective practices, and has documented results that will bring the college into compliance.

1. Student Financial Assistance Cluster
2. The TRIO Cluster audit finding resolution be verified on the Fiscal Year 2018 audit and compliance activities be noted on the previously recommended monitoring report.
3. The Higher Education – Institutional Aid program which reappeared for Fiscal 2017 and has been identified on and off in past audits.
4. Concerns over information technology
 1. Security risk-assessment
 2. Access controls
 3. Configuration management
 4. Information security policies and procedures
 5. Information technology contingency planning
5. Internal controls over purchasing.

5.B - 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.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Through examination of documentation and interaction with college administrators, faculty, staff, and Board members the Team determined that PCC's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

The Pima County Community College District Governing Board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities. The Board receives reports at the monthly meetings from the Chancellor and other college representatives from major employee groups and students. The Evidence File provides several examples of recent informational reports. The Governing Board members expressed appreciation for the value of the periodic "study sessions" held, focusing on topics relevant to PCC and higher education issues (several examples were provided). The Board does have a policy which allows the administration to refuse to honor data requests that will require more than four hours of staff time to fulfill. The policy was adopted because Institutional Research was frequently overwhelmed by such requests that went beyond the normal data considered necessary for an informed decision. The Team found this policy to fall within the normal range. Board members are frequently invited to visit the campuses so that they have first hand knowledge of the campus activities. The Board does ask its members as a courtesy to inform appropriate campus leadership when they plan to visit

Professional development activities for board members include an orientation for new members, an annual retreat, and opportunities to attend Association of Community College Trustees conferences and the Higher Learning Commission's Annual Meeting. Board members cited multiple external professional development opportunities in which they had engaged including training and attending/presenting at professional conferences.

The Board has two ongoing committees, Finance and Audit and Human Resources Advisory, which review those aspects of college processes. The Board's By-Laws address the members' fiduciary responsibility including issues of conflict of interest. The Board is involved appropriately in the Pima budget development process and receives monthly financial updates. The Argument gives a chart outlining actions taken by the Governing Board to fulfill their legal responsibilities. Questions were raised about the assignment and roles of the college's general counsel. The team believes these concerns about the college's legal service model are outside the scope of the visit Criteria. The Team believes it is not the role of the Team to advocate for or against a particular type of model. The model used by Pima College seems to be within the normal range.

In 2016, PCC reorganized its top administrative structure to move from an approach which had promoted ineffective autonomy among the six campuses. The current reorganization is intended to unify the college as a single institution through a streamlined, centralized leadership. Many employees, particularly from faculty and student services, expressed enthusiasm for how mid-level reorganization has been beneficial for the operation of programs and services across the campuses. However, other employees expressed confusion as to lines of authority of administrators that function as connectors between the mid-level and the Chancellor. Through study of the 300+ page organizational charting document and conversation with various employees, the Team determined that the current top-level complexity is an improvement at the upper levels of administration, but the administrative structure and reporting lines appear to remain be confusing and unclear. The existing array of vice-chancellors, presidents, associate vice-chancellors, vice-presidents, and executive directors, some of whom hold two titles that are usually perceived as being at two different levels of the hierarchy (for example vice chancellor and president), seems to create a less than entirely effective or manageable administrative structure for efficient operations and clear reporting lines. PCC might find it helpful to review and assess double titles and supervisory tracks to clarify how reporting flows through levels of the organization, looking for administrative responsibilities that might be made more efficient and transparent.

PCCC has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies - including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students - in the institution's governance. The Board Policy statement on Governance provided and affirmed by Board members interviewed emphasizes the Chancellor's responsibility to advance a collaborative and highly communicative governance structure that involves representatives from all internal stakeholder groups. The existing framework for governance operates with an All-College Council (ACC) made up of representatives from the three major representative bodies, the Student Senate, the Faculty Senate, and the Staff Council and membership from all of Pima's six campuses and PimaOnline. The Team heard positive feedback from representatives of all these employee and student groups who interact with the Governing Board. The ACC makes recommendations to the Chancellor on matters of college-wide importance not directly related to wages, salaries, and working conditions. The Argument and employees gave examples of actions taken by the college as a result of ACC recommendations. PCC has provided documentation for the processes by which college stakeholders can participate in the formulation, review, and deletion of Board Policies and Administrative Procedures through a formal submission followed by review by the Chancellor's Office, the Faculty Senate, Staff Council, the Student Senate, and the ACC and a three-week period allowing for public comment. Documentation of the charges and membership for sixteen standing committees with faculty representation and twenty-seven cross-functional working groups are included in the Argument.

An All Employee Representative Council (AERC) with two representatives from each employee group addresses personnel and working conditions issues. This council is a recent revision of the

college's previous practice of "Meet and Confer." The "Meet and Confer" approach was a group of representatives from employee groups which required paid memberships and met only once a year. Numerous administrators and other employees explained to the Team that the "Meet and Confer" group was not representative of a majority of the PCC employees nor could it respond in a timely manner to issues. The new AERC is generally seen to be more broadly representative and more effective because it meets on a monthly basis.

As attested to by a range of employees interviewed and documented examples provided, administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort. With the exception of curricular decisions, academic policy and procedures are formulated, reviewed, and deleted through an inclusive process. Faculty and the Director of Curriculum agreed on the central faculty role in and the effectiveness of the curriculum development and revision process. The Team reviewed the Curriculum Procedures Manual that articulates the process for curricular decision-making which involves expert college discipline area committees and a representative College Curriculum Council.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met With Concerns

Evidence

After reviewing the documentation provided and interaction with a wide range of college employees and Board members, the Team determined that PCC engages in systematic and integrated planning with one area of concern involving assessment of student learning.

As evidenced in planning and budget documents and corroborated by testimony from PCC constituents, the Team found that the college allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities. The narrative provides graphics which indicate that actions taken as part of the various master plans (Strategic, Education and Facilities, Strategic Enrollment Management, and Diversity, Equity, a Inclusion) were all in response to and in alignment to the PCC Mission Statement and the Board approved Priorities. PCC employees, particularly strategic goal "owners"(action plan coordinators) attested to this alignment. PCC might consider making the relationship of these plans to the mission more transparent by articulating the linkage for each goal in the plan to the mission/vision documents.

The discussions with PCC employees gave evidence that the college has made significant progress in a variety of coordinated efforts guided by the various master plans and through its revised practice of program review which links its processes for evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. A process chart provided identifies the major steps for allocation of resources for planned initiatives outside of the operational budget process arising from any of the following:

1. Strategic Plan
2. Educational/Facilities Master Plan
3. Strategic Enrollment Management Plan
4. Diversity, Equity and Inclusion Plan
5. Student Learning Outcomes

6. Program Review
7. Institutional Quality Process.

The information and examples given by administrators, faculty, and staff attested to the validity of this claim. There is also an overview flowchart for “the comprehensive planning process” which identifies the relationship of long range (10+ yrs), medium range (4 yrs), and short to medium (1-4 yrs) plans with budget and hiring processes including operational budget, capital funds, strategic initiatives funds, and hiring justification. PCC employees, particularly administrators, spoke of the prioritization of efforts as documented in this flowchart.

After examining available documentation and discussion with a wide range of PCC personnel, the Team determined that the processes for assessment of student learning both in the assessment program and in program review are not yet consistent or comprehensive enough to be yielding data nor analysis at any level (CLOs, GELOs, PLOs) that is resulting in meaningful linking with evaluation of operations, planning, or budgeting. The college has implemented a new Program Review process and established an office which directs assessment of SLOs as well as purchasing eLumen as a tool to facilitate the collection of assessment data. However, these are only necessary preliminary steps toward establishing a robust practice of SLO assessment which can then be used to inform the evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. This constitutes an area of concern for 5C.

The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups. PCC documents and constituent testimony provide evidence that the college has used the Society of College and University Planning (SCUP) model and training resources to guide the creation and work of a 19-member Strategic Planning Team (SPT) representing all major internal and external stakeholder groups to develop the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan. A series of Futures Conferences for stakeholders, which numerous persons cited as valuable, feedback surveys, and the SCUP Planning Institute yielded input for the work of the SPT. A seventeen-member administrator and faculty committee formulated the college’s current Educational Master Plan (EMP) for 2015-2025 utilizing a review of the college’s history, assets, institutional trends, planning documents, national trends, regional information, and EMP specific research. A larger team made up of administrators, technical specialists, members of the Governing Board, and external consultants generated the 2018 Facilities Master Plan (FMP) informed by a district-wide analysis, focusing on student geographic distribution by race/ethnicity, vehicle ownership, and income. The FMP Team’s study also included campus-based analyses, a space-needs analysis, and a stakeholder survey with larger participation.

PCC documents and interaction with employees and other constituents established that the college strives to plan on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans have been formulated recognizing the need to anticipate the possible impact of decreases in the institution’s sources of revenue, particularly declining enrollment and the absence of state support. Between FY2012 and FY2017 the enrollment declined by approximately 25 percent. State funding ended in 2016. The Governing Board has approved a budgeting scenario which will reduce expenditures approximately five million dollars a year for three years. The SPT Budgeting Subcommittee has created a list of Budgeting Criteria to guide allocations including reductions. The Team recognizes that the college’s plans for establishing several Centers of Excellence at the various campuses as a means of focusing and enhancing workforce development programming is a key response to PCC’s attempts to reverse enrollment declines, increase community engagement, and address area employer need.

The impression garnered by the Team from examining particularly the Strategic Plan 2017-2021, the Educational Master Plan, and the Facilities Plan is that PCC might benefit from reevaluating the number of planning goals and recommended changes in its current planning commitments. The Strategic Plan alone has thirty major goals, not to mention the large number of additional goals and recommendations found in the EMP and the FMP. There are also those found in the Strategic Enrollment Management Plan and the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan. PCC is to be commended that a broad range of stakeholders have engaged in formulating these plans and goal owners (action plan coordinators) are committed to advancing strategic efforts. However, numerous employees expressed concern to the Team that the magnitude of the demands was too much for the college's employee capacity and that strategic initiative fatigue was already setting in. The Team suggests that PCC's strategic progress might be enhanced if it continues to reassess its timing and prioritization of its large array of planning goals.

Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization. The EMP committee used a range of data sources including the AACCC 21st Century Commission Report recommendations for transformation, Complete College America's five game changers, Pima County population projection, population trends by age and race/ethnicity, and job demand data to inform their work. The FMP formulation group used an analysis of Pima County data on all residents, vehicle ownership, income distribution, and educational attainment. The SPT used environmental scans and comparisons with competitor institutions to inform their SWOT and STEEP analyses in developing the Strategic Plan's various elements. The Team heard testimony from members of several advisory committees that attested to the college's responsiveness to the needs of area industry. The college's efforts through its Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Plan and its efforts involving international students, refugees, and DACA individuals suggest an institutional awareness of globalization issues.

The Embedded Interim Report on planning and information gathered by the Team provided evidence of establishment of an effective planning structure and process. The Assurance Argument documentation and stakeholders interviews presented examples of goals being achieved and progress on key performance indicators from the final Report on the 2014-17 Strategic Plan presented in the fall of 2018. The PCC Strategic Plan Goal Status report for November 2018 documents significant progress through implementation of action plans across the college's strategic initiatives. Successful outcomes reported include:

- Improved rates in cohorts between 2014 and 2016 in Fall-to-next-term retention, first term credit success rate, two year credit success rate, completion of certificate or degree, and transfer
- Improved CCSSE benchmark scores in four of the five categories with greatest improvement in Student-Faculty Interaction and Support for Learners between 2014 and 2018
- Improvement in the proportion of successful (A,B,C,P) and unsuccessful grades between 2014 and 2016
- Improvement on all items on the employee survey pertaining to the college's planning processes between 2013 and 2017

The Interim Report states that with other goals and KPIs intended progress was either not made or could not be measured adequately. Those have been carried over into the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan. Examples include:

- Increasing the applicant to registered student conversion rate
- Increasing student transfer success
- Establishing goals to improve community engagement

Gathering data on Pima graduates in the workforce

PCC is confident it will improve effective measurement of goal achievement and advancement of KPIs with the 2017-2021 Strategic Plan because the majority of goals in that SP have established baselines and targets; and, the college will be using nationally standardized data such as the College Employee Satisfaction Survey and the Voluntary Accountability Framework data to benchmark progress on many strategic goals.

The Team reviewed documentation and received corroborating support from college employees that the mission-aligned strategic goals found in the Strategic Plan 2017-2021 were used to inform decision-making in budget processes for the annual operating budget, the approval of capital projects, and the allocation mid-cycle for strategic initiative needs.

The Team examined the Educational Master Plan and the Facilities Master Plan documents. The Team also spoke with a variety of PCC stakeholders who referenced the impact of these plans on the college's ongoing operations and institutional improvement. These documents were particularly helpful in understanding the purchase of four tracts of land adjacent to the Downtown Campus. This purchase addresses two strategic issues for the Downtown Campus: the fact that the campus is land-locked and the Pima's goal of creating Centers of Excellence. The additional land will solve some of the land-locked issues and allow the Downtown Campus to build the required classrooms/tech areas for it to fulfill with quality programming its Center of Excellence target goal. The plans made clear the use of the land to support Centers of Excellence as well as space for active learning classrooms.

Based on the evidence presented in the argument, reviewed documentation, and the findings of the accreditation visit on the use of results of the assessment of learning outcomes in budget planning and allocation, the Team finds Pima Community College Meets with Concerns Core Component 5.C and recommends monitoring for Criterion Five.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

The team recommends a required follow-up interim report on Criterion Five, Core Component 5.C, submitted no later than June 2021. The report will demonstrate that PCC has

- Developed procedures within its budget process for requesting funding to support curricular and pedagogical changes designed to improve student learning that have been identified during the assessment of learning outcomes and the program review processes,
- Has implemented the budget practices,
- Has created clear documentation of the use of Program Review and SLO data and analysis of such data in its budgeting process,
- Has closed the loop by assessing the student learning results stemming from the changes financed by budget allocation.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Through examination of the documentation provided and interaction with a wide range of administrators, faculty, and staff, the Team found that PCC works systematically in most cases to improve its performance. PCC has provided ample evidence that it develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations. The college also has demonstrated that it learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

The Argument states and various employees with a range of strategic goal advancement roles attested to the college's use of the mission fulfillment framework tool and the KPIs identified for each of the goals in the Strategic Plan guide the monitoring and documentation of operational performance. The Team reviewed documents provided which demonstrated that there is an increased focus on performance metrics between the 2014-2017 and the 2017-2021 Strategic Plans. Strategic "goal owners" cited the use of American Association of Community College's Voluntary Framework of Accountability (VFA), the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE), the College Employee Satisfaction Survey, and several measures generated in-house in gauging operational progress. The Argument, faculty, and staff cited the adoption of Open Educational Resources (OERs) and expanded tutoring support as improvements made in response to feedback surveys. It is apparent from reviewing the mission fulfillment framework document and goals from the several documented plans that the primary institutional focus is advancing student success. PCC monitors the advancement of its efforts through its numerous goal action plans by employing appropriate traditional measures including credit success rates and certificate and degree completion. One example of learning from data analysis follows: the college recognizes progress in shorter term success with newer students but weakness in longer term (6 year) student indicators which prompted inclusion of new goals addressing this concern in the Chancellor's Goals for 2018-19. There is data evidence of at least modest progress in several goal areas cited in the 5.C embedded interim report. The college recognizes there is strong evidence in the data of the need for more effective efforts in addressing ongoing challenges including enrollment decline and low six-year graduation rates. These two major weaknesses are addressed by goals and metrics in the 2017-21 Strategic Plan. Each of the goals have action plans and KPIs which are being monitored to guide further action.

A major institutional effectiveness tool implemented in 2015 is a data warehouse as part of the college's business intelligence system, which facilitates expanded access for all employees to

institutional data through the college's Pima Reports platform. Data in this platform allow employees to drill down to data relevant for unit performance analysis through documented streamlined processes. This reporting mechanism is an effective tool for the more effective revised approach to unit performance management evaluation. Since 2015, PCC has responded to employee input and has incrementally modified unit performance effectiveness review and performance improvement planning by consolidating the two processes into a single four-year Institutional Quality (IQ) process cycle. The Argument provides documentation of the reporting template used in the IQ process and seven reports from a wide range of the academic and non-academic units.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

Based on review of the Assurance Narrative, the documents provided, and interaction with a broad range of college employees and Board members, the Team determined that Pima County Community College's resource base may be able to continue to support its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future. Given the college's current commitment to strategic allocation of its resources, PCCC has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered. The Assurance Narrative, documents provided, and employees and Board members interviewed attested that PCC's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a super-ordinate entity in that no resources are allocated to any super-ordinate entity. The Team determined through examination of the guiding documents for the college's various Plans (Strategic, Educational Master, Facilities Master, Strategic Enrollment Management, and Diversity, Equity, & Inclusion) that the goals contained in those plans constitute the elaboration of PCC's mission statement through alignment with the college's Mission Statement. The Assurance Narrative, employee files sampled, Human Resources personnel, and various employees queried affirm that PCC's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained. Human Resources maintains documentation of class specifications for all non-faculty positions. PCC has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Through examination of documentation and interaction with college administrators, faculty, staff, and Board members the Team determined that PCC's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission. The Pima Community College District Governing Board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities. In 2016, PCC reorganized its top administrative structure to move from an approach that promoted ineffective autonomy among the six campuses. The current reorganization is intended to unify the college as a single institution through a streamlined, centralized leadership. PCC has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance. As attested by a range of employees interviewed and documented examples provided, administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

After reviewing the documentation provided and interaction with a wide range of college employees and Board members, the Team determined that PCC engages in systematic and integrated planning with one area of concern involving assessment of student learning and program review. As evidenced in planning and budget documents corroborated by testimony from PCC constituents, the Team found

that the college allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities. The discussions with PCC employees gave evidence that the college has made significant progress in a variety of coordinated efforts guided by the various master plans and through its revised practice of program review to link its processes for evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. However, after examining available documentation and discussion with a wide range of PCC personnel, the Team determined that the processes for assessment of student learning are not yet consistent or comprehensive enough to be yielding data nor analysis at any level (CLOs, GELOs, PLOs) that is resulting in meaningful linking with operations, planning, or budgeting. It also appeared to the Team that the results of program review do not have a clear pathway to budget requests. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups. PCC documents and interaction with employees and other constituents established that the college strives to plan on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

PCC has provided ample evidence that it develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations. The college also has demonstrated that it learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts. Through examination of the documentation provided and interaction with a wide range of administrators, faculty, and staff, the Team found that PCC works systematically to improve its performance. The Team had concerns with budgeting, business, and IT practices and quality improvement areas covered by the 2017 Audit related to Federal Compliance and with the integration of the results of learning outcomes assessment and program review into the budgetary process.

The Team determined that PCC has met Criterion Five with concerns in two areas:

In light of the absence of any clear documentation of the use of the results of program review or the assessment of student learning outcomes data or analysis of such data to inform operations, planning, and budgeting, PCC should supply clear documentation of the use of program review and SLO data and analysis of such data in its planning and budgeting processes as a monitoring report.

The Team also recommends a monitoring report to address the issues identified in the 2017 Audit.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met With Concerns
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met With Concerns
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met With Concerns
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met With Concerns
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met With Concerns
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met With Concerns
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	

Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date

6/1/2021

Report Focus

Monitoring: Correction of Concerns Identified in the 2017 Audit from the Arizona Auditor General: Financial Reporting, Student Financial Assistance Cluster, TRIO Cluster, Information Technology, and Purchasing Controls

The Team recommends that Pima Community College submit a follow-up interim monitoring report on Federal Compliance: Title IV Program Responsibilities; Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A; and Criterion 5, Core Component 5.A. The report will address two fiscal years of corrective action and data. The report will detail status on the identified items with the time to correspond with the release of the Fiscal Years 2019 and 2020 Single Audit Report findings to ensure that the college can address federal compliance and auditor concerns.

1. The report will provide documentation that concerns within the Student Financial Assistance Cluster have been addressed
 1. Provide a plan and timeline for ongoing tracking of data and participating students to prevent further lapses
2. The TRIO Cluster audit finding resolution be verified on the Fiscal Year 2018 audit and compliance activities be noted on the previously recommended monitoring report.
 1. Document that audit findings were found to be resolved in the FY 2018 audit.
 2. Document what compliance activities have been implement and how they are monitored for consistency.
3. The Higher Education - Institutional Aid program which reappeared for Fiscal 2017 and has been identified on and off in past audits.
 1. Provide the plan and timeline that has been developed to ensure the Aid program remains in federal compliance.
 2. Describe the monitoring and improvement activities that have been implemented to ensure ongoing compliance.
4. Concerns over information technology: Security risk-assessment, Access controls, Configuration management, Information security policies and procedures, Information technology contingency planning.
 1. For each of the identified areas provide a description of the plans/procedures that are being implemented to correct concerns.
 2. For each of the identified areas describe the processes that have been developed to monitor and continue to improve how each of the area remains in compliance.
5. Internal controls over purchasing.
 1. Document the controls that have been put in place to bring purchasing into audit compliance.
 2. Describe the processes that have been created to maintain compliance and improve procedures.

Due Date

6/1/2021

Report Focus

Monitoring: Assessment of General Education, Course, and Program Learning Outcomes; Faculty Participation; Integration of Assessment and Program Review results into the Budgeting Processes

The team recommends a required follow-up interim report on Criterion 3, Core Component 3.B; Criterion 4, Core Component 4.A and Core Component 4.B; and Criterion 5, Core Component 5.C. The report should be submitted no later than June 2021. The report will demonstrate that PCC has maintained its focus, has implemented established practices, and has documented the results in order to achieve a meaningful process for the assessment of the general education (GELOs), course, and program learning outcomes and that those practices are being used to improve student learning. The report will also document growing participation of faculty in assessment, the use of eLumen to record results, and the use of data for improvement of content delivery and student learning. Finally, the report will demonstrate the processes developed for using learning outcome and program review data to substantiate funding for initiatives designed to improve student learning.

1. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of GELOs:
 1. Detailed documentation of faculty training on the eLumen system, faculty work with the office of AQI, and participation in the Assessment Academy events during 2019 and 2020.
 2. The rubrics used for GELOs assessment and a demonstration of how the rubric will result in data that are comparable and trackable.
 3. Detailed assessment that has been completed up to the reporting time for GELOs, including a list of courses, programs, and co-curricular activities utilized for the assessments.
 4. Several representative examples, data, and analysis of results from GELO assessment.
 5. A detailed summary providing specific examples of how analysis of assessment data has been used at the program and course levels for focused improvement of content delivery and student learning.
2. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of Program Learning Outcomes:
 1. Documentation of measurable program outcomes for all degrees, including Transfer Degree Programs.
 2. Detailed documentation of program assessment of those outcomes, including samples of the assessment of program learning outcomes.
 3. Several representative examples of how analysis of assessment data has been used at the program level for focused improvement of content delivery and student learning.
3. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of Course Learning Outcomes:
 1. Documentation of measurable course learning outcomes for all courses.
 2. Detailed documentation of course assessment of those outcomes.
 3. Several representative examples of how analysis of assessment data has been used at the course level for focused improvement of content delivery and student learning.
4. The interim report should contain the following documentation of the assessment of learning outcomes in co-curricular activities.
 1. Documentation of measurable learning outcomes for co-curricular activities (ideally connected to GELOs and/or program learning outcomes).
 2. Detailed documentation of assessment of the outcomes in activities.
 3. Representative examples of how analysis of assessment data is being used to improve activities.
5. The interim report should contain documentation of faculty participation.
 1. Description of a plan and timeline for increasing faculty participation.
 2. Description of professional development designed introduce faculty to effective rubric use, sharing of data through eLumen, and analyzing aggregated data.
6. The interim report should contain the following documentation of integration of learning outcomes and

program review data into the budgeting processes.

1. Description of the process/procedures that can be used to request funding support for initiatives developed as the result of assessment of learning outcomes and program review to improve content delivery and student learning
2. Description of how funds are set aside for funding of initiatives
3. Representative examples of initiatives funded, data used to support the requests, and the evaluation plan for the initiatives.

Conclusion

The Team recognizes that Pima Community College began the current evaluation period with several enormous challenges. The college was faced with addressing six separate concerns in embedded reports focused on assessment, planning, budgeting processes, and a redesign of developmental education. In addition, a Formal Complaint and the previous Comprehensive Evaluation Report brought to the Team's attention the stressors and divisiveness that existed on the campus at the time of the previous visit. During the Visit and the Multi-Campus Visits the Team had the opportunity to meet with over three hundred constituents coming from administration, middle management, staff, faculty, students, and external stakeholders. The Team was gratified at the collegiality, cooperation, and transparency it experienced from each of the groups at each of the locations it visited. While the Team is recommending two monitoring reports for the college, it also found that the college has moved forward in all the embedded report areas. The Team believes that the college begins addressing the monitoring areas with groundwork already laid. The Team also found the college moving forward with a structure which encourages collaboration and the sharing of best practices across campuses. The Team encourages PCC to maximize its foundational work and its functioning as a single accredited institution as it resolves the assessment, budget process, and Federal Compliance concerns.

The Team recommends that Pima Community College be limited to selecting the Standard Pathway. Remaining in the Standard Pathway will provide the college with more frequent touch points for assessing its progress as well as opportunities for receiving mentoring as it practices continuous quality improvement.

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met With Concerns

Sanctions Recommendation

No Sanction

Pathways Recommendation

Limited to Standard



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

This worksheet is to be completed by a Federal Compliance reviewer or by the peer review team that conduct the on-site visit. If a Federal Compliance reviewer completes the form, the reviewer will evaluate the materials in advance of the visit and refer any issues to the team for further exploration and confirmation. The team chair will confirm that the team has reviewed the Federal Compliance reviewer's findings, make any necessary adjustments to the worksheet following the on-site visit, and submit the worksheet as part of the team's final report.

The Federal Compliance reviewer or the team should review each item identified in the *Federal Compliance Filing by Institutions* (FCFI) and document their findings in the appropriate spaces below. Peer reviewers are expected to supply a rationale for each section of the Federal Compliance Evaluation. Refer to the [Federal Compliance Overview](#) for information about applicable HLC policies and explanations of each requirement.

Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in the appropriate parts of the team report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance Requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, the recommendation should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section of the team report.

Submission Instructions

Federal Compliance reviewer: Email this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* in an editable format to the team chair. The team chair's email address is provided in the Assurance System.

Team chair: Send the draft of this worksheet and the *Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours* to the HLC staff liaison for review and then to the institution for corrections of errors of fact. Submit the final worksheets to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org.

Institution under review: Pima County Community College

Please indicate who completed this worksheet:

- Evaluation team
 Federal Compliance reviewer

To be completed by the evaluation team chair if a Federal Compliance reviewer conducted this part of the evaluation:

Name: Joan Kuzma Costello

- I confirm that the evaluation team reviewed the findings provided in this worksheet.

Assignment of Credits, Program Length and Tuition

(See FCFI Questions 1–3 and Appendix A)

1. Complete the [Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours](#). Submit the completed worksheet with this form.
 - Identify the institution's principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level (see the institution's Appendix A if necessary). The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate's degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor's degrees = 120 hours
 - Master's or other degrees beyond the bachelor's = At least 30 hours beyond the bachelor's degree
 - Note that 1 quarter hour = 0.67 semester hour.
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.
 - Review any differences in tuition reported for different programs and the rationale provided for such differences.
2. Check the response that reflects the evaluation team or Federal Compliance reviewer's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

(See FCFI Questions 4–7 and Appendixes B and C)

1. Verify that the institution has documented a process for addressing student complaints and appears to by systematically processing such complaints, as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.
 - Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints, its complaints policy and procedure, and the history of complaints received and resolved since the last comprehensive evaluation by HLC.
 - Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
 - Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into improvements in services or in teaching and learning.
 - Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.
 - Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Pima Community College has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/administrative-procedures/docs-ap-03/AP-3-31-01.pdf>. The institution provides students guidance in the complaint process and it is available on the institution’s website <https://www.pima.edu/current-students/complaint-processes/>. The Complaint Log was provided for review. Review of the evidence demonstrates that the institution has in place processes to inform students of the procedures for making complaints, that the institution tracks complaints, and that the institution has in place processes to resolve complaints in a timely manner.

Quarterly, the Assistant Vice Chancellor (AVC) for Accreditation and Academic Quality Improvement, Office of Dispute Resolution (ODR) Investigator, and Student Code of Conduct and Title IX Officer meet to discuss the student complaints and identify which ones lend themselves to systemic improvement. Units overseeing processes needing systemic improvement work with the AVC to complete the Continuous Improvement Action Plan to address the student complaints. Action Items and their associated timelines are entered into a Smart Sheet (project management software) with reminders set to automatically follow -up with the Action Plan owner, AVC, and ODR Investigator for completion.

“Trends and Recommendations” were included with the Complaint Log for review.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Transfer Policies

(See FCFI Questions 8–10 and Appendixes D–F)

1. Verify that the institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies should contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.
 - Review the institution’s transfer policies.
 - Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and for specific programs and how the institution publicly discloses information about those articulation agreements.
 - Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its website) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.
 - Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. The information the institution provides to students should explain any program-specific articulation agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution (1) accepts credits from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; (2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements; (3) both offers and accepts credits with the institution(s) in the articulation agreement; and (4) what specific credits articulate through the agreement (e.g., general education only; pre-professional nursing courses only; etc.). Note that the institution need not make public the entire articulation agreement, but it needs to make public to students relevant information about these agreements so that they can better plan their education.
 - Verify that the institution has an appropriate process to align the disclosed transfer policies with the criteria and procedures used by the institution in making transfer decisions.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.

- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution discloses transfer policy information to students and the public in the 2017-2018 College Catalog pages 28-29 and on the website <https://www.pima.edu/new-students/apply/transfer-to-pima.html>, Board policies concerning transfer were also reviewed.

Information regarding approved articulation agreements is also available on the institution's website <https://www.pima.edu/current-students/transferring-from-pima/transfer-partnerships.html>, <https://www.pima.edu/programs-courses/credit-programs-degrees/gen-ed/gen-ed-transfer/index.html>. The articulation agreements are provided on the website.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

(See FCFI Questions 11–16 and Appendix G)

1. Confirm that the institution verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided through distance or correspondence education. Confirm that it appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students, and that the method of verification makes reasonable efforts to protect students' privacy.
 - Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
 - Check that any costs related to verification (e.g., fees associated with test proctoring) and charged directly to students are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance or correspondence courses.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.

- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion .

Rationale:

Pima Community College verifies identity with issued user accounts that require a username and password for access to the institution's learning management system. Some courses require proctored exams. Students may take proctored exams free at campus testing centers, or students have the option to use an online proctoring service. Cost for the service ranges from \$17.00 to \$25.00 dollars per proctored exam. Additional costs for online course proctoring are displayed to a student in the online schedule of classes prior to enrollment.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

(See FCFI Questions 17–24 and Appendixes H–Q)

1. This requirement has several components the institution must address.
 - The team should verify that the following requirements are met:
 - **General Program Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities.
 - **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** The institution has provided HLC with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 5 if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)
 - **Default Rates.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its three-year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department has raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note that for 2012 and thereafter, institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact the HLC staff.
 - **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its

disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.

- **Student Right to Know/Equity in Athletics.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion 2, Core Component 2.A if the team determines that the disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)
 - **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance Policies.** The institution has provided HLC with information about its policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook and online. Note that HLC does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance unless required to do so by state or federal regulations but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.
 - **Contractual Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a contractual relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Contractual Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
 - **Consortial Relationships.** The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic programs and evidence of its compliance with HLC policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require HLC approval and has not received HLC approval, the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Substantive Change Application for Programs Offered Through Consortial Arrangements on HLC's website for more information.)
- Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
 - Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution's compliance or whether the institution's auditor has raised any issues in the A-133 about the institution's compliance, and also look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
 - If the institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the Federal Compliance portion of the team report and whether the

institution appears to be moving forward with the corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.

- If issues have been raised concerning the institution's compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution's ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Components 2.A and 2.B*).

2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:

- The institution meets HLC's requirements.
- The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
- The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
- The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (Criterion 2 and Criterion 5).

Rationale:

September 2012, the institution was placed on Provisional status with the Department for a high Perkins loan default rate. In June 2014, Pima CC participated in a Department Program Review (Closed). In March 2015, the institution submitted a PPA for recertification. In May 2016, the institution underwent a Focused Program Review after self-reporting an unapproved additional location (Open/Pending). In June 2016, the Perkins Loan Program was liquidated with the Department of Education (Closed). In September 2016, the institution received provisional recertification for Title IV programs. The institution intends to apply for recertification by submitting a Program Participation Agreement (PPA) in March 2019.

Pima Community College's composite financial index is above the zone for 2017, 2016, and 2015 (4.16, 2.7, and 1.86 respectively) indicating no concerns regarding financial responsibility. The three-year student loan default rates are 19.3%, 19.3%, and 20.9% (2015, 2014, and 2013 respectively) and slightly higher than peer institutions.

The institution's website disclosures for SAP, Right to Know/Equity in Athletics, and Crime Reporting were reviewed.

In reviewing the Fiscal Year 2017 Single Audit Report for year ending June 30, 2017 as produced by the Arizona Auditor General's office, several financial statements findings are of concern. The Student Financial Assistance Cluster has been out of compliance all the years (Fiscal Year 2017 – 2012) the reviewer has examined. The TRIO Cluster and the Higher Education – Institutional Aid program have reappeared for Fiscal 2017 and have been identified on and off in past audits. New to the Fiscal 2017 audit are concerns over information technology security risk-assessment, information technology access controls, information technology configuration management, information security policies and procedures, information technology contingency planning, and internal controls over purchasing.

For the past several years (reviewer examined Fiscal Years 2017 – 2012), Pima Community College District has been out of federal compliance for the Student Financial Assistance Cluster reporting student enrollment status change. (The Fiscal Year 2018 audit has not been released; nevertheless, it is anticipated that the Student Financial Assistance Cluster will continue to be out of compliance.)

For Fiscal Year 2017, both Material Weakness and Significant Deficiency has been identified for the Student Financial Assistance Cluster as well as other major programs managed by the college. Since Fiscal Year 2015, the college has been implementing incremental fixes to address the ongoing Student Financial Assistant Cluster issue. In Fiscal Year 2018, the college established a steering committee to ensure enhanced review of student records and reporting to address the continuing reporting issue. However, in documentation outlining corrective actions provided to the review team, a majority of the remedial activities were not started until October 2018 (Fiscal Year 2019). The auditor’s verification of the corrective measures results will not take place until the Fiscal Year 2019 audit which will not be presented to the college’s Governing Board until the end of 2019 or early 2020.

The college has implemented policies and procedures to correct TRIO Cluster audit findings in Fiscal Year 2018. The college submitted information regarding the findings and verified with the Federal Department of Education (DOE) compliance with the Department’s regulation. The DOE notified issues were resolved in May of 2018.

Information technology concerns are being addressed by the college. All of the information technology related concerns identified by the audit are currently being addressed and are scheduled to go into the production environment during the Calendar Year 2019:

Acceptable Use Agreement	Early 2018
Bring Your Own Device Policy	April, 2019
Data classification and data handling policies	April, 2019
Operational Security Incident Response Plan	March, 2019
Disaster Recovery Plan	June, 2019
Standard Operation Procedures and Administrative Procedures	June, 2019
Core Services Incident Response Plan	September, 2019
Centralized Ticketing, project management, information governance, and service levels	December, 2019
Information/Cyber Security program	December, 2019

Also, in the Fiscal Year 2017 audit, the college was cited to improve their purchasing internal controls. At the end of Fiscal Year 2018, the college implemented a new Purchasing Administrative Procedure. The procedure developed product and services acquisition guidelines and parameters to ensure compliance with the Federal Procurement Requirements. The Purchasing Department consolidated all of their purchasing activities campus-wide under a single director. The college is currently testing a new purchasing system they are anticipating will go into production at the end of June 2019.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Given all the activities planned to address the Fiscal Year 2017 findings with special concern for the repeated out-of-compliance Student Financial Assistance Cluster, the visit Team

recommends the college provide a monitoring report that addresses two-years of corrective action and data for each of the concerns identified in the audit:

- Internal control over financial reporting
- Internal control over major programs
 - Student Financial Assistance Cluster
 - TRIO Cluster
- Issues related to Information Technology
 - risk-assessment process to include information technology security
 - access controls over its information technology resources
 - configuration management processes over its information technology resources
 - security over its information technology resources
 - contingency planning procedures for its information technology resources
- Internal control over purchasing

This report should detail status on the above items with the time to correspond with the release of the Fiscal Year 2019 and 2020 Single Audit Report findings to ensure it can address federal compliance and auditor concerns. It is also recommended the TRIO Cluster audit finding resolution be verified on the Fiscal Year 2018 audit and compliance activities be noted on the previously recommended monitoring report.

Required Information for Students and the Public

(See FCFI Questions 25–27 and Appendixes R and S)

1. Verify that the institution publishes accurate, timely and appropriate information on institutional programs, fees, policies and related required information. Verify that the institution provides this required information in the course catalog and student handbook and on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Evidence that the institution publishes accurate, timely, and appropriate information concerning programs, fees, policies, and other pertinent information was found at <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/consumer-information/index.html>
<https://www.pima.edu/current-students/advising/docs/2017-18-student-handbook.pdf>
<https://www.pima.edu/programs-courses/college-catalog/1819/1819-catalog.pdf>

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

(See FCFI Questions 28–31 and Appendixes T and U)

1. Verify that the institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with HLC and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Review the institution’s disclosure about its accreditation status with HLC to determine whether the information it provides is accurate, complete and appropriately formatted and contains HLC’s web address.
 - Review the institution’s disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.
 - Review the institution’s catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, website and information provided by the institution’s advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate, timely and appropriate information to current and prospective students about its programs, locations and policies.
 - Verify that the institution correctly displays the Mark of Affiliation on its website.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institutional website easily identifies its relationship with HLC by linking from <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/index.html> to HLCs affiliate confirmation. Programmatic accreditations are found at <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/program-accreditation-certification.html>. Program and relevant policy information is easily found on the website as well.

Appropriate information directed toward current and prospective students is available on the website: <https://pccthinksmart.com/>, <https://www.pima.edu/new-students/index.html>. Advertising samples in Appendix T were reviewed as well.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 32–35 and Appendix V)

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether they are appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs the institution offers and the students it serves.
 - Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about planning, academic program review, assessment of student learning, consideration of institutional effectiveness and other topics.
 - Review the institution's explanation of its use of information from the College Scorecard, including student retention and completion and the loan repayment rate.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution stated that a priority of the College is to improve and maintain positive factors on the metrics represented by the College Scorecard. The College is very competitive in regard to annual cost, but institutional graduation rates are less than desired when compared to the regional and national averages.

The institution reports data on its website for the public <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/federal-reporting/index.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/federal-reporting/docs/2017-student-right-to-know.pdf>

The institution reported that student outcome assessment information at the program level is collected and analyzed as a part of regular program review. The institution collects and aggregates assessment data using a relational assessment database (eLumen) which provides reporting functionality useful to generate reports on program assessment, course

assessment, and general education assessment outcomes. Each academic program develops outcome measures specific to their discipline as well as generalized outcomes including graduation rates, etc. and reports on these measures as a part of their periodic program review. Information gained from the assessment of student learning is a significant component of program review and a reflection on the effectiveness of the program and institution.

The College reported that a goal for this year is to better intentionally link its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting. This occurs with the program review cycle as requests for new resources are linked to evidence-driven evaluation of need and impact. Student outcome data impacts the processes and planning for assessment, as the college continues to develop measures that reflect promising practices.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Publication of Student Outcome Data

(See FCFI Questions 36–38)

1. Verify that the institution makes student outcome data available and easily accessible to the public. Data may be provided at the institutional or departmental level or both, but the institution must disclose student outcome data that address the broad variety of its programs.
 - Verify that student outcome data are made available to the public on the institution’s website—for instance, linked to from the institution’s home page, included within the top three levels of the website or easily found through a search of related terms on the website—and are clearly labeled as such.
 - Determine whether the publication of these data accurately reflects the range of programs at the institution.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution reports data on its website for the public <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/federal-reporting/index.html>

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing With State and Other Accrediting Agencies

(See FCFI Questions 39–40 and Appendixes W and X)

1. Verify that the institution discloses accurately to the public and HLC its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditors and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team should consider any potential implications for accreditation by HLC of a sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or of loss of authorization in any state.

Note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the assurance section of the team report and provide its rationale for recommending HLC status in light of this action.

- Review the list of relationships the institution has with all other accreditors and state governing or coordinating bodies, along with the evaluation reports, action letters and interim monitoring plans issued by each accrediting agency.
 - Verify that the institution's standing with state agencies and accrediting bodies is appropriately disclosed to students.
 - Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet HLC's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the HLC staff liaison immediately.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

Accreditation information is made available to the public at <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/program-accreditation-certification.html>. No sanctions or pending sanctions were found in the evidence provided. No evidence was found to indicate that adverse action is currently in place or pending by any of the accrediting bodies disclosed.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment (FCFI Questions 41–43 and Appendix Y)

1. Verify that the institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments. The team should evaluate any comments received and complete any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments.

Note: If the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comments relate to the team’s review of the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the appropriate section of its report in the Assurance System.

- Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including copies of the institution’s notices, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
 - Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
2. Check the response that reflects the team’s conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC’s requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC’s requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

The institution made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third-party comments using print ads, social media, the college website, and email invitations. Samples of the notifications were reviewed in Appendix Y. The Visit Team received four third-party comments. The Team reviewed the comments and followed up on them during the visit.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Competency-Based Programs Including Direct Assessment Programs/Faculty-Student Engagement

(See FCFI Questions 44–47)

1. Verify that students and faculty in any direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution have regular and substantive interactions: the faculty and students communicate on some regular basis that is at least equivalent to contact in a traditional classroom, and that in the tasks mastered to assure competency, faculty and students interact about critical thinking, analytical skills, and written and oral communication abilities, as well as about core ideas, important theories, current knowledge, etc. (Also, confirm that the institution has explained the credit hour equivalencies for these programs in the credit hour sections of the Federal Compliance Filing.)
 - Review the list of direct assessment or competency-based programs offered by the institution.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty in these programs regularly communicate and interact with students about the subject matter of the course.
 - Determine whether the institution has effective methods for ensuring that faculty and students in these programs interact about key skills and ideas in the students' mastery of tasks to assure competency.
2. Check the response that reflects the team's conclusions after reviewing this component of Federal Compliance:
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements.
 - The institution meets HLC's requirements, but additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The institution does not meet HLC's requirements and additional monitoring is recommended.
 - The Federal Compliance reviewer/evaluation team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Rationale:

N/A. The institution does not have competency-based programs.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list of materials reviewed here:

2014-2018 Complaint Log

GELO Spring 2017 Summary Report

Official Cohort Default Rates for Schools

<https://www2.ed.gov/offices/OSFAP/defaultmanagement/schooltyperates.pdf>

College Catalog 2017-2018 <https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/assurance-2018/docs-compl/apx-r/appendix-r-required-information-for-students-and-the-public.pdf>

College Catalog 2018-2019 <https://www.pima.edu/programs-courses/college-catalog/1819/1819-catalog.pdf>

2017 A-133, 2016 A-133, 2015 A-133 Audit Reports

College Website

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/policies/administrative-procedures/docs-ap-03/AP-3-31-01.pdf>

<https://www.pima.edu/current-students/complaint-processes/>

<https://www.pima.edu/new-students/apply/transfer-to-pima.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/current-students/transferring-from-pima/transfer-partnerships.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/programs-courses/credit-programs-degrees/gen-ed/gen-ed-transfer/index.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/paying-for-school/financial-aid/satisfactory-progress/index.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/programs-courses/credit-programs-degrees/attendance.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/administrative-services/college-police/reports-statistics.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/federal-reporting/docs/2017-student-right-to-know.pdf>

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/consumer-information/index.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/current-students/advising/docs/2017-18-student-handbook.pdf>

<https://pccthinksmart.com/>

<https://www.pima.edu/new-students/index.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/federal-reporting/index.html>

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/accreditation/assurance-2018/docs-compl/notification-facilitating-public-comment.pdf>

<https://www.pima.edu/about-pima/reports/federal-reporting/athletics-related.html>



Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours

Institution Under Review: Pima Community College

Review the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including all supplemental materials. Applicable sections and supplements are referenced in the corresponding sections and questions below.

Part 1. Institutional Calendar, Term Length and Type of Credit

Instructions

Review Section 1 of Appendix A. Verify that the institution has calendar and term lengths within the range of good practice in higher education.

Responses

A. Answer the Following Question

1. Are the institution's calendar and term lengths, including non-standard terms, within the range of good practice in higher education? Do they contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

The institution follows a semester calendar with term lengths of 14, 15, and 16 weeks primarily. A few non-standard terms were identified. These range from 5- 24 weeks. The institution's calendar and terms lengths are within the range of good practice in higher education allowing for a rigorous and thorough education.

B. Recommend HLC Follow-Up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's calendar and term length practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2. Policy and Practices on Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

Review Sections 2–4 of the *Worksheet for Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and Clock Hours*, including supplemental materials as noted below. In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps. The outcomes of the team's review should be reflected in its responses below.

1. **Format of Courses and Number of Credits Awarded.** Review the *Form for Reporting an Overview of Credit Hour Allocations and Instructional Time for Courses* (Supplement A1 to the *Worksheet for Institutions*) completed by the institution, which provides an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats.
2. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution (see Supplements B1 and B2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, as applicable).
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14–16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The descriptions in the catalog should reflect courses that are appropriately rigorous and have collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode and types of academic activities.
 - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. HLC procedure also permits this approach.

3. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course (see Supplement B3 to *Worksheet for Institutions*). Pay particular attention to alternatively structured or other courses completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor that have particularly high credit hour assignments.
4. Sampling. Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
 - For the programs sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several courses, identify the contact hours for each course, and review expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
5. **Direct Assessment or Competency-Based Programs.** Review the information provided by the institution regarding any direct assessment or competency-based programs that it offers, with regard to the learning objectives, policies and procedures for credit allocation, and processes for review and improvement in these programs.
6. **Policy on Credit Hours and Total Credit Hour Generation.** With reference to the institutional policies on the assignment of credit provided in Supplement A2 to *Worksheet for Institutions*, consider the following questions:
 - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?
 - Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
 - For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame allotted for the course?
 - Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public

institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

- If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?
 - Do the number of credits taken by typical undergraduate and graduate students, as well as the number of students earning more than the typical number of credits, fall within the range of good practice in higher education?
7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:
- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and provides evidence of implementation.
 - If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or a single department, division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (a monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
 - If the team identifies systematic noncompliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify the HLC staff immediately and work with staff members to design appropriate follow-up activities. HLC shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team

Annotated Syllabus Template

BIO 105IN Environmental Biology - (Community Campus online, 8 weeks), (Downtown Campus 14-week self-paced), (West Campus 16-week traditional), (Northwest Campus 16-week web hybrid), Course Schedule fall 2018

BIO 100IN Biology Concepts - (Community Campus online 8 weeks), (Community Campus online 16 weeks), (East Campus 16 week traditional), (Northwest Campus 16-week web hybrid), Course class schedule fall 2018/spring 2019

Associate of Applied Science Nursing

- NRS 104 Nursing Process I - Syllabus (traditional 16 weeks), NRS 104 Reading Assignment & Exam Schedule, NRS 104 Lecture Schedule
- NRS 105 Nursing Process II – Syllabus (traditional 16 weeks), NRS 105 Semester Calendar Fall 2018

- NRS 201 Nursing Process III – Maternal Child, Pediatrics, and Psychiatric Nursing (traditional 16 weeks)
 - NRS 202 Nursing Process IV – Syllabus (traditional 16 weeks), Lecture Schedule and Required Assignments document
 - Class Schedules NRS 104, 105, 201 and 202 Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
- Associate of Applied Science in Business
- ACC 211 Financial Accounting – Syllabus/Schedule (traditional 16 weeks)
 - ACC 212 Managerial Accounting – Syllabus/Schedule (traditional 16 weeks)
 - BUS 220 Legal Environment of Business – Syllabus/Schedule (hybrid)
 - ACC 211, ACC 212, and BUS 220 Class Schedule Fall 2017 and Spring 2018
- Certificate in Mechanical Designer/CNC Programming
- CAD 117 Print Reading with CAD for Manufacturing – Syllabus (16 weeks)
 - CAD 142 Introduction to Parametric Modeling: SolidWorks (traditional 16 weeks)
 - CAD 172 Geometric Dimensioning and Tolerancing (traditional 16 weeks)
 - CAD 242 Advanced Parametric Solid Modeling: SolidWorks (traditional 16 weeks)
 - CAD Class Schedules Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
 - MAC Class Schedules Fall 2018 and Spring 2019
- Associate of Arts – History Concentration
- HIS 101 Western Civilization I (online 8, 14, or 16 weeks)
 - HIS 102 Western Civilization II (online open enrollment 8 or 14 weeks)
 - HIS 141 U.S. History I (online 8 or 16 weeks)
- Dual Enrollment Class and Corresponding College Credit Class
- WRT 101 Writing I (dual enrollment for Marana High School)
 - WRT 101 Writing I (web hybrid for college students)
 - MAT 151 College Algebra (dual enrollment for Marana High School)
 - MAT 151 College Algebra (5 weeks computer enhanced class for college students)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1. Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

a. Does the institution’s policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

Yes No

Comments:

The PCC Annotated Syllabus Template requires that each instructor adhere to, “The federal credit hour definition is one hour of instructor contact and two hours out of class work per credit/fifteen weeks. For a 3-credit course/16 week semester this would be 45 hours of instruction and 90 hours out of classwork.” The Curriculum Procedure Manual 2018 states, “Courses offered using alternative modes of delivery (e.g. online, web - hybrid, self-paced) require an equivalent of 45 hours of work per credit, will use the same course outline and require the same outcomes. Courses offered in compressed time frame s (e.g. 14 weeks, 8 weeks, 5 weeks, etc.) within a term also require an equivalent of 45 hours of work per credit, will use the same course outlines and require the same outcomes.”

b. Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Yes No

Comments:

The PCC Annotated Syllabus Template requires that each instructor adhere to, "The federal credit hour definition is one hour of instructor contact and two hours out of class work per credit/fifteen weeks. For a 3-credit course/16 week semester this would be 45 hours of instruction and 90 hours out of classwork." The Curriculum Procedure Manual 2018 states, "Courses offered using alternative modes of delivery (e.g. online, web - hybrid, self-paced) require an equivalent of 45 hours of work per credit, will use the same course outline and require the same outcomes. Courses offered in compressed time frames (e.g. 14 weeks, 8 weeks, 5 weeks, etc.) within a term also require an equivalent of 45 hours of work per credit, will use the same course outlines and require the same outcomes."

c. For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the time frame and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes No

Comments:

N/A

d. Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

The institution's policy follows the federal definition and is in the range of good practice in higher education.

2. Application of Policies

- a. Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that HLC will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments:

Course description and syllabi reviewed reflect both the institution's policy and the federal definition of credit hour policy.

- b. Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

Yes No

Comments:

Learning outcomes in the samples reviewed were found to be appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and consistent with the institution's policy on the award of credit.

- c. If the institution offers any alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

Yes No

Comments:

Five-, eight-, and fourteen-week course samples reviewed demonstrate course descriptions and syllabi appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy concerning the award of academic credit.

d. If the institution offers alternative-delivery or compressed-format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonable for students to fulfill in the time allocated, such that the allocation of credit is justified?

Yes No

Comments:

Learning outcomes for the 5-, 8-, and 14-week courses reviewed are in keeping with the institution's credit hour award policy, parallel to those of companion 16-week courses, and demonstrate learning outcomes that can be achieved in the allotted time.

e. Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

Review of sample courses and programs indicates that the institution's assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution is reflective of its policy on the award of credit and is reasonable and appropriate.

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this worksheet. If the team has responded "no" to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign HLC follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's credit hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:

D. Systematic Noncompliance in One or More Educational Programs With HLC Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Did the team find systematic noncompliance in one or more education programs with HLC policies regarding the credit hour?

Yes No

Identify the findings:

Rationale:

Part 3. Clock Hours

Instructions

Review Section 5 of *Worksheet for Institutions*, including Supplements A3–A6. Before completing the worksheet below, answer the following question:

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours or programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

Yes No

If the answer is “Yes,” complete the “Worksheet on Clock Hours.”

Note: This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (for which an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock hour programs might include teacher education, nursing or other programs in licensed fields.

Federal regulations require that these programs follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, the accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction so long as the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8):

1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction
1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour includes at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

1. Does the institution's credit-to-clock-hour formula match the federal formula?

Yes No

Comments:

The institution's 2018 Curriculum Procedures Manual, page 37, states "Clock Hour: A term used to measure time spent by a student in non-credit, career and technical education learning activities; one clock hour equals 60 minutes and 640 clock hours equal one Full-Time Student Equivalency (FTSE). The clock-to-credit hour conversion is 37.5 clock hours equals 1 credit hour."

2. If the credit-to-clock-hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class.

N/A

3. Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

Yes No

Comments:

4. Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit-to-clock-hour conversion?

Yes No

C. Recommend HLC Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any HLC follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

Yes

No

Rationale:

Identify the type of HLC monitoring required and the due date:



Multi-Campus Reviewer Form

After conducting the electronic and on-site portions of the multi-campus visit, the assigned peer reviewer completes a separate Multi-campus Reviewer Form for each campus that was reviewed. The reviewer then emails completed forms to the rest of the comprehensive evaluation team members. The team discusses and integrates the findings into its final comprehensive evaluation report in the Assurance System, including any concerns or recommended follow-up.

After the visit, the team chair should email a copy of all Multi-campus Reviewer Forms to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org. The Multi-campus Report from the institution and the reviewer forms become part of the institution's permanent file and are shared as appropriate with future evaluation teams.

Instructions

A Multi-campus Reviewer Form should be no more than five pages. The form begins with a brief description of the campus and its operations to provide the context for the on-site team's deliberations.

For each review category, provide 2–3 evidence statements that make clear the team's findings in relationship to the Criteria and Core Components. Check one of the following for each category:

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the review category. (The reviewer may cite ways to improve.)
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the review category.

This form does not request a recommendation from the reviewer. Instead, the full evaluation team is expected to include a discussion of the evidence related to the multi-campus visit in its deliberations about the oversight, management, and educational quality of extended operations of the institution. The team will incorporate evidence on extended operations into the final team report. Further, the full team may determine that a pattern of concern exists across multiple categories of a single campus or more than one campus and may result in a recommendation for additional monitoring or sanction.

Report Template

Name of Institution: Pima Community College

Name and Address of Branch Campus: Community, 401 North Bonita Ave., Tucson, AZ 85709

Date and Duration of Visit: December 5, 2018, 3.5 hours

Reviewer: Philip E. Pena

1. Campus Overview

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

Pima Community College Community Campus was established in 1975 and serves approximately 16,717 students per year. Community Campus offers credit, workforce, adult basic education, and community coursework. PimaOnline is headquartered on campus as well as the supporting services. Northern Arizona University (NAU) has offices located on campus serving the university's distance learning operations.

2. History, Planning, and Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution's planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting and resource allocation at the institution.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Day-to-day supervision of the campus is the responsibility of a campus president who reports directly to the system chancellor. Academics, facilities, technology, external relations, student support services, and institutional research, planning, and effectiveness leadership maintains on-campus representation in addition to additional supporting services and senior leadership oversight located on other campuses. Of the local campus groups on-campus, all felt fully supported for all their academic and support needs.

3. Facilities and Technology

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution's facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative

offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; access for people with disabilities; and other services or facilities (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.).

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

District administration provides much of the technology support; however, other than very occasional off-hour support, all local campus groups reported good and timely services from technology support staff. The facilities are well maintained as observed by the reviewer and confirmed by the local campus groups. An onsite facilities coordinator ensures access to facilities administration support.

4. Human Resources

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Human resources support is provided by an onsite coordinator with additional support available through other locations. In general, across all employees, there is a general feeling of concern over the lack of state financial support and its effect on all levels of faculty and staff in terms of job availability and benefits. Hiring and evaluation standards are set and monitored at the system level.

5. Student and Faculty Resources and Support

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to

admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Students in general feel support throughout their academic career by both academic and student support services. However, some expressed difficulties with life/school balance; support is there but not well advertised. Students who have received support feel it was good and adequate. A few students felt that to get specialized supporting services they did have to travel to other campuses, i.e., registration support for classes not located on the local campus and especially with travel times between classes. Faculty also expressed good support from their deans and other supporting services and had the tools needed to effectively teach. There is a concern among faculty that fewer advising and student support services will impact support to students.

6. Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Faculty felt well supported and managed. Consolidation of resources is working well. Faculty would like more focused training; in general, they are excited about the Center for Teaching Excellence and having coaches and are anticipating the center to be effective. In general, faculty are participating and feel their voices in their programs and in college administration are heard.

7. Evaluation and Assessment

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence and completion sufficiently in order to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in

particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at the branch campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Assessment is being standardized across all institutions at the class, department, program, and institutional levels. Academic oversight is the responsibility of the faculty-elected department head. Faculty hiring standards and expectations are set by the Provost's Advisory Council which is made up of the campus president, division deans, and PCCEA and Faculty Senate representatives.

8. Continuous Improvement

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution's planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus, as well as alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

It was observed by the reviewer in college literature and interviews that there is a system-wide effort to establish outcomes, improvement plans, and improvement efforts for all college divisions and departments. Curriculum is aligned and reviewed with the system-wide curriculum process. All coursework is reviewed on a three-year cycle to ensure learning outcomes are current, relevant, and consistent. Community campus has outlined online student expectations and improvement plans that include defined support services. Each online course is monitored through a defined review process.



Multi-Campus Reviewer Form

After conducting the electronic and on-site portions of the multi-campus visit, the assigned peer reviewer completes a separate Multi-campus Reviewer Form for each campus that was reviewed. The reviewer then emails completed forms to the rest of the comprehensive evaluation team members. The team discusses and integrates the findings into its final comprehensive evaluation report in the Assurance System, including any concerns or recommended follow-up.

After the visit, the team chair should email a copy of all Multi-campus Reviewer Forms to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org. The Multi-campus Report from the institution and the reviewer forms become part of the institution's permanent file and are shared as appropriate with future evaluation teams.

Instructions

A Multi-campus Reviewer Form should be no more than five pages. The form begins with a brief description of the campus and its operations to provide the context for the on-site team's deliberations.

For each review category, provide 2–3 evidence statements that make clear the team's findings in relationship to the Criteria and Core Components. Check one of the following for each category:

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the review category. (The reviewer may cite ways to improve.)
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the review category.

This form does not request a recommendation from the reviewer. Instead, the full evaluation team is expected to include a discussion of the evidence related to the multi-campus visit in its deliberations about the oversight, management, and educational quality of extended operations of the institution. The team will incorporate evidence on extended operations into the final team report. Further, the full team may determine that a pattern of concern exists across multiple categories of a single campus or more than one campus and may result in a recommendation for additional monitoring or sanction.

Report Template

Name of Institution: Pima Community College

Name and Address of Branch Campus: Downtown, 1255 North Stone Ave., Tucson, AZ 85709

Date and Duration of Visit: December 5, 2018, 3.5 hours

Reviewer: Philip E. Pena

1. Campus Overview

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

Pima Community College Downtown Campus was established in 1974 and serves approximately 5,908 students per year. Downtown Campus offers credit and workforce coursework. The campus houses many of the system's laboratory-based technology programs such as automotive, building and construction, CAD, and machine tools. The campus is also home to the translation studies and paralegal program.

2. History, Planning, and Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution's planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting and resource allocation at the institution.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Day-to-day supervision of the campus is the responsibility of a campus president who reports directly to the system chancellor. The campus provides onsite admissions and advising, financial aid, bookstore, learning center, and food services in addition to additional supporting services under senior leadership oversight located on other campuses. Of the local campus groups on-campus, all felt fully supported for all their planning, academic, and support needs. They found resource allocation is much better under the OnePima methodology.

3. Facilities and Technology

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution's facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative

offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; access for people with disabilities; and other services or facilities (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.).

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

District administration provides much of the technology support; however, other than very occasional off-hour support, all local campus groups reported good and timely services from technology support staff. Bring-your-own-device for support is limited to a small window; not all students can make the times when support is open. The facilities are well-maintained as observed by the reviewer and confirmed by the local campus groups. An onsite facilities coordinator ensures access to facilities administration support.

4. Human Resources

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Human resources support is provided by an onsite coordinator with additional support available through other locations. In general, across all employees, there is a general feeling of the uncertainty that comes from the lack of state financial support and its effect on all levels of faculty and staff in terms of job availability and benefits. Hiring and evaluation standards are set and monitored at the system level.

5. Student and Faculty Resources and Support

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to

admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Students in general feel supported throughout their academic career by both academic and student support services. Student would like an increase in training in accomplishing basic tasks, i.e., registration. Both students and faculty felt that information flow downward is problematic especially from the system. A few students felt that to get specialized supporting services they did have to travel to other campuses, i.e., registration support for classes not located on the local campus, especially dealing with travel times between classes. Faculty also expressed good support from their deans and other supporting services and had the tools needed to effectively teach. There is a concern among faculty that fewer advising and student support services staff will impact support to students.

6. Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution's capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Faculty felt well supported and managed. Consolidation of resources is working well. They would like more focused training; in general, they are excited about Center for Teaching Excellence and having coaches and are anticipating the center to be effective. In general, faculty are engaged and feel their voices in their programs and in college administration are heard. However, faculty felt there sometimes is an issue on whom, how, and the timeliness of getting special services.

7. Evaluation and Assessment

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence and completion sufficiently in order to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at the branch campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Assessment is being standardized across all campuses at the class, department, program, and institutional levels. Academic oversight is the responsibility of the faculty-elected department head. Faculty hiring standards and expectations are set by the Provost Advisory Council which is made up of the campus president, division deans, and PCCEA and Faculty Senate reps.

8. Continuous Improvement

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution’s planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus, as well as alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

It was observed by the reviewer in college literature and interviews that there is a system-wide effort to establish outcomes, improvement plans, and improvement efforts for all college divisions and departments. Curriculum is aligned and reviewed with the system-wide curriculum process. All coursework is reviewed on a three-year cycle to ensure learning outcomes are current, relevant, and consistent. Online learning has outlined student expectations and improvement plans that include defined support services. Each online course is monitored through a defined review process.



Multi-Campus Reviewer Form

After conducting the electronic and on-site portions of the multi-campus visit, the assigned peer reviewer completes a separate Multi-campus Reviewer Form for each campus that was reviewed. The reviewer then emails completed forms to the rest of the comprehensive evaluation team members. The team discusses and integrates the findings into its final comprehensive evaluation report in the Assurance System, including any concerns or recommended follow-up.

After the visit, the team chair should email a copy of all Multi-campus Reviewer Forms to HLC at finalreports@hlcommission.org. The Multi-campus Report from the institution and the reviewer forms become part of the institution's permanent file and are shared as appropriate with future evaluation teams.

Instructions

A Multi-campus Reviewer Form should be no more than five pages. The form begins with a brief description of the campus and its operations to provide the context for the on-site team's deliberations.

For each review category, provide 2–3 evidence statements that make clear the team's findings in relationship to the Criteria and Core Components. Check one of the following for each category:

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the review category. (The reviewer may cite ways to improve.)
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the review category.

This form does not request a recommendation from the reviewer. Instead, the full evaluation team is expected to include a discussion of the evidence related to the multi-campus visit in its deliberations about the oversight, management, and educational quality of extended operations of the institution. The team will incorporate evidence on extended operations into the final team report. Further, the full team may determine that a pattern of concern exists across multiple categories of a single campus or more than one campus and may result in a recommendation for additional monitoring or sanction.

Report Template

Name of Institution: Pima Community College

Name and Address of Branch Campus: Northwest, 7600 North Shannon Road, Tucson, AZ 85709

Date and Duration of Visit: December 6, 2018, 3.5 hours

Reviewer: Philip E. Pena

1. Campus Overview

Provide a brief description of the scope and operations of the campus. Include information about consortial or contractual arrangements, if applicable.

Pima Community College Northwest Campus is the system's newest campus established in 2003 and serves approximately 3,387 students per year. Northwest Campus offers credit and workforce coursework. The campus works with the county and the YMCA to provide recreational and educational services on-campus. The administration team commented that the University of Arizona is envious of the new science labs.

2. History, Planning, and Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the effectiveness of the institution's planning, governance and oversight processes at the campus and in relationship to the broader systems of the institution, particularly as they relate to enrollment, budgeting and resource allocation at the institution.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Day-to-day supervision of the campus is the responsibility of a campus president who reports directly to the system chancellor. The campus provides onsite admissions and advising, financial aid, bookstore, learning center, veteran center, open computer lab, and food services in addition to supporting services and senior leadership oversight located at other campuses. Academics, facilities, technology, external relations, student support services, and institutional research, planning, and effectiveness leadership is maintained with on-campus representation in addition to additional supporting services and senior leadership oversight located on other campuses. Of the local campus groups on-campus, all felt fully supported for all their planning, academic, and support needs.

3. Facilities and Technology

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s facilities and technology at the campus and their suitability to the needs of the students, staff and faculty, as well as the educational offerings. Consider, in particular, classrooms and laboratories (size, maintenance, temperature, etc.); faculty and administrative offices (site, visibility, privacy for meetings, etc.); parking or access to public transit; bookstore or text purchasing services; security; access for people with disabilities; and other services or facilities (food or snack services, study and meeting areas, etc.).

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

District administration provides much of the technology support; however, other than very occasional off-hour support, all local campus groups reported good and timely services from technology support staff. The facilities are well maintained as observed by the reviewer and confirmed by the local campus groups. An onsite facilities coordinator ensures access to facilities administration support. Students did cite they have to use two different email systems one for the institution and D2L for classwork.

4. Human Resources

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on appropriateness of faculty and staff qualifications, sufficiency of staff and faculty for the campus, and the processes for supporting and evaluating personnel at the campus. Consider the processes in place for selecting, training and orienting faculty at the location, as well as the credentials of faculty dedicated to the campus and other faculty.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Human resources support is provided by an onsite coordinator with additional support available through other locations. In general, across all employees there is a feeling uncertainty over the lack of state financial support and its effect on all levels of faculty and staff in terms of job availability and benefits. Hiring and evaluation standards are set and monitored at the system level.

5. Student and Faculty Resources and Support

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the student and faculty services and academic resources at the campus, as well as the processes to evaluate, improve and manage them. Consider, in particular, the level of student access (in person, by computer, by phone, etc.) to academic advising/placement, remedial/tutorial services, and library materials/services. Also, consider the level of access to admissions, registration/student records, financial aid, and job placement services, as well as attention to student concerns. Finally, consider the resources needed by faculty to provide the educational offerings.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Students in general feel support throughout their academic career by both academic and student support services. Learning Center services received high compliments. Students who have received support feel it was good and adequate. Student registration support is confusing; two systems have to be used to get fully registered for classes. Registration and financial aid are not connected and usually require in-person support. Faculty expressed good support from their deans and other supporting services and had the tools needed to teach effectively. However, block scheduling has been problematic for some student schedules. There is a concern among faculty that fewer advising and student support services will impact support to students.

6. Educational Programs and Instructional Oversight

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s capacity to oversee educational offerings and instruction at the campus. Identify whether the institution has adequate controls in place to ensure that information presented to students is ample and accurate. Consider consistency of curricular expectations and policies, availability of courses needed for program and graduation requirements, performance of instructional duties, availability of faculty to students, orientation of faculty/professional development, attention to student concerns.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Faculty felt well supported and managed. Consolidation of resources is working well. They would like more focused training; in general, they are excited about the Center for teaching Excellence and having coaches and are anticipating the center to be effective. In general, faculty are participating and feel their voices in their programs and in college administration are heard. However, a couple of faculty felt they are not involved with their curriculum. Students expressed quality issues with a few faculty members; they were unsure if the complaints to their respective deans are being heard.

7. Evaluation and Assessment

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements on the institution’s processes to evaluate and improve the educational offerings of the campus and to assess and improve student learning, persistence and completion sufficiently in order to maintain and improve academic quality at the campus. Consider, in particular, the setting of outcomes, the actual measurement of performance, and the analysis and use of data to maintain/improve quality. Identify how the processes at the branch campus are equivalent to those for assessment and evaluation on the main campus.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

Assessment is being standardized across all institutions at the class, department, program, and institutional levels. Academic oversight is the responsibility of the faculty elected department head. Faculty hiring standards and expectations are set by the Provost Advisory Council which is made up of the campus president, division deans, and PCCEA and Faculty Senate representatives.

8. Continuous Improvement

Provide 2–3 evidentiary statements that demonstrate that the institution encourages and ensures continuous quality improvement at the campus. Consider in particular the institution’s planning and evaluation processes that ensure regular review and improvement of the campus, as well as alignment of the branch campus with the mission and goals of the institution as a whole.

Judgment of reviewer (check one):

- The evidence indicates that the institution fulfills the expectations of the category.
- The evidence indicates that there are concerns related to the expectations of the category.

Evidentiary Statements:

It was observed by the reviewer in college literature and interviews that there is a system-wide effort to establish outcomes, improvement plans, and improvement efforts for all college divisions and departments. Curriculum is aligned and reviewed with the system-wide curriculum process. All coursework is reviewed on a three-year cycle to ensure learning outcomes are current, relevant, and consistent. Online learning has outlined student expectations and improvement plans that include defined support services. Each online course is monitored through a defined review process.

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

INSTITUTION and STATE: Pima County Community College District, AZ

TYPE OF REVIEW: Standard Pathway Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW: The Board maintained the College on the Standard Pathway with its next comprehensive evaluation (Year 4) in 2018-19. The Board required that the College submit an embedded Interim Report for its next comprehensive evaluation on the following topics:

- Goals and activities implemented by the new staff charged with oversight of assessment activities;
- Evidence that planning goals are being achieved;
- The establishment and continuation of a defined planning structure and process;
- Evidence of further development in linking budgeting to strategic planning;
- Evidence of the approval and implementation of the education and facilities master plan; and
- Data demonstrating the effectiveness of the Developmental Education Redesign and how the Redesign has contributed to increased persistence, retention, and completion rates.

The institution was granted an extension until September 1, 2022 to become compliant to the faculty qualification requirement.

A multi-campus visit will occur in conjunction with the comprehensive evaluation to Northwest Campus, 7600 North Shannon Road, Tucson AZ 85709-7200; Community Campus, 401 North Bonita Ave, Tucson AZ 85709-5000; and Downtown Campus, 1255 North Stone Ave., Tucson AZ 85709-3000.

Comprehensive evaluation includes a Federal Compliance reviewer: Dr. Tonya Buttry.

DATES OF REVIEW: 12/3/2018 - 12/4/2018

No Change in Institutional Status and Requirements

Accreditation Status

Nature of Institution

Control: Public

Recommended Change: no change

Degrees Awarded: Associates

Recommended Change: no change

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Reaffirmation of Accreditation:

Year of Last Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2014 - 2015

Year of Next Reaffirmation of Accreditation: 2018 - 2019

Recommended Change: 2024-2025

Accreditation Stipulations

General:

Prior HLC approval is required for substantive change as stated in HLC policy.

Recommended Change: no change

Additional Location:

Prior HLC approval required.

Recommended Change: no change

Distance and Correspondence Courses and Programs:

Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

Recommended Change: no change

Status:

See Public Disclosure Notice.

Recommended Change: remove PDN

Accreditation Events

Accreditation Pathway

Standard Pathway

Recommended Change: Limited to Standard Pathway

Upcoming Events

Comprehensive Evaluation: 2024 - 2025

The team should review that the institution has completed its plan to come into compliance with the faculty qualification requirement.

Recommended Change: no change



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Monitoring

Upcoming Events

None

Recommended Change:

Interim Report due June 1, 2021, with two areas of focus:

1. Correction of Concerns Identified in the 2017 Audit from the Arizona Auditor General: Financial Reporting, Student Financial Assistance Cluster, TRIO Cluster, Information Technology, and Purchasing Controls (Federal Compliance, 2A, 5A); and
 2. Assessment of General Education, Course, and Program Learning Outcomes; Faculty Participation; and Integration of Assessment and Program Review results into the Budgeting Processes (3B, 4A, 4B, 5C).
-

Institutional Data

Educational Programs		Recommended Change: no change
Undergraduate		
Certificate	103	_____
Associate Degrees	53	_____
Baccalaureate Degrees	0	_____
Graduate		
Master's Degrees	0	_____
Specialist Degrees	0	_____
Doctoral Degrees	0	_____

Extended Operations

Branch Campuses

- Community Campus, 401 North Bonita Ave, Tucson, AZ, 85709-5000
- Desert Vista Campus, 5901 South Calle Santa Cruz, Tucson, AZ, 85709-6000
- Downtown Campus, 1255 North Stone Ave., Tucson, AZ, 85709-3000
- East Campus, 8181 East Irvington Rd., Tucson, AZ, 85709-7000
- Northwest Campus, 7600 North Shannon Road, Tucson, AZ, 85709-7200
- West Campus, 2202 West Anklam Rd, Tucson, AZ, 85709-0001

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

Recommended Change: no change

Additional Locations

Amphi Land Lab, 450 E. Wetmore Road, Tucson, AZ, 85705 - Active

Andrada Polytechnic High School, 12960 S. Houghton Road, Tucson, AZ, 85747 - Active

Arizona State Prison Complex-Tucson, 10000 South Wilmot Road, Tucson, AZ, 85734 - Active

Aviation Technology Center, 7211 South Park Avenue, Tucson, AZ, 85709-6185 - Active

Casino Del Sol Resort, 5655 W. Valencia Road, Tucson, AZ, 85757 - Active

Central Arizona Vocational Institute of Technology, 1789 W. Coolidge Avenue, Coolidge, AZ, 85128 - Active

Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, 5355 E Granite St, Bldg 2441, Suite 130, Tucson, AZ, 85709-3009 - Active

Desert View High School, 4101 E. Valencia Rd., Tucson, AZ, 85706 - Active

District Support Service Center/Maintenance and Services (M&S), 6680 South Country Club Road, Tucson, AZ, 85709-6185 - Active

East Valley Institute of Technology, 1601 Main Street, Mesa, AZ, 85201 - Active

El-Rio Community Health Center, 839 W. Congress, Tucson, AZ, 85747 - Active

Federal Bureau of Prison Federal Correctional Complex, 8901 South Wilmot Road, Tucson, AZ, 85756 - Active

Golder Ranch Fire District Training Facility, 3855 E. Golder Ranch Drive, Tucson, AZ, 85739 - Active

JTED at Camino Seco, 8727 E. 22nd Street, Tucson, AZ, 85710 - Active

JTED at Master Pieces, 2855 W. Master Pieces Dr., Tucson, AZ, 85741 - Active

Marana High School, 12000 W. Emigh Rd., Tucson, AZ, 85743 - Active

Northwest Fire District Training Center, 5125 West Camino de Fuego, Tucson, AZ, 85743 - Active

Pascua Yaqui Tribal Nation, 7465 S. Camino Benem, Tucson, AZ, 85757 - Active

Pima Community College 29th St. Coalition Center, 4355 East Calle Aurora, Tucson, AZ, 85711 - Active

Rural Metro Fire Dept. Operations, 3759 N. Commerce Drive, Tucson, AZ, 85705 - Active

Santa Cruz Center, 2021 North Grand Avenue, Nogales, AZ, 85621 - Active

Santa Rita High School, 3951 S Pantano Rd., Tucson, AZ, 85730 - Active

Sunnyside High School, 1725 E. Bilby Rd., Tucson, AZ, 85706 - Active

Tucson Public Safety Academy, 10001 South Wilmot Road, Tucson, AZ, 85756 - Active

Western Maricopa Education Center (West-MEC), 1617 W. Williams Drive, Phoenix, AZ, 85027 - Active

Recommended Change: no change

Correspondence Education

None

Recommended Change: no change

Distance Delivery

05.0202 - American Indian/Native American Studies, Associate, American Indian Studies-AA

11.0501 - Computer Systems Analysis/Analyst, Associate, Programmer/Analyst - AAS



Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

- 11.0501 - Computer Systems Analysis/Analyst, Certificate, Computer Systems Analysis/Analyst
- 11.0602 - Word Processing, Certificate, Computer Applications Office Assistant - Cert
- 11.0901 - Computer Systems Networking and Telecommunications, Associate, Computer Systems Networking and Telecommunications
- 11.0901 - Computer Systems Networking and Telecommunications, Certificate, Systems Admin/Networking-Cert
- 13.0101 - Education, General, Associate, Education
- 13.0101 - Education, General, Certificate, Certificate (post baccalaureate) in Secondary Educ.
- 13.0201 - Bilingual and Multilingual Education, Certificate, Bilingual and Multilingual Education
- 13.1001 - Special Education and Teaching, General, Certificate, Special Education and Teaching
- 13.1210 - Early Childhood Education and Teaching, Associate, Early Childhood Education and Teaching
- 13.1210 - Early Childhood Education and Teaching, Certificate, Certificate (post baccalaureate) in Elementary Educ.
- 13.1299 - Teacher Education and Professional Development, Specific Levels and Methods, Other, Certificate, Ed Endorsement ESL-CERA
- 13.1299 - Teacher Education and Professional Development, Specific Levels and Methods, Other, Certificate, Ed Endorsement Mid Schl-CERA
- 13.9999 - Education, Other, Certificate, Education
- 23.1303 - Professional, Technical, Business, and Scientific Writing, Certificate, Tech. Writing/Communication - CERA
- 24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Associate, AA in Liberal Arts
- 24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Associate, Liberal Arts (AGEC-A)-AA
- 24.0101 - Liberal Arts and Sciences/Liberal Studies, Certificate, Certificate in Liberal Arts
- 24.0102 - General Studies, Associate, Associate in General Studies
- 24.0199 - Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies and Humanities, Other, Certificate, Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies and Humanities
- 43.0104 - Criminal Justice/Safety Studies, Associate, Criminal Justice/Safety Studies
- 45.0201 - Anthropology, Associate, Anthropology-AA
- 45.1001 - Political Science and Government, General, Associate, Political Science-AA
- 45.1101 - Sociology, Associate, Sociology-AA
- 51.0707 - Health Information/Medical Records Technology/Technician, Certificate, Health information Technology
- 51.0805 - Pharmacy Technician/Assistant, Associate, Pharmacy Technician/Assistant
- 51.0805 - Pharmacy Technician/Assistant, Certificate, Pharmacy Technician/Assistant
- 51.1503 - Clinical/Medical Social Work, Associate, Clinical/Medical Social Work
- 51.1503 - Clinical/Medical Social Work, Associate, Social Services-AAS
- 52.0101 - Business/Commerce, General, Associate, A.A.S. in Business & Industry Technology
- 52.0101 - Business/Commerce, General, Certificate, Business
- 52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General, Certificate, Business, Advanced-Cert
- 52.0201 - Business Administration and Management, General, Certificate, Business, Basic-Cert
- 52.0207 - Customer Service Management, Certificate, Customer Service Management

Institutional Status and Requirements Worksheet

- 52.0301 - Accounting, Associate, Accounting
- 52.0301 - Accounting, Certificate, Accounting
- 52.0401 - Administrative Assistant and Secretarial Science, General, Associate, Office Manager - AAS
- 52.0401 - Administrative Assistant and Secretarial Science, General, Certificate, Administrative Office ASST-Cert
- 52.0901 - Hospitality Administration/Management, General, Associate, Hospitality Administration/Management
- 52.0901 - Hospitality Administration/Management, General, Certificate, Hotel & Resturant Mgmt-Cert
- 52.1001 - Human Resources Management/Personnel Administration, General, Certificate, Certificate in Human Resources Management
- 52.1101 - International Business/Trade/Commerce, Certificate, International Business/Trade/Commerce
- 52.1803 - Retailing and Retail Operations, Certificate, Retailing and Retail Operations
- 52.19 - Specialized Sales, Merchandising and Marketing Operations, Associate, Retailing & Consumer Services_AA
- 52.1902 - Fashion Merchandising, Associate, Fashion Merchandising-AAS
- 52.1902 - Fashion Merchandising, Certificate, Fashion Merchandising

Contractual Arrangements

None

Recommended Change: no change

Consortial Arrangements

52.0203 - Logistics, Materials, and Supply Chain Management - Associate - Logistics and Supply Chain Management - Logistics and Supply chain Management WSU TEch and Pima

Recommended Change: no change
