
DISCLAIMER: THIS CART/CAPTION FILE WAS TRANSCRIBED AND PRODUCED FOR COMMUNICATION ACCESS AS AN ADA ACCOMMODATION AND MAY NOT BE 100% VERBATIM. THIS IS A DRAFT FILE AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. IT IS SCAN-EDITED ONLY, AS PER CART INDUSTRY STANDARDS. IT MAY CONTAIN SOME PARENTHETICALS INDICATING INDISCERNIBLE AUDIO OR PHONETICALLY REPRESENTED WORDS OR INCORRECT SPELLINGS. THIS IS NOT A LEGAL DOCUMENT AND MAY CONTAIN COPYRIGHTED, PRIVILEGED, OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.

THIS FILE SHALL NOT BE DISCLOSED IN ANY FORM (WRITTEN OR ELECTRONIC) AS A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OR POSTED TO ANY WEBSITE OR PUBLIC FORUM OR SHARED WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE HIRING PARTY AND/OR THE TRANSCRIPTIONIST. THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT AND SHOULD NOT BE RELIED UPON FOR PURPOSES OF VERBATIM CITATION.

August 10, 2026. Study Session.

(Study Session already in progress when video began.)

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: That was moved.

Is there any question or discussion on 2.1?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: I have a question.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Yeah, go ahead.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: It's more just a comment about I feel uncomfortable -- oops, let me see. I just had that language. I feel uncomfortable with the language on 2.1, the last three lines of the description where it says authorize the chancellor or designee to take any action or execute any other agreement necessary to accomplish the purposes of the agreement as may be limited by the chancellor's or designee previously authorized signature authority.

So I think that's just a very, very broad statement, and when I talked with the chancellor earlier today, I mentioned that I sort of feel that, you know, that could mean something like hiring a new AVC, you know, in charge of dual enrollment, prisons, things like that.

I think in general, you know, the reason we give this authority to the chancellor or his designee is because it's still our responsibility. We should know about it, we should be informed about it, but we don't want to actually do the legal work of going in and signing the document, so that's why we're giving him signature authority.

And I just think that in general, when we don't even know in the future what we're delegating that authority to be, I just think it's a slippery slope, and it doesn't sit well with me.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Chancellor, or maybe Jeff Silvyn? Want to comment there?

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: Yeah. Hi, everyone. Good afternoon. Yeah, I did speak with Board Member Riel about the language, and what I take the language to mean in talking with the general counsel is it gives myself, as the chancellor, the authority or my designee just to execute any additional documentation specific to this IGA. It would be very specific to implementing this IGA which provides these program at the state prisons, not beyond something like the IGA, like hiring a whole new arm of the college or something to deal with that. Just within the purposes of this particular intergovernmental agreement with the state prison system. So basically managing the bureaucracy of executing so we can provide these programs to these populations.

I don't know if I could clarify it beyond that.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Okay. Any other questions? Board Member Riel, is there any followup on that?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Well, so Kristen had her hand up, but Kristen, if I just may just say, here are my thoughts. I would assume that whoever wrote those words would have an idea of what they're pertaining to, and so, you know, more specific, not just generalities, right? It's very, very vague.

You know, I'm sure that there are things that come up in the daily life of the legal department and the chancellor's office that they have to do things that I have no awareness of, but if it's talking about one of a board member's responsibilities, I just think that, you know, it would be nice -- we have never had this kind of language before, I don't believe. I could be wrong on that. But I read these things pretty carefully, and I don't remember ever seeing this additional language that, you know, they can sign more documents or do more decision-making without letting the board know.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Board Member Randall?

>> MS. KRISTEN RANDALL: Chair Taylor, I would like -- so I don't have, and I don't take a particular issue with the language, I don't think. I do see Board Member Riel's point, and I would like to ask Board Member Riel, do you have language for a friendly amendment you would like to make on this motion?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: I really wasn't thinking of cutting those words out, but I would be okay with that. I mean, I really feel that the reason they have Governing Boards, especially an elected Governing Board, is because some of those responsibilities fall on our shoulders, and this is -- to me, it just seems like it's a, if we don't know the specifics, it's just too vague and too general.

Jeff, do you want to remark on, Jeff Silvyn, do you want to remark on any of these thoughts that I'm having?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: I'm sorry it created that impression. Part of the reason for the language at the end about previously authorized

signature authority is to be clear that the chancellor can't agree to do something, as he explained, that's not consistent with the agreement the board is approving.

But I will give you one example. One of the challenges here is we don't actually know entirely what might come up. I will give you an example. In a prior agreement, and I'm pretty sure it was the state prison system and not the federal prison system, there was a point in time where the state wanted to require that all the Pima College employees go through some specialized training for what to do and have a plan for what to do in the event of certain emergencies at the prison.

That wasn't in the original agreement, but it seemed like something that was reasonable for the state to ask, and of course if it was a training that was going to help Pima College students -- students, excuse me -- Pima College staff be safer and feel more comfortable in the prison environment, then certainly that's something we thought, sure, we would of course agree to do that.

So it's to try and preempt things like that, where, depending on what the change is, whether we have to go back to the board. So the idea is if -- and like I said, this happens from time to time, if the state wants to make a minor change in procedure or adding a minor additional requirement, we want -- the idea was that we could respond quickly, deal with the issue, and move on to further implement the agreement without necessarily having to go back to the board.

If it's a substantive change, then we would come back to the

board. At least that's the intent of this, and hopefully that clarification, kind of having this on the record of this board meeting, helps in case there is a question that comes up later.

It's certainly maybe something we can try and come up with some more precise language if this scenario comes up in the future.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: I guess just my question to your example, then, is that's under the purview of a board member's responsibility or the entire board to vote on what kind of training employees receive? Like, I don't even understand why that specific example would come before us.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: So I'm just trying to give examples of there

may be what are not really very substantive amendments but they are different than what the college agreed to going into the agreement that you would think of as more of an administrative-type ask and to be clear that the chancellor has the authority to go ahead and do that, because the way board policy is set up now, intergovernmental agreements are reserved for approval from the board.

So we just want to be clear, at least in this case, the intent was to be clear that if there is some further administrative requirement that the state adds at a later date, as long as it doesn't substantively change the nature of the agreement, that the chancellor would have the authority, to be clear that the chancellor had the authority to go ahead and do that so there wouldn't be a question about that.

Does that help a little bit?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: A little bit. I still think, you know, those things, it's nice for a board member to hear about them before it happens than after the fact or maybe not at all when someone approaches us and asks us about, you know, something that, you know, the board moved or whatever, and we're, like, well, I don't know what you're talking about, because I haven't heard it.

That's my only concern, really truthfully.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: Sure. Like I said, what's hard is to give -- I'm trying to contemplate all scenarios where I could give examples of what's a really minor sort of ministerial thing versus substantive. I think I actually had an example of another situation where the state asked for what we would have considered to be a minor kind of ministerial change to an agreement.

Again, it does happen from time to time. The idea was to be clear about what the chancellor's authority actually is or isn't.

I will give you another example. In the past, we would enter, Pima College would enter agreements with governmental entities, so it has to go to the board, and there might be a provision that says this agreement is for three years, and the college has the right to extend for an additional two years.

Well, if we weren't clear in the board motion about whether the chancellor had authority to agree to the extra two-year extensions or whether it had to come back to the board, we would tend to err on the side of caution. Well, the board didn't explicitly delegate that authority to the chancellor, so it really ought to come back to the

board.

Since then, we typically have gone to the board and said, the full length of the agreement could be five years, three years with extensions and the chancellor has the authority for the initial three and for the extension, so there wasn't confusion about that.

Because people are trying to be sensitive to this idea of what did the board actually authorize the chancellor to do, and is the chancellor or his designee staying within the bounds of that authority.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: I wonder, Board Member Riel, because I agree

with you in terms of I don't really like to be surprised by stuff, either, so I'm wondering if the issue around notification could be dealt with, I mean, if we did like a friendly amendment to the motion and just added some language at the end that, like, the board needs to be notified of any such actions that are being referenced there within, I guess we could say whatever time frame, but before the following board meeting or something like that, so that none of these things, even though they are well-intentioned, perhaps, are just sort of happening without us realizing and then we just don't know it's happening.

Would something like that help allay those fears that you have?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Yeah, it's not necessarily a fear. Yes, I think that would be better than how it's written right now. It's not a fear. It's just very vague.

I don't understand -- Jeff Silvyn, am I incorrect in thinking

that this is a relatively new thing, that it hasn't been written like that in very many of the IGAs, if any, that we've seen in the last three-and-a-half years for me?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: It's not common. I don't think this is the only time this has ever happened, but it's not -- yes, I would agree it's not usually done this way.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: So when I read it, it just seemed odd, and I was hoping that, you know, that yeah, I think us being informed, I would say even while the signature is happening, right? Just FYI, a quick e-mail, that would be nice.

I'm not saying that, you know, at the next board meeting is too late, but it could be too late, right? Because, you know, sometimes it could be weeks.

I'm >> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Yeah. So, I mean, what you want to say, just trying to figure out -- I was just making up that time frame off the top of my head, so it could be whatever we thought was reasonable, like, you know, if we wanted to put time parameters on it, like within a week of the action taking place, enough time for people to put an e-mail together, or whatever the notification ends up being.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Sure. Yeah, I think even maybe just saying a reasonable amount of time. If the college hears about it in January, and we need to write the letter, sign the letter, not us, but the college needs to sign the agreement by the end of February,

you know, the fact that we couldn't be told between those two time

periods, to me, I just think that that might not be reasonable, right?

But if they get an e-mail today saying we need it tomorrow, and we didn't have this meeting, yeah, then reasonable would be within working days or whatever. Yeah.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Okay.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Difference between adequate notice and reasonable notice? I'm asking Jeff Silvyn.

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: So what if it were something like as soon as practicable and no later than the next regular board meeting?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Okay.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Yeah, that works. It wasn't my motion, so if that was okay with, I think it was --

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: I did.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: -- Board Member Barraza. I'm trying to remember who at this point now made the motion and seconded.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: I made the motion.

Can you read that again to me, Jeff, so I can make sure that I'm hearing it correctly?

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: You mean the last? So what I was suggesting

is, so we could tack onto the end with notice of the additional action provided to the Governing Board as soon as practicable and no later than the next regular board meeting.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Yeah, it sounds --

>> MR. JEFF SILVYN: That's not exactly what I said the first

time. That was better, because I had a chance to think about it a little bit more.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Does anybody have any objection to amending the motion to that?

Not hearing any, is there any other discussion before we call the vote? No?

Let's call the vote on 2.1. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Ayes.)

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: I'm aye, as well. Any opposed, say nay?

All right. Not hearing any, that passes.

So let's move to 2.2, the experiential education intergovernmental agreement between the Arizona Board of Regents for and on behalf of Arizona State University and Pima Community College.

Is there a motion on 2.2?

I will move 2.2, then. Is there a second?

>> MS. KRISTEN RANDALL: I'll second.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Any discussion on 2.2, questions or comments?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: I just have -- I hate to beat a dead horse,

whatever the saying is, why don't we include that language on this one? I mean, is it something that there just won't be any reasons to have changes we foresee? I'm just wondering why it was in the one prison one but not this one.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Chancellor or General Counsel Silvyn, you

want to tackle that one?

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: Dr. Roark, this is your agreement.

Is there any reason there is a difference between these two languages?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: In general, Board Member Riel, that is the case. The likelihood of the educational arrangement between Arizona State University and the college changing to the extent that we would need to bring the IGA back to the board is highly unlikely.

However, in the previous example, the Arizona State Prison, there

are lots of things that can happen where it would change the nature of the operation, as outlined in either the responsibilities of the state or the responsibility of the college, to the effect that if one line item in the IGA is changed, we would have to bring it back to the board for approval.

Considering the previous example, I'll give the example of page 10, it's PDF page 6 but page 10, section 3, which starts the section that outlines the college district's responsibilities with respect to the state.

It refers to Exhibit No. 1, which lists the programs of study that the state is asking us to provide and that we have agreed to provide. There are three different building/construction technology programs listed in that exhibit.

If the state were to come back midcycle and either want us to delete one of those programs or add a new one, we would have to bring the entire agreement back to the board before we could make said changes at the request of the state.

So the environment is much more likely to change at an operational level, which does impact the nature of the IGA more frequently.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Thank you.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Any other questions or comments on 2.2?

Not hearing any, let's call the vote on 2.2. All those in favor,

please say aye.

(Ayes.)

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: I'm aye, as well. Any opposed, say nay.

Not hearing any, that one passes.

Then move to the final action item, 2.3, a request to reschedule our September 14 board meeting to September 25. I know there were a number of board members that had conflicts on September 14 and wouldn't be able to attend, me included. So that was a date when everybody was available.

So I'll go ahead and move that, if there is a second, and then we can have a discussion.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: I'll second that, since I was the other troublemaker (smiling).

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Any discussion or questions or comments on 2.3?

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: I just found out I may have a conflict. I suggest we go ahead and vote on it, and I will try to join virtually or make other arrangements if that is the case that I won't

be able to be here.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: You have a conflict on the 25th? All right.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Sorry, no. I made a mistake. I do not have a conflict on the 25th. Sorry. Something came up today, but... I'm good. Apologies.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: No worries. So the 25th sounds like it's still good all around. Any other questions, comments?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: It's a Friday. Are we going to go out for Happy Hour afterward?

>> MS. KRISTEN RANDALL: I second that friendly amendment.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: We'll see how the meeting is and go from there. Perfect.

I'll call the vote on 2.3, then. All those in favor, please say aye.

(Ayes.)

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: I'm aye, as well. Any opposed, say nay.

All right. So that one passes, as well.

Let's move then into section 3, the 3.1 program life cycle. I think, Chancellor Nasse, did you want to introduce that or get us kicked off there?

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good afternoon, good evening, I suppose, Members of the Governing Board. Good to see everyone again after a bit of a summer break. I think we last met together in June, so it's been a little bit.

I'm excited to be back together and looking forward to the start of another academic year.

Tonight we're going to be talking about program life cycle. As you know, this was actually on our agenda back in June, but we had a fairly significant storm, an act of God, if you will, that had other plans for our study session. I wish we could be in person today, but I'm glad at least we have the opportunity to really return to this topic.

This, I think, is a really fundamental and important conversation

for the board, because program and program life cycle really gets to the heart of what we deliver as a college.

When we use that word "program" today, we're talking specifically

about a collection of college-credit courses that lead to a certificate or degree, which is the vast majority of what we do. Pima has more than a hundred different college-credit programs, and it's a significant part of our mission and what we provide to our students and to our community.

You've heard me talk about that idea of curriculum and market-driven or industry-driven curriculum, and our college-credit programs are a significant part of that.

We're always asking ourselves, our programs, are they relevant for our students, are they rigorous in terms of learning, are they responsive to our community, are they ultimately meaningful for the students who invest their time and their money in these programs.

So there are some fundamental questions that we need to be thinking about when we think about programs. How does a new program

come into being? As you know, we're launching our bachelor's in

education this fall. It is a new program that's being launched. How do we determine that our community needs a new program?

And then, of course, once we have a program, we have over a hundred, how do we evaluate a program's health and effectiveness? When does a program need to change? How do we adjust a program? Sometimes, when is it appropriate for a program to come to an end?

Of course, these kinds of decisions, all the way from bringing on a new program to changing a program to closing a program, they're more complicated, right? It's not a simple thing. As you'll see today, program creation really needs to think about is that something we can do as a college? Of course, we look at labor market information. Do we have industry partners to support that program? Are there other providers, competition? What do resources look like in terms of faculty, equipment, facilities?

And even existing programs, how well is it enrolled? Are people finishing the program? Are people successful in the program? Again, labor market information, partnerships. Certain programs have very specific accreditation requirements. What are people learning? Then of course resources, budget. What does it take to run a program? What is the cost for a program?

Then if a program is deemed no longer viable, you know, what is that process for inactivation, and what are we talking about in terms of teaching out for students?

So it can be pretty academic and technical, but underneath all of

the processes and terminology is really a straightforward

responsibility, right, just ensuring that the programs we offer at Pima are serving our students and serving our community.

Certainly this is a lot of what people in academic affairs really

spend a great deal, a lot of time thinking about. So I have asked our provost and his team to walk us through the full life cycle today from how a program gets created, thorough review, continuous improvement of existing programs, and then ultimately through potential program inactivation. We'll use some actual PCC examples to help illustrate how these decisions kind of work in real life and practice.

So I encourage the board members to ask questions throughout, and

this is all about a study session and having a conversation. We certainly don't want to make this more complicated than it needs to be, but give you, as the board, a stronger understanding of how we steward, which arguably is one of our most important assets in terms of the quality, the relevance, the health of our academic programs.

With that, Dr. Roark, I'll turn it over to you and your team to begin this conversation.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Thank you for that introduction, Chancellor. Good evening, Board Chair Taylor, Vice Chair Bernal Morales, Board Members, colleagues, and guests.

We are excited to talk about the program life cycle, as the chancellor introduced, and look forward to any questions that you have.

We have certain breaks throughout the presentation that are

already set up for questions, and those are not the only time that we of course would field any. There is a lot of information that we will be presenting.

First and foremost, are you able to see the screen I am sharing? Okay. I'm going to be putting it into presentation mode. Or I'm not going to, because then I can't see all of you.

Is it okay, Board Chair Taylor, Board Members, if I leave it in this mode so that I can see you and see the presentation? And is it big enough? Okay, great.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Yeah, that's fine. Whatever works for you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: If you need me to enlarge any slide because there are some slides with a lot of data on them, just let me know and I'll feel free to Zoom in.

I think the chancellor really set this up well with respect to what we call core concepts when we discuss programs in an official setting, and even that word "program," on a day-to-day basis, we get asked, do you have a program that does X, Y, Z. For example, we get asked about the Center of Opportunity programming, and internally or externally with partners, we may say, yes, we have programs, but in reality, we may not have what's actually considered a program. But for the sake of the program life cycle and what we will be discussing predominantly in this study session, the first core concept is that definition of "program," and this definition stems from accreditation language as well as Department of Education and thus filters through the institution with respect to policy, administrative procedure, and

standard operating protocols. So the core concept is it is a collection of college credit-bearing courses that lead to a certificate or a degree.

As of the start of the bachelor's degree in education that we are

launching very soon, we will have officially 100 certificates and degrees at the college. However, as you are aware, we have other offerings such as Pima FastTrack or other marketable skills achievements that may be done on a continuing education basis but for which college credit is not earned. In that particular case, those are not defined as programs in this context.

A core concept after that is that not all community needs are met

via a program. So not all community needs need to be met by a college credit-bearing certificate or degree. In some cases, individuals may ask for it not to be a college credit-bearing certificate or degree.

I can give one example of something that we recently launched back in the spring and we're very proud of. Colloquially, we call it our optics program. We worked with the Arizona Technology Council and Vice Chair Bernal Morales in her role as the vice president of the Arizona Technology Council and a group called Optics Valley to address their need with respect to optics technicians.

The original request from Optics Valley was to replicate a two-year degree program they had found at another college in another municipality in another area of the country. Upon looking at how

optics technicians are integrated into manufacturing and assembly

here in Greater Tucson/Southern Arizona, came to the conclusion that that degree program would not meet the needs of our local industry, and instead we designed a customized not-for-credit workforce training offering aligned directly to the needs of our optics employers and optics technicians, and that program -- we call it program -- that offering has launched successfully, but by definition here, it is not a program.

Another core concept is the difference between a program and a discipline. As an example, the associate of science degree that we offer at Pima is a program, but biology or math would be disciplines, not programs. There are some rare cases where the discipline and the program are one and the same, such as commercial truck driver training or emergency medical technician.

Any questions about those key concepts, which really serve as the foundation for the rest of the conversation?

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Yes. I'm a little confused as to why optics is not a program. Because it doesn't yield a certificate or a degree? Is that why?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes, and it is not offered for college credit,

for a college credit-bearing certificate or a college credit-bearing degree. There is a credential at the end of those sorts of offerings. Internally those are called marketable skills achievements.

Per our accreditation and the Department of Education, anything

offered in that format does not need Higher Learning Commission or

Department of Education approval, and so, as I said, some needs are better met in that way. That provides us a lot of flexibility to adapt to industry need and adapt curriculum on a much faster time frame than the time frame you will see later on in this presentation for college credit-bearing certificates and degrees.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Absolutely.

Any other questions?

So we really, in preparation for this study session, coined the term "program life cycle" to really talk about, as the chancellor introduced, the creation of programs, how we review programs, and how if, after that review, if and how we inactivate programs. So we will talk about all three stages.

The first is program creation. There is a lot of work and a lot of data, if you will, that goes into investigating whether or not we need to create a program, and the sources can be various. It is not uncommon for requests to come to the college directly from a single employer or from a group of employers, as was the case with Optics Valley.

Sometimes program deans or faculty have ideas themselves in doing

their own research or what they see happening at other colleges that we may not be doing, and they come up with ideas for new programming.

Sometimes it's at a very strategic level such as with the higher education and facilities master plan and the preparation for the centers of excellence and new programs that came out of those efforts

where local economic development organizations and municipalities were informing the college as the future trajectory of the economy and what we need to be building, and then adding the necessary programs over time.

A keen example of that is our automated industrial technology program and its adjacent programs in the Advanced Manufacturing Building, whereas a decade ago, we did not have that program, nor did we have that building. But it was in coordination with Sun Corridor Inc., Pima County, and others at the time, that really, we were charged with shifting a focus to advanced manufacturing, and thus, we are now meeting that economic development need.

The labor market information is very important for us. Whenever we say "labor market information," we use LMI, the acronym, quite a bit. But labor market information will show you here, like some of the labor market information we looked at for the bachelor's in education, but really is key quantitative data outside of the college that informs us on such things as job growth, number of annual openings, entry-level wages, median wages, and what education level is actually required of the position in the labor market.

Industry partnerships are always a key in developing successful programs. Our most successful programs at the college are often predicated on strong industry partnerships, good relationships, good data, lots of job openings, and conversations with business and industry that lead to a more informed program investigation and development.

Also, a competitor analysis. We need to look at what other organizations and/or institutions within our service area are offering similar or like programs whenever we get those requests, and whether or not we would be saturating the labor market if we were to add an additional program, if you will, to meet that requested need, or there is such need in the community that it is really imperative for us to meet that need in some form or fashion.

An example that we will be looking at soon is physical therapist assistant. We did not have a physical therapist assistant program at Pima Community College. There are other entities within our community that do, and so we will be looking at the labor market to see if there is room for the college to potentially add that sort of program. In that case, it would be a program, as most physical therapist assistant positions require an accredited program that is college credit bearing.

Then resource needs. There are competing resource needs within the institution at all times. So, for example, we have resource needs to meet the ultimate vision of the center of excellence in health professions. When that center was launched, it was built with the capacity to double the output of our nursing and allied health professionals. So we are working on a business plan that will scaffold so that we can ultimately have the faculty and staff positions needed to meet that need.

So if we are to start a new program that we currently do not have, we have to weigh in the balance if adding a new program with

its faculty and with its equipment will take away from our ability to add what we need to the center of excellence in health professions. That's just an example of the many competing resource needs and interests with respect to growing programs and as our enrollment continues to grow in many areas of the institution.

Finally, implementation planning. Can we fit this program in with everything else that we are doing with respect to human resource time and allocation. There is no single area of the institution dedicated solely to the purpose of creating new programs. So whenever a new program is being looked at, it requires additional time and effort of every unit that is involved on top of the regular scope of work.

of Any questions about when we are exploring programs, what types of information we look at?

Board Member Barraza?

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Yes. So my question is in terms of industry partnerships, does that mean that the college also relies on financial assistance in order to set a program up, and if there is no financial assistance, are we unable to do it? Is that what that kind of means, as well?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: No, it is not a make-or-break yes-or-no, but it is certainly helpful, right, whenever there are industry partners who have skin in the game with respect to perhaps tuition reimbursement or paying for time and effort for students who come to the college.

We're seeing a lot of that activity in many areas, but right now it's particularly popular to have that in our health professions program, so we are working with most of the major medical systems in our community where they are investing not only in a program but they are investing in people. So they'll pay the salary and the benefits of the people while they're taking the classes with us, and they will pay for the classes.

But that was not a predicate for starting those programs. It's just emblematic of the labor market need, which is very high in those particular programs.

And to that point, Board Member Barraza, sometimes we will see sometimes industry support to that degree ebb and flow with respect to how tight or loose the labor market is for those positions.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Absolutely.

Any other questions?

So the next slide, slide 6, is an example of some of the labor market data, for instance, that we would look at with respect to the bachelor's degree in elementary and special ed. So when you look at the first two lines in particular, that shows the demand that there is on an annual basis for elementary teachers that are not special ed and CTE, but then you also add in the fourth line, which is the special education teachers, kindergarten, and elementary, which was 46.

So on an annual basis, the need that we are aiming for with the

launch of our new bachelor's of education degree here very soon is 233 plus 249 plus 46 in that last year for 2025 alone, which is an indicator of healthy labor market need.

For that reason, when we visited with the University of Arizona, there was really no issue on their part with respect to launching a degree that they also offer, because both institutions together are not even meeting the annual labor market need.

We also look at things such as the type of education, and we'll show some examples later on, it's clear that this particular occupation requires a bachelor's of arts or more, and then of course the median salary is listed there.

So after we look at all of that information and it's determined, yes, we should really start a program, which means certificate or degree, then we go into the next -- a lot of work is done on that front end before we go into this next portion, which is the new program approval, and this is a high-level overview of the steps for approval.

There has to be stakeholder discussion within the institution with respect, in particular, to facilities, IT, finance, and HR, just to ensure that we have the facilities capacity, the equipment capacity, and the staffing capacity to support the program and its respective growth. Also gathering documentation needed for accreditation, and that happens at two levels. We need to report information to the Higher Learning Commission after board approval, but also whether or not the program itself that we are seeking has

third-party accreditation. We have to gather a lot of information for that prospective third-party accreditor.

So, for example, the physical therapist assistant program that I mentioned, there would have to be an analysis done by that third-party accreditor, as well.

Then when all of those things are accomplished, the program is presented for Governing Board approval, and usually in a regular board meeting, as an action item. That is required by our policy but also by the Higher Learning Commission. And so through that, the HLC, or Higher Learning Commission new program screening form is sent in to our accreditor. Once that is approved, we then send a lot of information to the Department of Education if the program is seeking federal financial aid eligibility, meaning it is 16 credits or more for regular federal financial aid or now meets all of the requirements for the new Workforce Pell financial aid.

Then also licensure documentation for financial aid, and if we intend to offer the program at an additional location and not one of our main campuses, we may have to submit additional information to the accreditor there, as well.

So in sum total, when you put together the program exploration and then the program approval, this is a chart that at a high level shows the key steps as well as the approximate amount of time needed for each step.

That time frame is not always a hard line. Sometimes the exploration may take longer for lots of different reasons. Sometimes

the approval may go much more quickly, because we put so much time and effort into the program creation steps.

We like and prefer, especially with respect to the Higher Learning Commission submission, as well as the Department of Education submission, to aim for the maximum amount of time due to when we need to add the new program, if approved, to our course catalog, as well as our course schedule, and then give time and opportunity for marketing and recruitment for the program to occur.

a So typically, when we are looking at a brand-new certificate or degree, we are usually aiming for an 18- to a 24-month process, depending on when we commence the exploration.

of I'm going to go ahead and stay on that slide or go back to any of the others if deemed necessary by members of the board. Are there any questions about program creation?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Dr. Roark, I just have a quick question about the two slides prior, No. 6. You know, I'm former teacher -- one more, slide No. 6. And my question for you is for the median salary, you know, maybe or maybe not, I don't know, TUSD's starting salary is \$37,800 right now, and one of the problems, I went to a teacher, new orientation-type thing last year, and what TUSD mentioned last year is that a huge percentage of their teachers quit in the first three years of teaching. My guess is it's because there is a \$37,800 salary.

What is the impetus -- and I'm not criticizing how these median

salaries were gleaned, but I'm assuming that none of them are

beginning teacher salaries.

I'm just wondering what is the rationale behind that, just taking

the median salary of teachers in that category, not necessarily first-year teachers? Is it because we want students and everybody to know what you will be making when you, like, really get into your career and you have done it for seven or eight years, or, you know, I'm just wondering why those numbers are relatively high.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: So I can explain why we use the median salary as an indicator of exploration, but to be clear, not a sole determining point. We also look at exactly what you talked about, Board Member Riel. We also look at entry-level wages too, because those are what our learners are going to be getting when they start in these occupations.

So we really look at the whole gamut. This was just a sample. But what the median provides us is really kind of a time-tested sort of steadiness, if you will, that encapsulates all of the employers in that particular industry and for that particular occupational code, because of exactly what you said.

There is such variance among, in this case, unified school districts, and then you include charters and others, there is such variance in what individuals are offered in terms of their entry-level wages, in terms of bonuses, in terms of other things, that we really need to be aware of the variance.

But also, we need to be aware of what that all looks like when it's aggregated into a single number that we can point to.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: That's nice.

And just my last comment. This was really uplifting to me, because for the last many years we have heard about the birth dearth, right, or whatever that is, decreasing births in Southern Arizona and throughout the United States, and this is showing that there isn't that. This is showing that there are more jobs and there are going to be job openings, and I think that's really a positive thing to promote, that, you know, it's not as tragic as we had been hearing before throughout, you know, everywhere. Everybody was talking about the birth dearth.

Anyway, thank you for that. I appreciate your answers.

Thanks, Dr. Roark.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes. Thank you, Board Member Riel.

Any other questions before we move on to the next section, which is going to be our program review?

Board Member Barraza?

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Yeah, so on average, I know some years might be different, but on average, since you have been at the college, how many new programs would you say per year, or is it, you know, X amount every three years? Like, how often are we approving new programs, you'd say?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, so in terms of -- I have been at the college for 11 years. I would have to go back and look at exactly how many new programs we have started in the 11 years at the institution, but it's actually not been many new programs.

I will give some examples that I'm familiar with off the top of my head. Automated industrial technology is a new program. Nondestructive testing in aviation technology is a new program. The bachelor's of education in special ed is a new program.

So certificate and degree programs, especially when we already have a quite robust catalog and in many respects are aligned to industry need at the college credit-bearing level, is not as often. So it's not one a year, for sure.

I would estimate, just based on our conversation right here, more along the lines of one every three years, for a number of reasons. We already have many diverse programs. As I indicated, now starting in the fall, we will have 100, which is a lot.

We have also met community needs, though, Board Member Barraza, in other ways that may be started as a conversation around offering a credit-bearing program, but really turned into a different way of offering it, or the individual entity didn't want an official program from the onset. They wanted something that was more flexible, like a marketable skills achievement or a Pima FastTrack-like offering.

Case in point, we saw partnership with the Center of Opportunity where we are educating and training on sheltered people. At that residential facility, they specifically requested not to have college credit-bearing programs offered at that site.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: So you'd say we approve more offerings than programs?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: I would say that when we add -- I forgot to

mention, IT/cyber security is another big one that we have launched in that time frame, as well.

But I would say that we tend to meet the industry and community needs the way they need to be met in as timely a manner as possible.

Of course, offering certificates and degrees is sometimes not as timely as the community needs because of the process I showed on that one slide. It can get quite lengthy, especially with respect to turnaround from the Higher Learning Commission and then the Department of Ed.

But in terms of what we do to respond to meet community needs, it's not only limited to that process. We can meet it in many other ways.

And I will go back to the optics one as another example. We are offering that on a noncredit workforce training basis at this point in time. If it continues to show the measure of success that it is showing in that particular format, and we continue to add additional courses based on the needs of industry, and there is enough volume there that it becomes apparent and obvious that it should be its own standalone program, the institution of course would explore that and go that direction, as well.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Okay. For the next portion of program review,

we really look at what we've started referring to as the three Es. When we look at programs, we are looking for evidence, effectiveness, and of course efficiency. Just high-level concepts that really are

just sort of imbued in the program review process.

There is a lot of words on this slide, though really from start to finish, what we are looking at is does the program meet its intended need and thus the learning outcomes. Is the curriculum aligned to where business and industry is now compared to when the program was created?

Our programs, of course in partnership with their advisory committee partners, do oftentimes update their curriculum, but we sometimes see major shifts in industry where immediately how the program is structured or how it's designed may not be offered to the labor market as it currently exists.

We have many things that we look at with respect to program viability, but really, at its core, is there sufficient enrollment for the program. And past enrollment, are sufficient number of people completing the program of study on an annual basis.

And then student success metrics, such as positive grade rates, persistence, retention. And then, at the end of the day, wages, and really looking at whether or not the wages meet our mission.

I'm going to give just a heads-up on some changes at the federal government with respect to federal financial aid called student tuition and transparency system that's going to be implemented next year. That is going to hold all colleges and universities who issue federal financial aid more accountable for the wage outcomes of our learners. And at the end of the day, we are going to be asked to compare the wage outcomes of credit-bearing certificates and degrees

to what earners would earn if they had just had a high school diploma in our region. Those are some things we are going to have to start reporting on with respect to labor market outcomes.

Labor market information, again, the labor market is very dynamic

and changes at times very quickly, depending on recessionary cycles, inflationary cycles, or cycles of growth.

Going back to again the prior conversation and questions around external partnerships, even beyond just employers and business associations, you know, working with our local workforce system, working with K12, working with local municipalities and entities such as SALC and the Chamber of Southern Arizona, are all important with respect to looking how vibrant a program is with respect to its partnership activities.

External licensing/exams for programs where that's applicable is a key indicator. So hypothetically, if we had a program that requires a licensure, an example would be nursing or surgical technology, and we had many completers, people who finished the program, but we have low numbers of people who pass their licensure exams that are not issued by the college, those are issued by the licensing entity, that would be something that we would need to be looking at with respect to program review, as well.

Accreditation, and usually that refers to the third-party accreditation, the predominant number of programs that have third-party accreditation are in the health professions or emergency health services but not always, such as aviation technology, which is

accountable to the Federal Aviation Agency.

Program review process also includes a SWOT analysis of things that are going well at the program, things that need to be improved upon, are there any going and future threats. I will give an example of a future threat that came about recently in this past session of the Arizona legislation.

As you may recall, there was actually a bill that would have eliminated the need for veterinary technicians to go through a college credit-bearing program in order to be certified for licensure and instead could have worked on the job under the tutelage of a veterinarian for a certain number of years and thus become certified to be a veterinary tech.

If that law had passed, which it did not, if that would have passed, that would have imposed a policy and thus labor market threat to our veterinary technician program. So we always have to be monitoring the policy and labor market landscape.

Finally, the goals and also the budget. Many of our programs, all of our programs are subsidized by the tax base as the predominant part of the Pima County Community College District budget. However, some programs are more subsidized than others with respect to their cost in terms of staffing, oftentimes capital-intensive programs, and programs that have a lot of materials that are used on an annual basis are more expensive per learner than programs that require classroom time or online classroom time only.

The program review cycle is actually a four-year cycle. There is

a midpoint check that is conducted that is not as robust as the four-year program review process that is really what we'll focus on for this presentation, but we are simply not just waiting until program review happens to address issues that we may discover along the way with programs.

And, if needed, a program can enter a full program review off cycle if the midpoint check deems that it is necessary. So again, a policy change, a labor market change, a budget issue, accreditation change, or other factor.

There is a lot of information on this slide, again, but it really

shows you in the fourth year all of the official steps that occur in program review. As indicated, it's a four-year cycle, and now we have 100 programs. So ideally, we will get into a cadence where we are reviewing 25 programs on an annual basis.

We don't have a perfect division in those cycles right now, but we are working to ultimately get to that sort of more equal number of programs on an annual basis going through this process that you see on the screen.

So there is a dean and a faculty-led self-study that commences the process. Then the program recommendations are sent to what is called the program review committee, which is comprised of faculty from many areas of the college, as well as staff in key areas that are impacted by program review, such as workforce development, federal financial aid, student experience, and others.

The dean and the faculty also make a presentation to the program

review committee, and at the end, the program review committee makes a recommendation to the provost, and we'll talk about what those recommendations are in the next slide. There are three different types of recommendations.

Then of course the vice provost of academic operations shares the recommendation from the provost with the dean. The dean and the faculty have time and ability to respond, and then it is sent to the provost -- sorry, the provost this time. The provost makes a decision, which is either to improve, inactivate, merge, or keep the program going as is with minor changes, and again, we will discuss on the next slide.

If a program is said to be inactivated, the chancellor's cabinet does discuss this before the recommendation goes to the board for a vote. And again, just as the board is the entity per policy that brings programs officially into creation by your vote, the board has the authority to inactivate a program or not once the recommendation is brought to the board.

So again, the three large possible outcomes are, No. 1, the program is doing great. There may be a couple of things we know as minor improvements. Something is hardly ever perfect, so continuous improvement is usually the outcome for the vast majority of our programs at the college.

Sometimes there need to be curriculum adjustments, so the current

program is problematic for any number of reasons, and there needs to

be curricular adjustments that may be significant enough that they do

go even to the accreditor if it is a substantive change for the program, but the program is not recommended for inactivation. It's needed. The community needs it. How can we address the data points that we have found through program review.

Then finally, sometimes there is a recommendation for inactivation, and we can talk about those steps after I address the questions from the hands that are raised.

Correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe that Vice Chair Bernal Morales had her hand up first and then Board Member Riel. Is that correct?

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Yeah, thank you, Dr. Roark.

My question, actually, I think you might have answered it.
Well,

if you could elaborate, could you give us a real-life example of a program that we've deactivated or tried to inactivate, deactivate, whatever the appropriate word is, and give me a little bit more context as far as what that timeline -- I know you talked about the four years. So the recent program that we discussed during our board meeting, which I believe was the archaeology program...

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Is the archaeology certificate program, yes.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Can you use that, kind of go back in your previous slide and tell me how that came about? I just want to get a better understanding with visuals of how long it took you all to make that decision before you brought it to us.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes. If I may, Board Member Bernal Morales, we actually have a series of slides related directly to that

following -- so we have two case studies. One program that was recently inactivated, and then the other one of course being the archaeology certificate that we recommended for inactivation, but the board did not approve that inactivation, so we actually will walk you through both.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Perfect. Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes, absolutely.

Board Member Riel?

Board Member Riel, I think you're on mute still.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Sorry about that. Right when I thought I was starting to speak, my dog started to go crazy because somebody is out front at my little free library, and they have to police the entire neighborhood.

So two questions about slide 12. I did program review for the math department many, many times, and I also was on the college curriculum committee, which is what I think used to be the PRC, I could be wrong about that, but we would be the entity that would send forward to the vice provost, the provost, about deactivations or, you know, fixing them up, whatever.

So my first question is when did this policy, like the dean and the faculty presenting to the PRC, has that always been the case, or did that just start up recently?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: So I have been a part of program review process since I became vice chancellor of workforce development four or five years ago, so I can't speak to what occurred prior to that.

Now, of course, serving as provost, we have merged academic affairs and workforce development, so both areas have a role, so it's still iterating and we are improving upon the process.

The college curriculum council has always been a separate entity from the program review committee, and whenever we are creating a new program and/or inactivating a program, we do send that through the college curriculum council, as well, and the voting and nonvoting members of the CCC, or the college curriculum council, do have input into both program creation and program inactivation through our system called Curriculog, which is our software system whereby we manage curriculum decisions and document things.

Then also, just to indicate what you had said, you probably had program review for math, because back in the day we had concentrations. The college does not any longer have concentrations, so we don't do program review for specific disciplines any longer. We do program review for the program, which could either be the associate of liberal arts, the associate of science, or the associate of business, for example. We do reviews for those large degrees, but it includes conversation around all of the disciplines within that particular program.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Okay. That adds a third question, but my question No. 2 is how long does this whole process take? Is it two months? Is it two weeks? Not that -- yes, this slide.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: It takes the whole year.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: What was that?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: It takes the whole academic year. It starts pretty quickly after we come back in the fall semester. I don't know, Dr. Thies or VPA -- can indicate which month, but it starts pretty quickly, because it is a quite time-consuming process for everybody who's involved.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: And so if somebody had to finish it in less

time than a year, let's say two months, that would obviously be like an extreme burden on all of those folks having to rush through the process, correct?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Correct.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: And then my last question that just popped to my mind, one of the things that I thought was really valuable when we did program review the way we did it was we would be able to justify if we needed more faculty.

You don't have to answer this now, because I don't think it's actually pertaining to this, but at some time, will you let the board know how we determine which areas are, you know, fluent in faculty, they have plenty, they can meet all their courses, and then programs or disciplines or courses, whatever it is, that need faculty? How does the college determine that if it's not, like if math isn't doing their program review?

But you don't have to answer that now. Just sometime in the future, that would be great to know.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, absolutely. I will answer a part of it now, because that is a finding that can be made in program review.

That is something that could be -- and it can come about a number of ways. We really need to increase the number of graduates that we have. That will necessitate, you know, adding more faculty and adjunct faculty to accomplish that goal.

So there could be a labor market push to grow the program, and that of course would inevitably lead to the staffing needed to accomplish that recommendation if the recommendation is approved.

Outside of program review, to your point and to your question, there is a process called faculty allocation process, and we can certainly give you some information related to that, will certainly be coming your direction, Board Member Riel.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: You're welcome.

Any other questions about this portion of program review?

So back to these outcomes, then what happens if -- oh, I want to talk about some of the things that come up that are really interesting. I'm going to talk about one that is going to be reviewed this upcoming year, so building/construction technology. Always thinking about this slide for the next example, so our three options: Continuous improvement, curriculum adjustments, or recommend inactivation.

When we look at the labor market information for building/construction technology, and this comes from the Arizona Office of Economic Opportunity, another resource that we look at, in addition to (indiscernible) for labor market data, you can see here

that every position has what's called a job code. We call that an SOC code, there's a little bit of redundancy there, because SOC stands for standard occupation code and/or job code.

Then we have the actual title is determined by the Department of Labor. Then we're looking at for here, Pima County, the number of people that were employed in that specific job. It gets pretty precise. The annual job change between 2025 and 2027 by percentage, the annual number of openings between 2025 and 2027, and then the average wage.

Finally, at the very end, this is, by the OEO or Office of Economic Opportunity, the education level required for that job in the labor market, right?

The point of this conversation is that there are jobs for which we offer college-credit certificates and degrees that, according to the labor market, don't require college credit-bearing certificates or degrees.

This is from our employment dashboard. You can see here the similar programs that we offer in our building/construction technology program. They have very good numbers, particularly for year 5, with respect to the percentage of employment one year to five years out from graduation or completion of their program.

Also have really good labor market data on these same positions, particularly five years out in the industry. Then also something that we have taken note of with respect to electrical and power transmission and installer, five years out, very good labor market

outcomes with \$73,000 being the median wage for that particular occupation for Pima graduates.

To be clear, this slide, slide 14, is what is reported by the Office of Economic Opportunity. These slides are our specific graduates, which to the question earlier, I think from Board Member Riel about wage data, this is what our learners are earning entry level year 1 and then through Year 5.

Board Chair Taylor?

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Just a quick question. Sorry if I'm jumping

the gun, but it just occurred when you were talking there. So you're showing like after one year, after five years, and you had said earlier about new requirements comparing what our graduates are making versus, like, the education level of the market, so I assume those would be examples there, like carpenter, electrician, whatever, where the education level required is a high school diploma, but we're offering these programs.

So do we have data, or is it true -- I don't know if it is or isn't -- that, like, an electrician that goes through our program ends up with a higher wage than someone who just entered with a high school diploma? Where is our added value for those types of programs where the education level we are requiring is not actually required for it?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Board Chair Taylor, that is the direction I was headed with respect to the conversation is that when we look at how we offer curriculum, I'll just say, we are going to, moving

forward, have to be very astute about whether we offer it as a college-credit program or degree or if it's better for our students and the institution to offer it in a different manner.

So, for example, on this next slide, with respect to building/construction technology, and to your point, I will say that, and correct me, David Donderewicz, who's on, if I'm incorrect, but the metric that we are looking at is approximately \$35,000 a year is what has been determined, and the feds are using the State of Arizona, not Pima County, as that metric.

So looking into the future, we're really keyed in on that key metric that the average wage of a high school graduate in the State of Arizona is \$35,000 a year.

So to your question, we will have to start looking at certificate

and degree programs where the learners are earning less than that \$35,000 a year after attaining a college certificate or degree.

Did I answer your question sufficiently?

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Not quite. So my question, like, so for example, as I'm scrolling through the slides here, but so carpenter, for example, I'm just using one of the lines in there, that was \$53,966 average wage, that's more than 35,000.

But my question is, so if a carpenter goes through our program and they're earning \$53,966, or if they skip our program and just go right into some kind of apprenticeship program or something with a high school diploma, do our graduates end up earning more than the one that went through a different path?

Like, what value are we adding? Are you following? I'm trying to figure out if we are saying you should come to Pima, why should they come to Pima if they don't have to and they earn the same amount of money, potentially.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: That is exactly -- yes. So the evidence does not show from a labor market context that earning a college-credit certificate in fields that require only a high school diploma and some training actually leads to higher wages.

So I want to show you on this slide, for example, the next slide shows the marketable skills achievements for the very similar or same occupations that we offer.

These are the noncredit workforce training programs called Pima FastTrack that are developed by our faculty, taught by our faculty in our same facilities as their parallel credit-bearing programs, and we can see that we have an increased number of completers on an annual basis, and we issue them what's called a marketable skills achievement. And we have seen growth in our credit-bearing programs, which are listed in this column here, the certificates and degrees, similar or same occupations.

What we will have to be guaging in the future is if we are penalized because our -- I'm going to skip to this slide. Entry-level completers of the credit-bearing programs, for example, property maintenance are at 33 or here at 39, but if they drop, are we going to be, in essence, forced to make a choice by whether or not we will be penalized from a Title IV perspective by the federal

government.

So it's just to illustrate the point that the labor market is oftentimes not aligned to how we are offering programs or vice versa. We are often not aligned in how we put programs together with respect to how that program or that occupation actually exists of the labor market, including what's required -- and you mentioned, like, for example in construction, sometimes it's an apprenticeship with no college credit required. That completer is likely to earn the same amount of money as a Pima Community College completer, if that makes sense, in a credit-bearing program.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Yeah, no, I'm following. That makes sense.

Well, it sort of shifts the -- well, it's interesting, I understand why people look at that and why it's important to look at that. It also is kind of a narrow view of education, right?

So if someone is making purely a financial decision based on their income versus what they are investing, that while we are offering couldn't necessarily directly relate to them earning more money, but we could potentially offer them more opportunities to grow as a human during the course of their training, then they might get in something that's more narrowly focused just to get them in that role.

It's interesting, because it seems like it requires us to articulate a different value proposition or a more broad value proposition for some of these programs where, yeah, getting the certificate or what have you might not increase your wages later on,

but perhaps during the course of pursuing that at Pima and getting exposed to all the things that Pima has to offer beyond just your direct program of study, that that could lead to maybe less quantitative growth than what all of these are measuring.

But it's an interesting thing to sort of noodle through. I'm just kind of rambling out loud, but thank you. I appreciate that.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: No, I actually appreciate the point and well taken. That is a nonmonetary value-add oftentimes with respect to how we are looking at these sorts of decisions. But to that point, it allows us, Board Chair Taylor and all, to really think about what are the things that we could do within that program space to take students to the next level.

So I'm going back to slide 14 -- I know I'm jumping around a little bit -- this number has really caught our attention, right, first-line supervisors in construction, and the average wage is over \$73,000. So due to an initiative called Back on Track that a number of individuals at the college are working through, we were really looking at some of our programs where they do have low-wage outcomes, and what additional programming, whether it's additional certificate or degree, or training that's outside of the college space, gets our graduates from our certificate and degree programs ready for those higher-level jobs in that same occupation. And building/construction technology and management is one of those areas that we're looking at accordingly.

And to your point, that means we would keep them with us, be

enrolled in our general education programs, and we certainly believe that our general education programming has that value added outside of just being a good employee but being a good overall citizen for the community.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Thank you. Yeah, that's interesting.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: For the sake of time, because I know that we have -- I want to really quickly go back to slides 15 and 16. You mentioned that those are our data collection versus the other one was OEO.

I'm really curious, is this anecdotal data? Is this our actual students? Or is it the average base on what's reported for those professions? I guess are we staying in touch with our graduates five years later so that we can have actual anecdotal data, or is it an average -- am I asking the question? Are you hearing what I'm asking?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes, I'm tracking. These are the numbers for our actual graduates and completers of credit-bearing programs at Pima Community College.

Dr. Nic Richmond of course has joined us on this call. Her area,

in partnership with the Office of Economic Opportunity, has allowed us to have these data. So we get these data from the Office of Economic Opportunity through the Department of Economic Security and Unemployment Insurance System in the State of Arizona. So these data are validated outside of Pima Community College by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

I

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: No, no, I hear that. But I guess wanted to know, we're not keeping track or communication five years after they graduate from our college, correct? Do we have any of that type of data?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: In terms of their wages after five years?

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Yes.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Dr. Richmond, I don't believe we track after five years currently. Is that the case?

>> DR. RICHMOND: We don't directly reach out to students and track them that way. I believe we actually have more than five years' worth of data through the agreement with the Office of Economic Opportunity.

We don't go much further back than five years for the tracking the dashboard, because otherwise we start getting quite a long way back to students who have left the institution for a number of years, and we question, there could be other life experiences that are impacting their earnings than what we would see maybe in those first few years that are more closely attached to us, but we can look at slightly earlier cohorts and track them over longer periods of time, should we wish to.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: Thank you.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: You're on mute, Dr. Roark.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: My apologies. To the subtext of that question, Board Member Bernal Morales, for us, slide 16, for whatever program we pull, will usually be lower than this sort of data that

we're looking at for 14, because it includes everybody past those five years, and our students are more on the entry-level wages.

Board Member Riel?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: One question, one comment on this slide 14 that you have currently. Can you tell me, though, that second and the third middle columns, the annual job change from '25 to '27 and the annual job openings, where do we get those numbers? What do they mean? All of that.

Is this like -- I mean, it's sort of a crystal ball, right? Because we don't really know those numbers. But anyway, where do we get those and what do they mean?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: So this data here is from the Office of Economic Opportunity. I can't speak to the specific methodology of each data point, but we can certainly reach out to them to get the specific methodology if there is interest, but there is a certain measure of surveying and economic reporting that goes on for job forecasting.

Some of it's quantitative and some of it's response-based from employers at a sample size. That's as much as I know about the methodology. But to get more precise on what goes into that, we can certainly get you that information.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Right. Because 0.6% change on that 1,690 for the last row, it's not 156. So I'm just wondering, what do those numbers mean and where do they get them. So that's my first comment.

And then the second comment, I would really like to see on all
of

these slides when you include the median, it would be nice to know the starting salary, too, just in the future. I don't know if the feds want starting salary, but to me, I have a friend who is a first-line supervisor, and he's making bucks. I mean, he's making, I'd say, triple or quadruple that 73,000 number, right?

So if there are people that are making that much money when they have been in the thing for 24 years, it would be nice to know what the first, second, third, starting salaries are, also. Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, absolutely. Thank you.

Okay. I'm looking at our time. We have 35 minutes left, and I do want to go through the two case studies that we previously discussed. So I will quickly go through a program that just went through program review, which was our culinary arts certificate, the fundamentals certificate.

When we look at the wages there, the median wages again are going

to be higher than the median wages for our graduates -- I have skipped slide 20 -- for our entry-level positions at year 1 and then year 5 after completion from our culinary arts certificate as well as our culinary arts AAS degree program.

For this and other things, we're looking at what can we do to ensure that our exit-level wages are getting closer to the wages that we see in the general labor market and are having those conversations with program dean and faculty as we speak.

If the board does vote to inactivate or close a program -- we're using those terms synonymously -- these are the various things that

happen in two sort of major buckets, if you will. There is a report to the Governing Board. Should the board approve, the students are sent notification letters, currently enrolled students in that program. Then of course we have to chart out a teachout begin and end date for that program.

a Then we go into the actual program teachout. So we don't close program and just leave individuals who are in that program without any next steps. There is always full consideration as to how do we help the current students in the program complete the program that they selected and elected at Pima Community College.

Then of course after the program teachout, we do an internal closure of the program through our curriculum processes and the CCC, and then of course we have to notify our accreditor, the Higher Learning Commission, and the Department of Education that those programs are no longer a part of the programmattic offerings at Pima Community College.

Any questions? Okay.

Back to Bernal Morales' question on the field archaeology certificate that was recently brought to the board. I want to go back to the number of completers on an annual basis. We went back to 2014 in this case.

The threshold for the institution is 10 completers on an annual basis, right, is the marker for program viability. The health, if you will, the number of people completing a program. A one-time dip below 10 does not automatically cause a program to be recommended for

inactivation. There may be other contributing factors that are extraneous to the program.

A consistent pattern of low completion numbers does speak to a number of things with respect to program deficiency, staffing, and viability, if you will, of the program in relation to other programs, and the allocation of resources including human resources across the broad spectrum of need at the college.

So I wanted to show that we removed what were called concentrations or a/k/a majors from all of our liberal arts degree, science degree, and business degree in 2019, 2020. There was a bump for the field archaeology certificate in 2024, due to what was called the Auto-Confer process. So that looked at students who had taken the courses for a certificate but had not declared that program as their intended program of study.

Auto-Confer helped a great many people at this institution earn the award that they really had earned all along, and we're grateful that we now have that Auto-Confer process in place at the college.

This certificate is among many that received a bump, because you're going back to all active students and awarding them the program for which they took the courses, even if they did not declare that program as their intended program. It was an expected bump, and we also knew that we were likely to go back to the regular pattern after Auto-Confer, because now Auto-Confer is catching everybody moving forward, so there is not years of course attainment that are now missing. The Auto-Confer process has really helped to close that

gap.

This next slide has a lot of information on it. What we're looking at is a four-year average, so a four-year mean, of the number of people enrolled in the courses that are indicated on the graph at the bottom. The dividing line that you see here that's a vertical line -- can you see my cursor? Yes?

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: This particular slide is really small, Dr. Roark, if you can maybe make it bigger.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Is that better, Chancellor Nasse?

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: A little bit better, yeah.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Everything to the left of this vertical line are the archaeology/anthropology courses that are a part of the Arizona General Education Curriculum for transfer to the state universities. Everything on the right side of the vertical line, except for the one course, are the courses that are specialized for the three different pathway options within the field archaeology certificate.

As indicated, the green arrows show the average enrollment in the five courses that are common to all of the pathways within the field archaeology certificate. But as you can see for the enrollment, so we have 13, 9, 9, 12, and then you have a really large number over here, which is 138. The reason for that is that average enrollment includes anthropology 101 or archaeology 101 that is a very commonly selected elective as a part of the Arizona General Education Curriculum and the associate of liberal arts degree.

So a vast majority of those students, the 138, are taking that course not as a part of the field of archaeology certificate but to complete their Arizona General Education as a part of their transfer regimen to go to university.

The remaining courses have to still remain for the time, because the field archaeology certificate has three pathways, and so thus we will be running those courses still with the continued average of three, two, four, two, and one enrollments when we run the course.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Quick question, Dr. Roark, on that slide.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: So I have been in contact with the archaeology community members and some of the people who are on the archaeology advisory committee to the college.

So one thing that they told Kristen and I when we went to one of their offices one time and they had 20 people there to talk to us, they mentioned that I think it was somewhere, 20-, somewhere in 2021, I guess, they were asked to not cross-list their courses but to only offer some of those high-level courses on the right under GIS, because GIS has a fancy name, and so even though of course all those students in the GIS courses were learning the same material, some of those students were archaeology students.

I'm just wondering, are those numbers present in some of these courses?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: So all cross-listed programs are listed here. The cross-listed that occurs within the archaeology certificate is

anthropology. The reason why it's cross-listed to anthropology is in fact when the students transfer, should the students over here on the left and perhaps some on the right transfer to the University of Arizona, the course does not transfer as an archaeology course. It transfers as an anthropology course. And that's why we have those cross-listed.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Right. So we were told to offer field classes in only ARC and GIS, and so we no longer cross-list those classes into anthropology. The numbers on this graph seem to have overlooked the anthropology piece of the cross-list.

I'm concerned that some people were saying that the numbers don't match up with their data from the college.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, these numbers include the cross-listed courses. So the numbers that were enrolled are included for all courses that are a part of the archaeology field certificate.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Okay. Okay. Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes. Okay. So then going to the timeline -- can you still see it if I back out a little bit on that slide?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Yes.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Thank you. So in 2017, the program viability report, the provost at the time recommended to inactivate based on the data that you saw largely on this slide. So in 2017, the provost recommended to inactivate the archaeology certificate due to low completers, four to five per year for the previous three years.

Then the program of course at that time was not inactivated.

Then in 2022 and '23 the program review process changed. Then in 2023, 2024, it was again recommended to inactivate and develop a stronger transfer pathway. That was basically the recommendation, for the most part, that was brought to the board recently. But because Dr. Nasse had just started at Pima Community College, and we knew that there were a lot of questions around this particular program, the provost at the time and others determined not to bring it to the board on Dr. Nasse's first semester at the institution, and the board vote was delayed.

In 2025 and 2026, there is a new leadership team in the provost's

office, including myself, and we then worked for a year with business and industry partners, the same partners that you had mentioned meeting after the board meeting that it was not inactivated, and that includes our vice provost of academic affairs and our AVC of workforce development, were very much involved in developing the recommendation which was really refining that recommendation to inactivate the credit-bearing certificate but to develop a stronger pathway for the transfer program.

And then in April of 2026, the board did not inactivate the field archaeology certificate.

Board Member Riel?

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Yes. Thank you. On the prior slide, was that where we had the numbers of completers, two slides, 24, maybe? I was also told that spring 2026, so this past semester, I was told

that there were between 10 and 12 completers that semester. I'm just

wondering, do we know who completed or do we only get those numbers at the graduation time?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, we can certainly get those numbers.
For

these sorts of proposals, we have been developing that slide deck for quite some time, so it was before the actual end of the academic year, and we like for the academic year to be finalized before we start reporting on the full completers.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Yeah. Then lastly, just one more thing, 2021, 2020, I guess, those two years, I wasn't teaching at that point, but those were COVID years, so a lot of the work that the archaeology do, they do in fields, like fieldwork, and they would bus the students out to the site, and you could only sit three people to a 12-person van because of COVID regulations.

So, you know, I think that the one person completing in 2021, good on them, right, for getting it done, because I'm sure it was quite the hassle to get that done.

I'd say for the last three, four years, you know, the numbers look pretty nice, way better than they had been prior to Dr. Nasse joining us. So good on you, Dr. Nasse.

Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: I believe Board Member Barraza was next.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: I have so many questions, I don't even know where to begin. But I guess I will ask the same question I asked previously about how many programs on average per year or every three years, since I don't know if we inactivate a ton. If I ask the

same sort of question, how many programs do we inactivate on average?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: This is going to be based on my recollection for the past 11 years, and --

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: I know it's ballpark.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: -- and not being in the office that actually made the recommendation, so I may miss some. In my tenure, I recall that there was a biological technology certificate program that was inactivated. We will talk about the therapeutic massage program here shortly, this one recommendation, and a behavioral health certificate program.

So it really tracks along the same as the number we added. It doesn't happen very often, but it -- it's not an unknown, right? It does happen, but it's not common.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Yeah. So second question, and then I'll let others ask questions and then we can come back. I don't want to hog the questions. So there were, you said there's three possibilities. The board voted not to inactivate. It could be merged, improved, or inactivated.

So where is it currently since we voted not to in April?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: The remainder of the slides talk about what needs to happen next. Is it okay if I take the others' questions before moving on to those slides?

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Sure.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Thank you, Board Member Barraza.

Board Member Bernal Morales.

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: I just want to get a point of clarification, because I want to make sure that I'm not seeing things incorrectly.

Based on the slide which is -- I have it on my screen, so it's the one, the case study field approach, field archaeology. I just want to understand this. So you're telling me it took nine years from the moment the conversation started to the moment that it got to us and we still said no.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yes, that is the case. And, in the college's history, it sometimes happens, especially when there's an advocacy group that wants to keep the program in its current form, right. That is usually when you see sort of that timeline and sometimes, right, the vote not to inactivate.

That is why, for example, the administration or the provost at the time, in working with Dr. Nasse when he arrived, knows that there are oftentimes actually interest groups both internal to the college as well as external that whichever program it is will always have a reason not to close it, will always bring forth their own data or interpretation of the data, and will always bring forward a number of reasons why the program wasn't given the support it needed to be successful.

Inevitably --

>> MS. KARLA BERNAL MORALES: And I appreciate that, Dr. Roark. I don't want to interrupt you, but I just really want to quickly say I ask that question almost intentionally, because I guess I wanted to

say thank you for doing this study session today, because I think it gives me personally perspective of the amount of time and effort it takes and all of the research that is done in the background, and it's good for people that listen to our meeting, whether it's internal or external, or in some way associated or involved with, connected with the particular program.

I'm just really appreciative of the time and effort that you guys

have taken yet again to explain and educate and inform us of the steps that you take when you make these types of decisions.

I just want to say thank you for that. I feel a little bit more prepared, and I feel definitely much more comfortable asking different types of questions when these types of proposals come to the desk for us.

So thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: You're welcome.

And if I just may add, nobody really likes bringing forward a recommendation to inactivate a program. At the end of the day, we're educators, and we love to see new programs be developed, and we love to see people complete their selected programs of study.

We love to work with business and industry. And, at the end of the day, we have a finite set of resources with which we can distribute across all of academics to meet the growing demands on other programs, and so program review is one of the ways in which we look at the full slate of offerings at the institution and try to reallocate resources that we have to the programs that we know are

growing and need additional faculty members.

Dr. Nasse?

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: Yeah, and the point I think is obvious, but I think it's worth restating here in a study session, it's hard to bring on a new program, and people come to us all the time, right, and say, we should have a program in bowling alley management. Wouldn't that be great? We need that program.

But as you can see, it takes a lot of time and resources to build

out a new program. You want to be really thoughtful, right? Lots of colleges will build out a program and then realize, after they have invested considerable resources, oh, the viability is questionable here. Maybe it's a labor market thing, an enrollment thing, there is a lot of things to look at, be thoughtful in terms of birthing a new program.

It takes time. We try to be responsive and fast, but a college credit program is -- that's why you see the emergence of so many, if you will, noncredit options that employers take advantage of.

And likewise, it is really hard, I think probably even harder, to

close a program for a variety of reasons. We're talking about people who have taught in the program who feel attached to the program. I think Dr. Roark's point is no one likes to close a program. No one wants to close a program.

But, you know, if you've only got so many faculty and we need to double the amount of nurses in the community, right, there is a

question of viability and resources.

So I think the questions from Dr. Barraza are well taken. How many programs have we launched in the last few years? How many programs have we closed in the last few years is also an interesting question to just be thinking about as we think about, you know, how we're serving our community. What's the best way we can maximize our existing resources, right?

With so many new technologies and new programs out on the horizon, we want to build out new programs, but what can we do with the existing resources. So good conversation.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Thank you, Chancellor.

To Board Member Barraza and all, we will get the exact -- because

I was just saying what I recollect over my last 11 years -- we will get you the actual list of openings and actual list of closings as a follow-up action item for this study session.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: I appreciate that. And I honestly think that, in my mind or my recollection, you will probably know better than I do, but that's what I would have guessed, that they're both not a ton of new programs and a ton that we inactivate.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: On those three options that I talked about at the end of program review, the vast majority of our programs have continuous improvement and keep doing the great work that you're doing.

So then I wanted to go to, the next slide actually talked about, Board Member Barraza and all, the next steps for the field archaeology certificate program.

So we still believe that we need to strengthen our transfer pathway to the University of Arizona for the individuals who are choosing the associate of liberal arts and really do want to transfer to the University and get into the field of archaeology, which is a vibrant field in our community.

The business advisory group and what we validated were accurate, right? These roles are in need in our community. Like, it's a real job. The challenge was that the utilization of a standard occupational code is not consistent from archaeological firm to archaeological firm, so it's called different things by different companies.

At the same time, what we also learned is that the college-credit

certificate is not a requirement for that role in business and industry. Many of the individuals who are practicing field technician work are actually individuals who already hold a bachelor's degree or a master's degree, and they are doing so on a work-base learning experience. Hence the recommendation at the time was for us to strengthen that pathway but to continue to offer the field archaeology curriculum but in a not-for-credit workforce training, postbaccalaureate sort of model.

That said, we will now keep the certificate, but we do need to look at our internal standards with respect to what the purpose of a level 1 certificate is at the college with our standard operating procedures and our definition of awards. A certificate at Pima Community College is intended to be a program of study that leads to

college credit and entry-level alignment to the labor market.

Because of the diversity of students that are enrolling in the field archaeology program, individuals who are taking it as their first course, people who have their bachelor's degree and are coming back and taking it, we will have to work with the advisory committee to realign the program to our internal standards and also to meet their external needs.

We too have met with the leadership of the business and industry advisory council for the field archaeology technology, including with Dr. Nasse and myself, and talked about some of the things that we will have to work through together over the next year as we redesign the certificate.

So the current certificate remains as is until we have a newly designed certificate in partnership with business and industry. That process, as you saw, can take one to two years, depending on internal and external turnaround, and then the new certificate would have to be approved by the board. The old certificate, which is the current certificate, would have to be approved for inactivation by the board.

In other words, we're not going to inactivate or bring forward a recommendation without something else to meet that industry need, and then the field archaeology program, the new certificate would enter the program review cycle, which, in all fairness, to a new certificate or one that's highly revised, does need the four-year cycle to validate the work.

Because you asked the question specifically, I want to make sure

you didn't have any further questions on next steps and we're good?

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: No, that's great.

Are you going to talk a little bit more about archaeology, or
are
we moving on to another field?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: A couple of questions that came up that we just wanted, that we knew that were brought to the team by Dr. Nasse to me, and really do want to speak to some certain questions that were raised and also admit where mistakes were made and own them.

So one point of clarification is the web presence, which is the course catalog for field archaeology, never waned. The field archaeology certificate remained in our course catalog during the duration of this whole time.

There was some question around, well, what was taken off of the website with respect to field archaeology? And it wasn't about what was taken off, but prematurely, what we did, was we did not, we developed the page that you see here as a part of what's called areas of interest.

Not to get too long and broad, but there is a newer page on our web site called areas of interest where like programs clumped together so that students who don't know what they want to do can click on broad categories, which you'll see on the next slide, that then takes them to specific certificates and degrees.

This specific page was developed but was not placed on the areas of interest website in December 2025. When that was pointed out and discovered, we asked staff to get it back into the areas of interest

website, as demonstrated here, and that occurred in April of 2026.

That should not have occurred, and we now have internal process to ensure that we will not -- not remove. We will not not display a program until the board has had the final decision with respect to inactivation or conversely program creation.

Just want to make sure there weren't any further questions about the web presence or archaeology field certificate.

Then finally, we are working -- oh, Board Member Riel.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: I was just looking at our catalog online, and I went to academics and programs, and I went down to degrees and certificates, and archaeology isn't on the list of certificates.

Do we not list all of our courses that you could get a certificate there?

>> DR. IAN ROARK: I believe in the catalog, it's referred to as field archaeology. Are you looking --

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Okay. I see it now. Thank you. I stand corrected. Thank you. Thanks.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, no worries. That's great. Always want to double-check, right? If it's not there, we do need to know. Thank you for checking, Board Member Riel.

>> MS. THERESA RIEL: Thank you.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Any further questions on the web presence?

Then I'm really excited about this one, and I know a number of our team members are, as well, because we are working with the same business and industry advisory team members, and specifically, the

owner of Trinity/Westland to deliver a noncredit version of the archaeology field certificate in partnership with tribal nations, and this is a very exciting development.

We are entering into a contractual training arrangement with one of those industry partners to deliver a noncredit version in partnership with tribal nations. There is a lot of detail that goes into this, and there will be a more formal announcement when it comes out, but what we're really doing here is meeting the needs of the business and industry partner and also the needs with respect to how artifacts and human remains are preserved on tribal land, which is very important, of course, to the history and culture of Arizona and Southern Arizona.

Me information coming out about that. It's just an example of how we continue to work with business and industry partners to use the diversity of ways that we can meet industry needs, to respond rapidly, and employ our ability to meet those business and industry needs creatively.

Any questions on field archaeology? Because if not, I'm moving on to therapeutic massage, which was one of the ones that was fairly recently inactivated.

If you look at the dashboard in front of you, and I'll make it a little bit bigger, it shows the information around enrollment, head count, and then total awards for therapeutic massage, which really started to decrease around 2018/2019.

So in 2022/2023 program review cycle, the provost at the time had

recommended the inactivation in teaching beginning in the summer of 2025. So that timeline also shows you that whenever a recommendation is made to inactivate, it's not a quick process. If and when an inactivation occurs, we still take time to implement that plan so that no student that's in the program is harmed in the process.

The dean and the program faculty explored a short-term noncredit offering, and it was discovered that should we be able to offer that, we would be offering it too far out of the market in terms of our internal cost, so there was a presentation of the noncredit program to the VPAA and AVC in 2025/'26 for the noncredit offering -- I'll make this one smaller -- and decided not to move with the short-term noncredit offering, because it would have been a very expensive not-for-credit program. Over 10 grand is expensive for that sort of offering. Also market saturation. The market need was being met by multiple providers and by the industry itself.

Also, the proposal did not meet the identified need to the community, and the board did approve that program inactivation at that point in time.

So, in conclusion, I really can't say much more than Dr. Nasse did just recently, whenever he addressed all of this in the conversation as well. Program creation is a lot of fun. It's always fun to create new certificates and degrees when the need is really there. It's always fun and interesting to meet labor market needs in other ways, as well.

It's a very costly and time-intensive program for the college.

And once a program comes into existence, it is also costly and takes a lot of time to review programs, and then equally, an intensive process to make the recommendation for either program realignment and/or in some small cases program inactivation.

So we do hope that this deeper look into the program review process or the program life cycle process was indeed helpful for future recommendations that may be coming to the board for new program creation and/or program inactivation.

Thank you for your time. Thank you for the level and depth of your questions. Of course, as always, this does not need to be the end of this or any other conversation.

If there is additional information that my team and I can provide, even after this session ends and you think of it after the fact, we are so eager to continue this conversation in order to help us all make the decisions and recommendations that we need to make with respect to our program offerings at Pima Community College.

So again, I want to thank the board. I really enjoyed this conversation and dialogue.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Thank you, Dr. Roark. We appreciate it.

Is there any final questions or comments? If not, we've reached the end of the agenda.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: I have a brief comment. The reason I was

asking about how many we initiate or inactivate is also because, as you said, it is not something we do every year or very often.

So I think clearly staff puts in a lot of work. That was never

in question. I just think that, you know, sometimes we have to honor your work and show the community that this has been a thoughtful and very meticulous process. And when something like this is put on consent, when it's not done that often, I think it's a disservice to the work that all of you do.

So perhaps for a future agenda item, maybe we could talk about adjusting the board policy that deals with this, which I think is 3.25, educational offerings, and the administrative procedure 3.25.05, which is program review, and perhaps have more language there that specifies, you know, that it would be good for the board and the community to see what you just showed us about, you know, the numbers and all of the great information that you shared today.

>> DR. IAN ROARK: Yeah, Board Member Barraza, thank you very much for that. Of course, this was my first decision to that respect to bring to the board in this current capacity, and of course in conversation with Dr. Nasse, we will not be having any future program decisions, whether it's program creation or inactivation as a consent.

We are making a change to that process following that previous board meeting, and of course just wanting to have that greater dialog and discussion as a part of an action item. So that change will be made at your request.

Equally, I really appreciate the request to add more information perhaps to the board packet as to how and why that decision or recommendation is being made either direction, right, because if

we're creating a program, we're requesting resources be allocated, and those are public dollars, and if we're inactivating a program, likewise. So I really appreciate the intentionality behind the points that you just raised.

>> DR. NICOLE BARRAZA: Thank you.

>> MR. GREG TAYLOR: Any other questions or comments or points for discussion?

No? Not hearing any. All right. We've reached the end of the agenda, so we'll adjourn. Thank you, everyone. Take care.

>> CHANCELLOR JEFFREY NASSE: Thank you. Good night.

(Adjournment.)

DISCLAIMER: THIS CART/CAPTION FILE WAS TRANSCRIBED AND PRODUCED FOR COMMUNICATION ACCESS AS AN ADA ACCOMMODATION AND MAY NOT BE 100% VERBATIM. THIS IS A DRAFT FILE AND HAS NOT BEEN PROOFREAD. IT IS SCAN-EDITED ONLY, AS PER CART INDUSTRY STANDARDS. IT MAY CONTAIN SOME PARENTHETICALS INDICATING INDISCERNIBLE AUDIO OR PHONETICALLY REPRESENTED WORDS OR INCORRECT SPELLINGS. THIS IS NOT A LEGAL DOCUMENT AND MAY CONTAIN COPYRIGHTED, PRIVILEGED, OR CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION.

THIS FILE SHALL NOT BE DISCLOSED IN ANY FORM (WRITTEN OR ELECTRONIC) AS A VERBATIM TRANSCRIPT OR POSTED TO ANY WEBSITE OR PUBLIC FORUM OR SHARED WITHOUT THE EXPRESS WRITTEN CONSENT OF THE HIRING PARTY AND/OR THE TRANSCRIPTIONIST. THIS IS NOT AN OFFICIAL TRANSCRIPT AND SHOULD NOT BE RELIED UPON FOR PURPOSES OF VERBATIM CITATION.
