>> How's that?

All right, so we have different mics.

When you talk, make sure they're on.

Okay, so we're going to have a little bit of a different format because of the HLC presentation, That will go first and then we'll come back to our meeting and that will be about the first hour, and so why don't we start off with our presentation and go from there?

>> Good afternoon, Community Campus.
David [inaudible], Community Campus.

[inaudible] Community Campus, mathematics and business.

Becky Olson, Desert Vista Campus, writing.

[inaudible] Community Campus writing.

Rose Ann [inaudible] East Campus, computer science applications.

Rob, East Campus, art.

Rita Flatterly, Vice President of PCCEA

Mary Chris [inaudible] West Campus, behavioral sciences.

Linda Marks, Downtown Campus.

[inaudible] early childhood education.


Diane Porter, Downtown Campus, mathematics.

Roman Carillo, automotive technology.

Tommy Salazar, machine tool technology, Downtown Campus.

[inaudible] Northwest Campus, science, and today I'm also Cheryl Blake biology and wellness, and Sandy Neimier for fashion.

Polyann [inaudible] Desert Vista -- and fitness.

Oh, okay, this one.

Karen Rubinstein, Northwest Campus.

Margaret [inaudible] history, West Campus,

Barbara Benjamin -- science and quite regular adjunct faculty, Mary -- East Campus, communication, chair of the Faculty Senate Committee.

Sterling Benson, Downtown Campus, art history and humanities.

Taralyn Patrice West Campus, world languages, and I'm proxying for Aaron Eikelberger today who is Northwest Campus.
Don [inaudible] Northwest, mathematics.

Jeff [inaudible] Downtown Campus, world languages.

Gretta [inaudible]

Sorry, the microphone is not on.

Change the channel?

It says it's on.

Probably the batteries.

Yeah.

Yeah, it says it's on.

Greta Buck Rodriguez, Northwest, [inaudible]

Ada Bryan, West Campus, allied health.

[laughter]

-- Milken, writing, writing, literature, Downtown Campus.

Patrick Lawless, building structures technology, Downtown Campus.

Barry Higgins, counselor, Downtown Campus.

Carrie Myers, physics and geoscientists, West Campus.

Kathy Buhling, life and physical sciences, East Campus.

Susan [inaudible], and interior design, Downtown Campus.

[inaudible] social sciences, Downtown Campus.

Jeff Sylvan, college legal counsel, District Offices.

[inaudible]

[inaudible] interim chancellor.

Jerry Migler, provost.

[inaudible]
>> -- Menchaca, Assistant Vice Chancellor, student development.

>> [inaudible]

>> Hello, [inaudible] Desert Vista Campus.

>> [inaudible] mathematics, East Campus.


>> [inaudible] mathematics at the [inaudible] campus.

>> [inaudible]

>> [inaudible]

>> [inaudible] Desert Vista.

>> [inaudible]

>> Ed -- [inaudible] Downtown Campus.

>> [inaudible] Community Campus, [inaudible] counselor.

>> -- Federico, counselor, [inaudible]

>> [inaudible] Northwest Campus.

>> [inaudible] West Campus, counselor.

>> Jeannie Arborgast, Desert Vista, mathematics and in my spare time, faculty senate.

>> Joe [inaudible] president of the faculty senate.

and before we go on, because it will be a long meeting, I want to thank Mike Rom and his team team for doing such a great job with us here in this room.

[applause]

And now I would like to introduce Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez who is going to introduce our guests.

>> I'll just go ahead and use this one. Can everybody hear?

>> Not really.
So just in case somebody didn't catch my name, it's Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez. I am the vice provost at the college and the accreditation liaison officer at the college.

I have the privilege today of making a brief introduction for two guests who have been with us all yesterday and all day today, trying to help us better understand the accreditation process, the sanction of probation, the Higher Learning Commission, and what we can do in terms of a college to make steps forward both for the probation sanction and for long-term change in the institution.

As you know already, Dr. Harris [inaudible] has asked the provost's office to be in charge of the efforts for our monitoring report, our self-study and our site visit coming up.

So this I really want to place some context around what is going to happen today.

You know that we have a monitoring report due on August 1. That is the first step in our response to the Higher Learning Commission.

The college finished a very successful monitoring report a couple of months ago and we are using basically the same process and structure for the upcoming monitoring report.

You will be receiving next week much more explicit information as to where we are on that. We have also had a call out for a faculty member to be a writer for the monitoring report. And hopefully some of you in this room have had some interest. If not, you may become interested or
encourage your colleagues to become interested.

That faculty member would be working over the summer and of course would be reimbursed but he or she would not be on contract.

This is basically a summer project because, again, monitoring report is due no later than August 1.

As an initial step in the self-study process, we have been making the presentation that you are going to see today at both District Office and Downtown Campus with remote site connections. Yesterday, as staff counsel, and here in Faculty Senate this afternoon and finally late this afternoon we will be making a presentation to The Board of Governors.

That is an open meeting with no public comment, but the board will have the opportunity to hear the exact same things that we as a college in toto are hearing and so I want everybody to know about the context of this.

Again, we will be getting information out of the provost's office next week will self-study structure and how people can participate because several people asked what can I do? We are going to need leaders

JOE: Lab faculty and President of the Faculty Senate. This is going to be a long meeting.

[Applause]

Now I would like to introduce Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez who will introduce our guest.

MARY ANN SANCHEZ: Can everybody hear?

Use the microphone on the podium.
Okay, is that okay? Good.

So just in case somebody didn't catch my name. It's Mary Ann Martinez Sanchez. I'm accreditation liaison officer. I have the privilege of making a brief introduction for two guests who have been with us all yesterday and all day today, trying to help us better understand the accreditation process, sanctions, the higher learning Commission. And what we can do in terms of the college to take the steps forward, both for the probation session and long-term changes in the institution.

As you know already, Dr. Harris’ office asked the provost office to be in charge of the efforts for the monitoring effort and self-study. I want to place the context on what's happening today. We have monitoring report due August first, the first step in our response to the Higher Learning Commission. The college finished a successful long-term report a few months ago. We are using basically the same. You will be receiving more specific information as to where we are.

And we also had a call out for a faculty member to be a writer for the monitoring report and hopefully some of you in the room have interest. If not, you may become interested or encourage your colleagues to be interested. The faculty member would be working over the summer, and reimbursed, he or she would not be under contract. It's a summer project. The report is due no later than August first.

As an initial step for the self-study process, we have been making the presentation that you are going to see today at both district office and downtown campus with remote site connections yesterday, and staff council this morning. Here at faculty Senate this afternoon and late this afternoon,
making a presentation to the board of governors, an open meeting with public comment. And the board has an opportunity to hear the exact same things that we as a college in total are hearing. I want everybody to be with me on the context of this.

Again, we will get information out of the provost office next week about self-study instruction, how people participate. Several people asked me what can I do, we need leaders, those that wish to participate. People interested in writing, researching, a vast number of people throughout the college. So please look for that and please, please, if you are interested, we need more help. We are probably going to be directly engaging 100 to 200, maybe more, of the folks at the college in this effort -- I mean direct engagement, researching and writing and very, very active, almost everybody at the college. Almost all of you not hiding will be touched and engaged by the self-study process. So, I'm not going to answer questions in that regard.

You need to listen (inaudible), Katie, you know her, some of you know her. If you don't, you should get to know her. She is passing around index cards. This is an effective way of question and answer sessions. We ask you, jot down the questions and identify yourself and your position at the college. And then we'll field as many of the questions as possible after the session. It's likely we will not be able to field all of them. The questions that we cannot get to, we will get answers in a different way. We will consult with doctors Solomon and Lopez and be able to direct them to you.

And the other thing, the questions we collected from the entire college body without identifying people or positions, would be to create an (inaudible), so the ideas and responses to the ideas can be seen and read by everybody.
So, let me introduce you to Dr. Karen Solomon, the liaison. And Dr. Lopez, from the city colleges of Chicago. Recently retired as of 48 hours ago. And -- her first act in retirement was to reengage in education and come to Tucson for us.

DR. SOLOMON: Good afternoon. Can you hear the microphone okay? We haven't had a chance to test it and I apologize. There's no such thing as a free lunch here. I've worked nonstop, since Wednesday evening.

Welcome everyone. Thank you for coming in on a Friday afternoon. I'm Karen Solomon, the staff liaison from the Higher Learning Commission. I have been there 10 years and recently started working with Pima Community College a year and a half ago when one of the other liaisons retired after about 18 years of service at the commission. I've gotten to know Pima a bit. And I'm pleased to be here today.

My background. I came to the Commission after doing research in adult continuing education and distance education opportunities at Northern Illinois University. Prior to that with ACT, American College Testing. I worked on CAP and COMP instruments. College testing. Prior to that, executive director of six Illinois compacts.

Dr. Lopez, introduce yourself.

DR. LOPEZ: Thank you very much. I have spent the last two years, before I retired 48 hours ago --

>> Can you hear her --?

>> Sorry.

DR. LOPEZ: All right, folks. Here we go.

I spent six years as the Vice President (inaudible) of one of the City
Colleges of Chicago, now Washington Colleges. It was one of seven that make up the City Colleges of Chicago and all of which are accredited. And then the last four years I spent at district as the associate vice chancellor for accreditation and assessment. Before that I was 12 years doing what she was doing at Higher Learning Commission. Then NCA

Before that I was a faculty member for 23 years. I was at Chabot College, a 2-year institution in Hayward, California. And then I also taught at Florida A&M, a historically black university.

DR. SOLOMON: We have quite a few things to go through this afternoon. And I know you have a busy schedule.

What we intend to do is spend 40 minutes on our presentation and open up to the questions gathered from the group and then get out of here. You have important business to talk about. Talk a little about the basics of accreditation. And then talk about the timeline that Pima Community College is on for the next several years and the different steps in the process.

Then we’re going to focus on the commission's expectations for institutions in terms of criteria for accreditation and assumed practices and wrap up a bit with resources that may be available.

This is the fourth presentation that we have made. We had two open sessions yesterday. Spoke with staff this morning and this is the latest presentation.

Most of the presentations are similar. Because of time constraints we narrowed the conversation a bit. But the other two sessions yesterday were taped. And one of those will be going up if you want to hear it again. Because it's so exciting and you may have missed something.
The map on the screen. The different colors identify the six different regional accrediting agencies in the United States. Ours is the largest. The area in blue is HLC, Higher Learning Commission. The Higher Learning Commission is one of two entities in the North Central Association; it's been around since 1895. And back in 2001, because of legal issues, we needed to separate the two entities. Higher Learning Commission is the group that accredits colleges and universities. And CASI reviews K through 12. And they have gone through evolution and linked with another organization.

We are the Higher Learning Commission of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools. It's beautiful to put on a business card. HLC, NCA we answer to both. The large area in the middle covers 19 states. We are the largest agency, 1,019 institutions as members and another dozen or so in the pipeline that are applying for membership.

What's interesting about the agencies, we are membership-based agencies. We receive no funding from any other sources but dues and fees from the members. We are not a federal agency. We do not take money from any other organizations or things like that. Our membership is the group that supports our organization but also drives our policies, practices, developments and acceptance of criteria for accreditation.

The work done by the agency in evaluating institutions is done by peer reviewers. They work at the member institutions and step up and volunteer to serve and review other institutions for a variety of issues and areas of focus. Some may be comprehensive evaluations, others for approval of a new campus or distance education. We have about 1300 peer reviewers; they are trained and do a great deal of work for little or actually no money,
small honorariums, sometimes $250 for 60 hours of work. So we -- pennies we pay these folks. The peer reviewers say it's the best professional development they have. They get to get out of their narrow scope of work and get to review parts or entire institutions in a broader context. And as they have the experiences over the years, they knit the experiences together and think about higher education at a treetop level.

The peer reviewers are dedicated; many have been around for 30 or 40 years. And other folks that just joined.

We are revising and improving our core. The types of institutions we actually accredit -- 2-year institutions -- constitute about one-third of our membership. And the rest of the institutions range from faith-based institutions, private institutions, research universities, Native American tribal colleges, single-purpose institutions, art schools or culinary schools, seminaries. We accredit private and public institutions and also not-for-profit and for-profit institutions.

What's interesting is that entire mix of institutions, all of them, must demonstrate they meet one set of criteria. We don't have compacts for different types of institutions. They all demonstrate, based on institution mission, how they meet the criteria for accreditation. What's interesting, the institutions themselves are the ones that are responsible for coming forward and rebuilding the criteria at that point in time. We will talk more about the criteria in a moment.

Let's talk about the timeline of what you are going through at this institution and identify a couple of key points.

As Dr. Martinez-Sanchez says, you have a monetary report due in August on
two key areas. That report is a plan on how the institution is going to deal with complaints and the processes of how complaints are dealt with. And the other area, a plan to demonstrate to the Commission that faculty have control of academic affairs and curriculum within the institution. It's a plan that needs to be put in place by the next summer, July 2014.

The institution will develop and submit a self-study report similar to the self-study report you submitted for the review in 2010. How many were involved in that review in any way, writing or anything? Part of the group has been involved in that process. The self-study report is required to be submitted before a team comes to visit the institution.

There are several components to the report. There is a comprehensive evaluation. Part of any comprehensive evaluation of the institution needs to provide evidence how they meet the criteria for accreditation, and another level with that, we call core components. The institution writes to that.

There's another document that the institution will need to write to in referring assumed practices. The assumed practices are interesting because they are not something the institution makes judgment about. They are demonstrating facts and assume problems are there. This is something we assume all institutions have information and follow on a regular basis, core to our understanding of higher education.

The assumed practices will be something we are going to talk about this afternoon. That's another part of the report.

And another part of the report or chapter will be information on how the institution resolved the issues of concern that led to probation. There's an opportunity to dig in and amplify how the institution resolved the concerns.
An additional part of the report is the review of federal complaints compliance. Institutions accredited by a region or national accreditor are eligible to apply to the Department of Education to receive Title IV or Title III funds or things like that. Because of the work we do as a gatekeeper for that change between the U.S. Department of Education and the institution, whenever an institution goes through a comprehensive review, they must work to show they are meeting federal compliance recommendations. There's a separate set of worksheets and documents and we review that on behalf of the Department of Education.

The Department has been going through a series of changes and increasing the amount of work we need to do. That continues to evolve.

The last component is review of multi-campuses and this is a somewhat new process. The institution will be submitting another additional appendix to the report that identifies and explains how the campuses themselves communicate across the institution, and academic quality is appropriate whenever and however education is delivered.

That's the entire body of the report, several sections, some overlap and some with discrete information only on those reports. It's interesting to see how many of you are involved in some of these reports. The report is submitted. Eight weeks later a team comes to the campus and will visit campuses across the entire district over two and a half or maybe three days, typically two and a half, interviewing folks around the institution. They are trying to determine that the resources and evidence submitted along with the report created by the institution, and the interviews all connect.

So they are working to triangulate that information, to identify and
confirm where the institution is in the criteria for accreditation. That visit occurs in September. Between September and November or December, the institution receives the final report, and at that point in time, because the institution is on probation, there's another step where there's a hearing. Institutional representatives come to Chicago and meet with another group of peer reviewers, to actually review the self-study that you submitted and the team’s report and determine whether they agree with the team’s recommendation, or maybe make modifications.

You have two different groups of peer reviewers examining the institution and both make a recommendation on what should occur next. Those recommendations go to the Board of Trustees, in February of 2015. From July to February will be the review period for the institution of when the active review will take place.

Let's, for example, say the institution is removed from probation at that point in time. February 2015. You move to one of our accreditation processes; we realigned them. No institution ever will go through a period of 10 years without review. Every institution will have review at least twice in 10 years. We have realigned all the processes. It's difficult to claim the quality of an institution we have not looked at for eight or nine years. Imagine where you were and what you were doing, and the institution, even 2004 or 2005.

We realize as higher education is evolving and changing we need to be more engaged with the institutions. And all the institutions undergo reviews twice in a 10-year period. So, your next review will come up in 2018-19. And then your next one, after you have a review in (inaudible), and year 10, next in 2024-25.

I look around the room and people are calculating. How much longer until
I retire?

If you follow Dr. Lopez, don't worry. You won't be retired long. You will be pulled back in service.

This is a timeline to give you an idea of where the institution will be over the next few years and how many of you will be engaged. I want to give you this information visually. On the far left-hand side of the screen you see a greenish-blue box, review completed. Say that's the self-study (inaudible) and there's a final report.

When the institution receives that final report they are given the opportunity to submit an institutional response. And that response is important. You can provide as much information as you would like to. When we send the final report we send a sheet and say check here, and say accept, and the Chancellor signs off -- and many institutions do that -- okay, we're done. Others provide a response and you are given an opportunity to do that. The institution at this point may want to continue to provide evidence how you continued to evolve as an organization.

Remember the last document we received is from July, and you're receiving this final report in November or December. There's a lot taken place in the Fall 2014 term you want to put on the line to say, here's how we continued to grow and change as an institution.

That final report and institutional response and your original self-study goes to the institution at Actions Council, the box in the middle of your screen. IAC, it's one of our decision-making groups. That's the group that conducts the hearing.

So you have the opportunity to slide more information, and say, we didn't stop. We continued to work and change, and we're also responding to some of the issues the team addressed and continued to work on those.
That (inaudible) hearing creates another report. And in that report is the second recommendation the second group of peer reviewers make. What's interesting is that report gets sent back to the institution, and you once again get an opportunity to respond. You can clarify things that came up, or provide more detailed information. You have the opportunity to submit your self-study report and the opportunity to send in information two more times before the Board of Trustees makes their decision in February 2015. Quite a bit of information. Quite a bit of time elapses during that point. And we want to make sure the institution provides the Board with up-to-date information.

That gives you a brief overview visually. The self-study report is not the only document. Many will be called on to help create the institutional responses or provide more evidence from meeting minutes or projects created or things like that. So I really want to push to remind you. July 2014 is not the ending.

What are the potential outcomes? Well, the institution could be recommended that actions be taken to remove the institution from probation. This could happen under two circumstances. One, the board may feel the institution made enough changes (inaudible) year-four review comes up in 2018-19, but no monitoring is necessary, and may not require additional reports or visits or things like that. On the other hand the board may feel the institution should be removed from probation, but still a few issues not totally resolved. Or still young, in infancy, and not a lot of documentation taken hold at this institution. They may require monitoring. That could be more reports or a small team that comes back for a look at the institution just for a few issues and we call that a focused visit.

Ongoing monitoring would be a report or visit. The board could decide the institution made some changes but not enough and recommend notice as
another sanction. Notice is actually just a warning. It says you improved some or are in danger of not meeting the core components and you are on notice. That’s another option. An institution coming off notice writes a report specifically on the areas of concern.

It’s not another entire new comprehensive review; it’s focused tightly on the areas of concern.

Or the board could determine the institution hasn’t made enough change and do one of two things: Give them another year, warning them we are about to withdraw your accreditation, putting you on show-cause and giving you one last chance, or identify the institution as not made sufficient changes and could vote to withdraw accreditation from the institution.

Those are all the different options and there’s no way anyone can guess which way it goes. Depends on what happens between now and February 2015.

Let’s talk about the elements of accreditation. Some folks are not familiar with all the ways we evaluate the institution. We have adopted new criteria, new assumed practices, and they went into effect January of this year. And all the information is available on the website. You can download from the front page.

It’s an 11-12 page book. Maybe you want to put it under your pillow to learn different components, for osmosis, and we have a YouTube video. If you want to listen to it, you can do that also.

The criteria book has several components. Not just for accreditation. The first part of the book, six action guiding values. And this explains the underpinnings of how and why we build the criteria.

Another section, towards the back, is obligations of affiliation, and it identifies the rules of membership for the organization. It identifies how you
must be a good member. Such as when we send you a bill for dues, you pay your bill. And also, say if somebody calls your institution, you will, somewhere, when somebody calls, have a live person to answer the phone and talk to the public. Unfortunately, we had many institutions that did not have that. People had to leave voicemail or if they went to a website, type in personal information, phone number, and email addresses just to get questions answered. That institution gathered a lot of personal information, and the public or student, could not get to anybody to help them.

What's interesting is that any institution that's accredited must post the information publicly, whether in the student catalog, website, or things like that and include the accreditors address and phone number. When we are the only phone number, we get the calls. We get calls from the public. The students think they got hold of somebody from the institution and found out they were talking to the accreditors. It wasn't serving students. We went to the institution and said post your phone number; we didn't have it written down. We had to do that. Over the years, what we do, we gave students the president's office phone number, and that took care of it for a couple of institutions.

Institutions don't have to respond unless an issue arises. They are the rule of membership and criteria for accreditation. It’s central to determining and demonstrating educational quality, core to accreditation, and the role of what our agency is working towards.

Another area, assumed practices. The fundamental understandings. We'll talk more about those.

Another layer that's not in the book. Eligibility requirements. These are basic things an institution must have in place. Legal authority to operate, bylaws,
financial statements and things, institutions must respond to the eligibility requirement as they go through the process for application. And also if they are sold or going through a merger. These are the first phases of information we receive about institutions and they are core to us being able to determine if an institution has approval to operate. And state approval to operate and things. You do not have to write to those in this review. It’s another layer of how we evaluate.

And finally, federal compliance section focuses on credit hours and how it’s calculated and verification of student’s identity for distance learning and a whole range of issues.

Talking about actual criteria for accreditation. There are 88 criteria, of which there are five that are broad statements. They must be explicitly addressed by the institution in evidence provided. Under each criterion are core components and these elaborate specific areas within the criterion. And they must be explicitly addressed and they define the criteria. The institution needs to write to the criteria and core components.

A new layer, subcomponents. A grouping of subcomponents does not define a core component, but they must be specifically addressed by the institution.

We layered the expectations. The criteria for 2005 we felt was too open for interpretation and institutions struggled trying to find out what you wanted from us, and our peer reviewers said, Wow, we thought we were going to get this information and the institution didn't write anything about it. We don't know if they avoided it or missed it or there's a problem. We were more explicit as we built the latest set of criteria. The criteria are evaluated through all the core components. We evaluate them first, and then evaluate the criteria. This is
different than the 2010 review. Each of the core components is separately evaluated. In the 2010 review, only at criterion level. We changed it. We evaluate each core component to determine if it’s met. Met with concerns, or not met. If it’s met? The institution meets the expectations for the core component. Concerns? It’s (inaudible) but we think we need monitoring on the issue. If a core component is not met, we have greater concerns and probably issue for sanction on that venue. When we evaluate all the core components were all of them met? If so, the criteria were met. If even one was met with concerns, the criterion is met with concerns. We worked the evaluation up from that standpoint.

What I said before, we don’t separately evaluate the subcomponents. We don’t do three layers of review under each criterion, only two layers. The assumed practices, the fundamental expectations are written by institutions going through a couple activities within the organization. Institutions undergoing a change of control structure, merger, acquisition, some of those things, reorganization of the entire structure that has legal implications would have to do it. Some institutions are owned by corporations, publicly traded. If that publicly-traded corporation becomes privately held at a corporate level, we are required to do this.

Institutions on sanction are required to write to the assumed practices. Those institutions applying in the candidacy stage or coming up for their first review for initial accreditation would also be required to write to practices.

If a core component is identified as met with concerns or not met, we also ask for core reviewers to go and cross-check to see if this is assumed practices that may correlate. They are doing a cross-check there, and we bring that information in.

In the case of your institution, we identified there were assumed practices we had concerns about. When we identify assumed practices of concern, we require
an institution to submit a report within three months of the action. That's why
your report is due this summer. Okay, that's standard for all of our institutions.

The institution must identify it's either cured the issues or present a plan. In
your case, we recognize it's going to take more time than three months to cure the
areas of concern. That's why the institution is asked to present a plan for how they
will address the issues. Three months from the date of action is the requirement
for a report. An institution must cure any issues with assumed practices within two
years. There's no option beyond those two years.

As we start thinking about the criteria for accreditation, do you want to talk a
bit about how we really moved from thinking about inputs and what an institution
states and how it demonstrates, how it functions as an institution?

DR. LOPEZ: Sure.

Every college has functional areas, like registration, admissions, disability
access center, tutoring, all the areas that support you, the faculty and student
services. Each of those areas needs to know: How do they know they are
effective? Based on admission or objectives for the services they perform for
the students or faculty or for the college as a whole. For example, how do we
know we are effective?

Once they determine that, and they need to determine that -- the question
is, What do they do with the data? And it's not only stacking up the data and
saying we got it and it proves we are this or that. The data is to show how folks
in the functional areas improved. What have you done with the data and used
the data to improve the services you provide for the college as well as those
that work in the college and those that receive the services of the college?

DR. SOLOMON: Thank you, Cecelia.
Let's move to the five criteria for accreditation.

If you want to listen to more detailed information about the criteria or core components, we created a YouTube video. It's interesting, but we have a full PowerPoint on the criteria and all the core components.

And we expanded on that, it's available on the website or YouTube if you search on Higher Learning Commission. We had an annual conference; 4,300 people attended. And we highlighted it and many people downloaded it, and on their treadmill this is what they are listening to. This is a sad commentary on someone's life when it becomes their treadmill entertainment.

On the screen -- on the far right-hand side, resources, there's a link for the criteria for accreditation, and that's where you get the presentation. Its dynamic, powerful listening You may want to turn it on when you are getting dinner ready.

Number one, mission. It's really the core criteria for any institution because by shaping, identifying your mission and how you function as an institution, helps you respond to how you write to all the others on. This is where we push the institution to demonstrate the educational quality is central to the organization regardless of all other activities going on. And there are many complex institutions with a lot of activities that the educational quality is core to the institution. This criterion pushes the institutions to demonstrate their public role, public good and public expectations and obligations regardless of the type of institution, public or private, for-profit or not-for-profit.

In this country we support higher education in many ways. Not-for-profit institutions don't have to pay taxes; we want the money to go towards the activities. We identify the public institutions that provide funding to support public
institutions. We also provide funding and support for students through states and federal government.

In a way, when you stop to think about it, this is a country that really supports higher education different than many other countries. What's interesting? How the institution identifies the ways they serve the broader public. And we allow each institution to identify what these publics and constituents are.

In the past criterion, those of you that worked in 2010, number one was mission and integrity. We felt they were two issues that deserved for attention. We split them apart. And in this we ask the institution to be able to demonstrate information on how it conducts itself as an institution with ethical and responsible behavior, how it's transparent to all the different constituencies and communicates clearly and honestly. This is a criterion that for most of the institutions, if they end up on with a concern with the commission and end up on sanction, often there's integrity issues and questions from that.

Institutions -- we expect they provide clear information to all the different constituents. Student, public, relating to information, not just about academic programs are, but cost and tuition. How you evaluate students and award degrees. There's a lot of information about not just academic integrity but how the institution operates and how the different constituent groups operate, also.

Criterion number three, about teaching and learning, and there are two criterions about teaching and learning. This criterion asks the institutions to demonstrate what they expect students to learn and why they know it's the right things students should be learning.

How do you develop general education? Deliver it? Build it? In terms of institutions and development of the substance and rigor of program practices
and how they established that. The quality of educational programs, the quality of services, the quality of resources available to make sure you can deliver on the promise of educational quality. That's number three.

Criterion four, teaching and learning on the back end. How do you know you delivered what you promised and how have you evaluated it? And where are the systemic processes to determine you have ongoing continuous academic improvement and improvement of student learning? We expect institutions to have systems to assess student learning and ongoing program review, detailed data analysis, information taken from the data and moved into other systems and instructors within the organization.

The question would be: How do you take what you know about student learning and where you need to make changes -- how do you take the (inaudible) and move them on to other systems of the institution? How do they roll with the planning efforts in the departments or institutional planning? To budgeting and financing within the institutional structure? This is asking the question: Do you know what your students actually learned? Is it the rate of learning you expected and how can you be sure you are doing it right and continue to make it better? It's the back end, being able to demonstrate; it's not just beautiful classrooms, qualified faculty, wonderful resources. It's here's how we deliver what we promised.

Criterion five asks what are the resources now and in the future? So you can ensure you maintain the quality you are delivering at the institution. And this goes to resources and planning and the ability to define issues that you need to review going into the future. It has more of a future focus than some of the other ones. It's asking the institutions to say, Here's where we are now, where we need to go,
and here’s when we see what we need to do to get there. And the institution is constantly looking and refining the process to do that.

We’re taking one of the criteria and one of the core components. What type of evidence would you provide? This is an area we get a lot of questions about over the years.

Dr. Lopez, would you talk about criterion four and what type of information would a team look for if we talk about how an institution demonstrates they are improving student learning?

DR. LOPEZ: Well since I don't represent the Higher Learning Commission, I'll tell you what we did at Mount Washington College (inaudible). We, the faculty, developed a human diversity survey based on the surveys that had been put out by mesa community college and the University of Michigan, everything they have done and made it our own with their permission and took data points consistently significant. And a lot of poster boards. Started with the title: What Do You Know? And under that, what was nine significant data points. They were plastered in every single classroom. It's a downtown loop, they are high-rise, 11 floors, and students actually saw different data points depending on which class they were in. It was wonderful. Students came and said, what does it mean? And that started conversations with faculty. And the faculty turned around and based on that, the response was overwhelming.

We had a series of workshops, with the faculty. Also met with TK, all the government students, government associations, anybody -- all the clubs, anybody that wanted to know. They wanted to know: what does it mean? It was, that was 2005.

As a result of those series of workshops and those discussions with the
students and with the faculty the faculty decided we needed a committee on human diversity. As a result of that (inaudible), we called the faculty council at the local level of the college. The next step was that council said, wait a minute we need this across the district. District-wide, all seven colleges. And faculty council said this has got to go to the board. They made a presentation to academic affairs and the vice-presidents and the deans, and we turned that discussion into a proposal to the board to have human diversity count as one course. Every student to get an associate’s degree regardless of type had to take one course with human diversity focus.

That passed in 2006 and 2007. 2012. October, when we did the report again, it was wonderful.

that one of the big complaints that came up in 2005 were from students with racial and ethnic backgrounds that said, it was uncomfortable to be in a class where the faculty member pointed to them and said represent your group and asked a question. As a Latina, I have to answer the question for all. It's an uncomfortable situation to be in, or as a female, how do I represent half the population. Impossible. It was important. And learning was the factor in 2012. It was not an issue.

DR. SALOMON: Thank you. One of the other ways institutions provide information is prove the negative. In this example, criteria two, there is a core component that states the institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personal functions, follows fair policies, for governance faculty and staff. The institution may be able to put up a bunch of policies, but we're looking to prove. Do you follow the policies and practices? What
information could the institution provide? Overhaul practices, worked to
diminish the amount of lawsuits and complaints lodged against the
institution in different parts. Once again, looking at evidence and providing
evidence in a different way.

Now we're mindful of time, and so I think at that point we would like to
close, and it's time to talk about looking ahead. Dr. Lopez, you have been at
an institution that went through challenges and you see from a different
view, from where Pima College is at.

DR. LOPEZ: I thought a lot about responding to that question. I decided to
write it down to explain how I feel for you all. My first question is, can Pima
remedy (inaudible), and will you? One of the ways I would suggest you consider
is that you see the probation as opportunity. It's an opportunity to lay, first
time or second time, a foundation. That will bring interplay to the table.

Collective intelligence, energy, and collective workforce of this entire institution.

Work for change. And I would recommend the following: I don't think that
failure is an option for any of you, and certainly not for your students.

I would recommend you start to forge and sustain a culture of trust, a
culture of respect, and a culture of hope. Such a change will not happen
easily, and not overnight. However it can occur. I have to think you can do
it, what I call C raised to the third power: Communicate, collaborate and
cooperate. You do that, I'm sure you (inaudible), that will bring about
honest, respectful, open dialogue which is essential in needing to build solid
relationships among all the groups, staff, faculty, support staff, as well as the
administration and the Board.

I would suggest thousands of your students, not to mention, also, those
external to the institution, are depending on you. My question to you is: Will you work to provide evidence that Pima is on a path to sustainable change and will you, for your students?

Thank you.

[Apause]

>> So there are several questions (inaudible), we will not be able to get through all of them. We have to get back for the board meeting. At the end I want to reiterate all the questions will be (inaudible), get back to you directly. Through an FAQ, so you receive answers to your questions, even though we can’t address all of them in this meeting. I want to start with a question, from (inaudible), is asking how it is, (inaudible) give a strong report in 2010. And put us on probation in 2013. How is it the issues that we recognize now were not spotted in 2010.

DR. SOLOMON: Great question. In 2010, the team reviewed the institution based on information that the institution provided. They provided in the report and evidence, and also what they heard during interviews, these issues did not come up to the team. We found out when we started receiving a series of complaints. One of the roles of the agency is to monitor the institution, not just at a comprehensive review but continually. And we have a complaint process where folks write in, students, anyone can write and we open a complaint investigation, as long as we have information to go back and contact the individuals, to clarify information, and ask they submit documentation or provide information in writing, and some people prefer to be anonymous, and we collect as much information from them that we can without revealing identities, and ask the institution to
respond. Other individuals give us names and very specific circumstances and we go back and ask the institution to respond.

In this scenario, none of it came to light in 2010. Once we started receiving complaints we acted on that. We received enough information from a variety of sources we felt we needed to get a team to find out what was going on, to talk to people here and allow people to meet individually, or in group sessions while the team was here. That with the information, where the team triangulated information and made a recommendation, that went on to the president and to the Board.

>> (inaudible) this is from (inaudible) I don't know your last name. Community Campus. He is asking how can faculty and Senate address the specific issues about governance --

DR. SOLOMON: I think the time has come for a series of dialogues across the groups. And the different groups agree to sit down and have lengthy conversations and identify where the real issues are, where their strengths and opportunities for improvement are across the institution. I think in some ways, looking at the age and maturity of the institution, maybe it's a natural process, when you look when the institution was founded and many of processes put in place. You expanded and developed over the years, maybe some of the governing instructors don't match where the institution is and where it needs to go. Maybe it's time to sit down and talk about what is governance at this institution. And we heard from students who feel they don't have a voice, and what does it mean to have shared governance. It's a misunderstood term, and it's an opportunity for a great education and reinvigoration, talking about where it will take the institution moving in the
future. And everybody collectively working.

>> One more question, it is asking about our self-study and does address all criteria or just those mentioned (inaudible).

DR. SOLOMON: The self-study report. It's a comprehensive evaluation. It must address all criteria, if you look at the first timeline slide. Criteria for accreditation, core components, Assumed practices and the next line was evidence that the concerns have been resolved. You write twice, write to all the criteria and core components. And probably separate sections or appendix that addresses the commission's concerns. Maybe redundancy, but we have to pull it out and have a separate document that goes through and addresses the probation issues. There are two issues, to remove the institution on probation, and create a comprehensive review for the institution.

>> (inaudible) I have several cards (inaudible).

We have responded in group study or FAQ, names and position at the college. So that is not identified in the public setting. If you (inaudible) [Applause]

>> Good afternoon, everyone.

Thank you for being here, and I will be doing the primary job I was told to do: work with board. And they will appear with Drs. Solomon and Lopez, they will be presented, the presentation here today, with a little I guess, it will lean toward governance. I wanted you to be aware of that. I also wanted to mention briefly the fact that there will be a lot of activity from now throughout, I suppose, the life of this institution.

In the next few months, I will be bringing people to this college to.
Dr. Lopez mentioned collective intelligence, so we are all on the same page. The whole issue of developmental education, what is it, how does it play into our mission and purposes? And one of the things we have to do as an institution is to re-examine our position and purposes in light of the challenges that we're facing today. And I (inaudible), who worked with me while I was on a board years ago and she is achieving the dream in St. Louis.

Our program faced many of the challenges our developmental program faces here. We will have a series of workshops. So we'll all be on the same page. And begin to think more about the institution. The other thing, there's a lot of things that will be going on.

The major -- I think the major effort of mine will be to work with the board on governance. The board understands they need a comprehensive plan, which means reviewing policies that have not been reviewed for years. And really I define policies, creating new policies that will work for Pima where everything is not delegated to administration and yet it doesn't allow for micromanaging. I look at the word "policies" and respond to the kind of efforts I'm undertaking, it's clear the position has too much power, with very little oversight.

I was looking -- just an example and then I'll run. I was talking to staff about identifying (inaudible) to bring in some of the people we're going to bring in including the ones that spoke today. And I was told, if it's under $100,000! How powerful I am! It's not quite that black and white. Governance is a major issue, and an area in which I plan to devote a great deal of time.

I think we have good heads, Dr. Migler, the committee, all of you will be
involved in responding to this self-study, and the report monitoring report that has to be submitted in all August. We have the people here, they have the knowledge and we hope to engage all of you. What's happening at the top will be a primary effort of mine. A goal, and let me say, we're all in this together. I haven't been here very long. And there are specific issues that have to be addressed. Long-term issues, that have hurt and we will evaluate, going deep into some of the areas. So we can make recommendations that in some cases we will make concrete changes that the college wants.

Not what I want. But what I support after hearing from you. And let me say your faculty representatives are great. They are strong, they are advocates for you. And I respect that. And I want you to know that they are bringing about change in this institution. So thank you and I can answer one or two questions, is that okay. All right.

Yes.

ROB: the initial plan has to be in by August. Most faculty leave in May. How will you involve a large portion of faculty when most of them don't teach summer school?

>> (inaudible) we talked about it, it's an issue. I'll ask him to respond. He has been working on it.

>> The monitoring report is due August 1, and that addresses assumed practices. And we are looking, if you recall, there's a notice out. We would like help with faculty writing. That's very much like the monitoring report for student learning outcomes. We think a smaller group can work. We have dollars budgeted and requests input. And the (inaudible) folks that have knowledge.
A bigger issue is the self-study. And we will be trying to kick that off, as Mary Ann said, look for information next week. That's a process; the heavy lifting will be done next fall. It's going to take us throughout the entire academic year, and we will need a lot of help. I think that, two things.

>> (Inaudible) okay, thank you all so very much for all you do for the college.

[Applause]

>> Our agenda -- we have so many people needing to leave. I'm going to do should some of this on the fly. Skipping down to 6.2. Jim and (inaudible),

>> Good afternoon. I'm supposed to be at the 3:00 Board meeting. So we all had a chance to look at the SPG.

Up until now the college outsourced legal services, 100%, (inaudible) full time, it will be the one to request services and figure out if we need to handle it internally or farm it out.

(inaudible) and another factor in this SPG striking the right balance between accessibility and making sure questions and concerns were addressed. There's lots of places where the issues could be addressed.

(inaudible)

So with that, the background, if there's questions or comments. I'm happy to deal with those.

>> The front page story, in "The Star" was in regard to the enormous costs that increased tremendously in the last few years the college paid out. You becoming in-house expert and changing the SPG, is that an effort to rein in the (inaudible).

>> The short answer is yes, that's part of it. What I get paid per hour is
significantly less than outside firms. One thing, it's unknown what the cost will be, in the last couple of years, there's unusual events partly responsible for the up-spike in legal services, (inaudible), yes, we're going to be trying to collect data, and yes it's part of it, having control on the total budget.

>> Excellent.

>> Denise, Northwest Campus. Is there any documentation that we have that says what legal services can be used for or applied to?

>> I don't think so. I guess I'm not entirely sure what the question is. There are many activities around the college that might have legal implication, copyright, policy. And the idea is if there's questions or concerns where there might be implications -- am I addressing your question?

>> Sort of. This SPG doesn't state how the legal services can be used. If they are requested, partially, if (inaudible),

>> So SPG sets up the process rather than the topic because it could be an enormous variety of subject matter. We are concerned there's state law that applies. College policy and disagreement about how to be interpreted. It could be the nature of the questioning, lots of things. Someone has a question or concern. They think there's a legal facet and they want to get that perspective, this is the mechanism by which it happens -- is that closer?

>> Yes.

>> Diane, math, Downtown. Would you be involved in negotiations with employee groups?

>> I don't know. That's the short answer. This year outside counsel was involved. I don't know what is going it happen next year. I'd like to look and
have conversations about what seems the best way to go forward. Right now I don't know the answer to that.

I guess, the one thing I add, right now are where all the donations between what I deal with and what gets farmed out is not decided.

Questions?

>> Thanks Jeff. Dr. Migler, -- did you need -- okay. Going back to the agenda. 2.0. Approval of the March 29 meeting minutes. The special meeting.

We have a motion to approve?

>> Second.

>> Addition and corrections? Okay.

All in favor of approving the special meeting say aye. Okay. On the April five, we have a problem with the date on the top.

And so, that also says March 29. It's really April 5. Any other additions corrections?

>> Page 10.

(inaudible)

>> Anything else?

Okay. Do I have a motion to accept the minutes?

>> So moved.

>> Second. All in favor.

We're on a roll.

Announcements.

>> All right. I am going to; we have a committee to look at the prereqs that came in at the last meeting. We have a great group of people and right
now our task is to collect history. We need information about what happened and when and why, so that will help guide us along the way. It's not a discussion now, but if you know someone who has been here long enough to help us understand the situation, please contact one of the members of the committee afterwards, either you know it or give it a name. We know Rob is a part of it. Any information you can get, I'm going to call out the names of the committee, because they may be around you and you just contact them and let them know. Susan, raise your hand. Melinda, Greta, Mace, Dave, (inaudible) Carrie, and Margie. If you get that information to one of us, a name, we greatly appreciate it, to try and get as much as we can, and get the changes made so that the barriers that happened last time we can overcome if they know the history. Thank you.

>> Any other announcements.

>> I had a message from Julia. We have been sitting on a grievance review committee. And we wanted to let you know how much wonderful progress we made. We have a series of suggestions going forward to the chancellor's cabinet and we hope that it's sustained for another year so we can do a piloting of having a grievance board that grievances, it will be an option to go before a board rather than a direct line supervisor.

>> Thanks, Duffy.

Do we have anybody on the Senate that's going to retire this year? Everyone will be back, that's great.

(inaudible)
I have an announcement. Wednesday May 8, solidarity rally and march to show support for PCC. People meet at Rincon High in Burns Park, Swan Road and Fifth Street. Assemble at 5:30 and march at 6:30 to the board of governors at the district office.

The flyers are around campuses, and I encourage everyone to go. Student body has been trying to get out the word. College wide.

Agenda modification and open forum. Any open forum items?

I'm going to reserve executive session, I don't think we need one but I'll reserve in case we do.

We do have an agenda modification. Adjunct faculty committee is going to move to business section, 6.8. And their report on 7.4. Wipe it off the agenda.

6.5.

Back on track 6.8.

>> Good afternoon, it's been a long time before I came before you. I'm bringing back the famous one. SPG, 3501 A. specifically, we're including in that, (inaudible) approved by the board in March so that we can then implement that piece for students for the fall.

The other is in-house keeping. 501A A. section 10 of part one, eligibility. Which deletes the category of non--(inaudible) student. Put in there when there were higher requirements for students to be taking credit classes, it should have been deleted at the time the others were deleted and it was an oversight. That's being taken out to clean it up.

The other one which is also, to keep in line, SPG 1302, A. B. Contracts. Prior
to January of this year, facilities was under administration and finance.

As of January facilities is under a vice chancellor. He needs authority to enter into contracts and spend money legally, by the action of the SPG, that’s what that piece is doing in 1302. There’s also a larger review of (inaudible) contracts being started. Right now we want to get Bill Ward the authority to do what he needs to do. These will be posted this afternoon, they are already up. And when I go back I just need to approve them. These two plus the one Jeff talked about, those will be on the web, effective later this afternoon.

Takes about an hour, and if you have comments, that you would like to submit, it will be open for a 21 day period.

We need to get this through housekeeping; they will be up for the entire three weeks. Any questions or comments? Diane?

>> Diane Porter, the changes that were done March 29. Were those posted for comment and how was that decision discussed with faculty?

>> No, it wasn’t posted for comment. It was brought before the board in special meeting. 1101 A. dealt with process regulations and standard practices.

Contains under all three, (inaudible) the statement, the Chancellor or designee may make exceptions to the above described review process, (inaudible) established or changed. When it delays -- adversely impacts the college’s operations, and under that authority. Chancellor chose to speed up the process to (inaudible).

>> The second part. How was it changed?

Were the changes discussed with faculty?
>> Not to my knowledge.

>> Denise Weeks. Northwest Campus. I was curious about how the amounts in the SPG are arrived at. Based on history or some sort of premises we're dealing with. The numbers in here. >> They were based, the last time they were reviewed. Based on the kinds of contracts the various administrators deal with, and what was considered appropriate. Those limits are going to be looked at in the large review of the contracts. That could change. They might not be effective. Might not be appropriate. Right now, the vice Chancellor for facilities has comparable amounts; he was given the amount, the same amount as other people at the level. It may not be appropriate. And there's a lot of discussion that the amounts are too small. As time goes on things are more expensive. There's been a lot of discussion, but currently, we're not looking at that because that's a much bigger question. All we're trying to do is give them authority to have signature, (inaudible), it's a good question, and it's going to be looked at in-depth.

Yes?

>> Rob.

(inaudible)

>> I don't think so.

>> Contracts over a certain amount have to go to the board. They are (inaudible).

>> (inaudible).

>> That's not the way the college has chosen to do it at the moment. It's per contract.
That's a good point. I'll take forward to the group reviewing the contracts.

>> Becky--
Rosa, West Campus.

My question is, since we were not informed about the decision that was made by not going through the (inaudible), is there a procedure in existence that allows for those types of decisions for that faculty (inaudible). Automatically if a decision was made without inclusion of the faculty, is there a process?

>> There isn't. The process that that SPG was altered was very unusual. And to my knowledge in the three years I've been involved there's not any other that has (inaudible), that has not followed regular process. That's extremely unusual and probably, a unique event.

>> (inaudible)

>> I can't address that.

I don't have any information, I'm sorry.

Anything else? Okay. Thank you so much for your time.

>> Thanks. 6.4. Linda and (inaudible) --

>> Good afternoon. We're here the four of us, to thank the Senate for serving and allow us to address the students success concerns and in the discussion we had to date, we have received positive feedback. So again we want to thank you for the support. And in that, we also are looking at the issue of enforcing the mandatory prerequisites and that is for the purpose of student’s assessment. We think you are all on board with that too. It’s our goal to support our students, to assist them in developing self-advocacy, and
also of equal importance, to support the faculty colleagues in a holistic manner of teaching and learning, both in the classroom, and outside of the classroom. So again, we want to thank you for your support. I'll turn it over to (inaudible).

>> West Campus (inaudible). So I want to thank you for having us to continue the conversation about student success. We know we only have 10-minutes. So we wrote all the PowerPoint rules and teaming rules, we (inaudible), I want to make sure there are key things we hit upon in having this conversation.

So this is what we're going to talk about. The next slide is really kind of a brief history. A show of hands. How many of you have been here since 2001? For those of you who haven't, we thought we would do a compare and contrast.

The college is going through some difficult challenges and knows this is not meant to be negative.

So, after 2001, we had the old (inaudible), mandatory assessment -- basically what used to happen, is that all the students were required to assess, and meet with academic advisors, and (inaudible), they had a hold put on the account and they were required to take the students assessment course, and attend orientation. We had a three pronged approach.

What happened on the flip side? 2008, (inaudible), many of you at the campuses have been paying attention. We know there's a lot of changes. Student’s services. And what kind of changed along all of that. There was a couple years, (inaudible), some of these things started getting unoperational.
And along with that, the change in the orientation, (inaudible), the faculty still were in charge of orientation, (inaudible) why is this important? Well, we certainly would like to see de-centralization. The reason, why is this important to other faculty besides Student Success folks? We all (inaudible), and we want to be part of the conversations of all things (inaudible) so what we really want to do is say to you, how can we be more pro-active. I talked to my colleagues about what can we do to help students be more successful. And certainly I have conversations with a lot of you. Why don't students know what's available to them? They come to me as a faculty member, there's so much we can't do to help them. Orientation, (inaudible) they are part of the conversation. You can follow the slides seeing what we used to have. The mandatory staff enforcement for academic progress is another area where we have seen a lot of students we end up talking to (inaudible) We want to give you some information from our review, and talk to you about what the students -- this is the slide that tells you more about our discipline. And what we do is address the affective, behavioral and the cognitive, and we do it across a continuum of learning, at the beginning of development of the student journey. And we have (inaudible); this slide is from the last program.

And we (inaudible) and we offer in January about the AACC report. These are ideas we consider at Pima, they are not new necessarily, but from the report, student don't do optional. That's a favorite quote. And the fact we give them a choice for orientation is maybe not the best way to approach. Maybe it's time to have that conversation.

We certainly heard a lot today from Drs. Solomon and Lopez, about HLC and
the mandatory report. We heard from Dr. Harris in talking about the
Achieve the Dream literature. We want to provide some other places to see
the research.

We put some of the things on the slides.

There's all kind of stuff out there (inaudible)

Okay. We come to you with the financial idea. Benchmarks with the sister
institutions and you can see, Pima is in the minority now with some of the
practices.

We're looking at what's mandatory in terms of student's success force and
student orientation. Everyone is requiring these things, orientation,
(inaudible) there are other colleges (inaudible), and the other footnote,
(voice echoing) as far as student success, there's only two other schools not
mandatory. The fact, we have all the data, (inaudible), and we need to be
looking at the student success and retention in general.

This next slide, I wanted set the record straight on a couple of things.
There's been public comments made here and to the board about our
particular discipline, and we really wanted to demonstrate right here, we
have 15 courses, you can see from the green highlights. Five are
untransferable. (inaudible), and the remaining three, we're working with
ASU, to get those courses transferable.

This is an ongoing process.

Again, you might say, why should we care how this relates? Any time there's
information, we want to rectify. (inaudible).

The next slide. STU helps students and faculty. Basically all the information
we're presenting, we're sharing information, (inaudible), we help students
get the answers they need. And specifically relates to (inaudible), we are all interested in student success. Therefore, we want to share some important things.

Which were, there's competing agendas with financial aid, veterans, that kind of thing. We're hearing courses not tied to a specific program of study may have funding difficulty problems. It’s an issue for all disciplines. I expect more information on that.

It’s a continuing conversation.

One last thing, I want to touch on, (inaudible) there are ideas about non-credit workshops. And faculty counseling, (inaudible), there's no data in our server that we found that demonstrates it's doable. (inaudible).

We definitely support the student orientation, other workshops (inaudible); we don't think it's necessarily the right direction to go into.

So in conclusion, why are we here? (inaudible) regarding the mandatory prerequisites across the board. Looking at regular late registration, we want to be part of the groups and part of whatever other conversations you have, ongoing or future issues. (inaudible). So we thank you very much for your support, and (inaudible).

>> Susan. On the slide that shows the data for retention and colleagues, it said, people that completed STU classes, are they full classes or modules?

>> They are actual courses. For the last few programs, we looked at 10 years of data, and looked at student courses across the board. Any STU class. They were retained at higher rates. We broke it out course by course, so we have specific (inaudible)
>> Denise. Far from being an expert on anything financial aid related. I'm talking to the choir, it seems to me, to have financial aid pay for a one or two credit hour course for a student that may prevent the student from doing classes over and over again because they are not well prepared, or well advised. That in the long run costs a lot less.

>> You won't hear any arguments from us.

>> Is there any way to relay that sentiment to people controlling the bucks students get to (inaudible), these courses are a benefit financially. And it's win-win situation for everyone.

>> You know, we have had those concerns, I don't know if that's part of the ongoing conversation, (inaudible), looking at late registration, maybe a future committee, based on HLC response.

Certainly, (inaudible) --

>> How did you get the data? It would seem if they can generate this, they could generate data more detailed that provides you with information on the number of times students take (inaudible) courses, looking at that and seeing the cost of that, it's not just a matter of looking at STU and non-STU but STU and the number of courses they need, and non-STU and the number of courses they need or don't need.

>> What I want to share, it's a federal government policy. There's a way to include, I think this could be worth exploring. Two courses can be required, built in a program. It becomes a matter for the faculty. The question is if we have with a 60 credit program, and we build in a few credits for STU. The data are compelling. I would like to say logic and policy are compatible. That's not always the case. The study, if it were local it would
be a different decision. It's really in terms of the clients. We have no ability (inaudible) on a larger level.

   >> Can we get the data? Be pioneers? If we can get the data and demonstrate, financial aid, it's costing you a lot of money. When we take a one credit hour course that gets them on the right track in terms of productivity to taxpayers.

   >> (inaudible).

   >> (inaudible) Right now, the courses are not transferable. They are being reviewed by the U. We should find out in a 60 day period. (inaudible),

   >> So if it's a liberal arts major or associated business for transfer, or the general studies degree. They can declare any of those programs of study and they are courses for transfer. Thank you for having us.

   >> Actually this is for Suzanne and the President. I would like to ask our senate leadership if we can strive to ensure we have (inaudible) inclusion in any of the subcommittees we have working on things, prerequisites assessments, orientations, anything within the expertise of these wonderful faculty members.

   >> (inaudible). Anything else?

   >> Thank you very much.

   >> 6.5. Code of conduct (inaudible).

   >> Good afternoon. And happy Friday. After you heard about student success and all that good stuff. And now we talk about code of conduct and sanctions. What we want to do today is we're going to be presenting to you and the vice-president of Northwest Campus, we are going to be discussing code of conduct reporting. The process.
What actually happens is nothing new. It's the existing code of conduct we have in place. This is nothing new. What was done is that the practice was put into writing, into black and white.

And there are multiple holes to that process.

One of the goals is to ensure college-wide consistency. The vice-president of student development is cast to implement the code of conduct. The document that you have in front of you step-by-step documents what actually happens when a code is initiated. It’s nothing new, just put in writing. Michael will shed light and give you an insight on how he puts forth that practice.

Highlight some of the key steps and hopefully this document will ensure whoever initiates the code, the faculty member or staff member, we close the loop with information, there's follow up. And follow through. With that I introduce Michael, Northwest Campus.

>> Thank you. I have been intentionally getting briefer and briefer throughout the day. I'll try to just touch on a few general themes.

You can walk through and see how it plays out. I'll touch on a few things in terms of the document. This was a collaborative effort throughout many aspects of the college. Vice-presidents of instruction, staff members, counselors, provost office, and a number of people across the campus and all campuses that took their time and helped develop the document. A couple things to touch on, first thing I want you to take away, encouraging you to report early and often.

What that means, if you have a question about students behavior. A lot of times it arises in class. If you have a question, I'm not sure if it's a code of
conduct, err on the side of reporting. We want to hear about it early. A lot of times we see a student slightly disruptive in your class, another class, collectively those can result in a conduct violation. Even if the (inaudible) Second thing. What this really provides is contact on each campus. And this is documenting the practice that we currently employ, but it specifies and gives a list of progression. Vice-president of student development. If I or my counterpart is not available, goes through the list. We don't want you hung up on that person is not there. Contact somebody and let them know.

Next thing, how to report. Touches on two pieces, contact the vice-president of student development. Fill out accident report form on the Internet. Don't get hung up. Do whatever is quickest. We don't want you scrambling for the form. I'd rather hear from you. The main issue is report early. The list of contacts is there for you to follow. This gets into how the code of contact transpires. If it becomes a code of conduct violation we contact the student, we follow up with sanctions, and also what this document is attempting to do, and it’s closing the loop with those of you initiating the report. Closing the loop with the rest of the campus population. (inaudible), it could be its a student that had an issue in another class, and you have that student. Perhaps let you know to keep an eye on what's happening. And let staff and other members know if there are certain things we expect, if you want to refer the student to a particular place, let the staff and faculty know, this is what we want you to do. It's documenting what we experienced as our best practices and takes from, I see a behavior incident, what do I do? And gets it to the point it becomes investigation with the code of conduct and ultimate sanctions. I'll stop there. Is there's specific
questions?

>> (inaudible). Are you saying that now we bypass (inaudible) and go
directly to the vice-president or the vice-president of student development.

>> This doesn't discourage you from talking to people you normally talk
with. If you suspect it to be the level that requires code of conduct
(inaudible), it's not very specific, it's not discouraging you, this is just if it's
becomes a code of conduct or behavior issue.

>> Thank you. Any questions?

>> This document is posted on the Internet as well as the (inaudible). If
you have questions, please ask us.

>> Thank you.

[Applause]


>> In this country, we reward those people that we work with usually with
a pay raise, at least with some type of financial increase.

This financial increase, we say to them. We value the contribution you are
making to the organization; you are one of us, we are proud to have you with
us. We say to them, you belong. With this in mind, I'm bringing to you today
the same thing I brought to you this time last year: a statement of concern
that adjunct faculty be included in the college's proposed pay raise. So I
think all of you, join me and read the statement of concern together.

On behalf of the Adjunct Faculty Senate Committee, representing a
constituent basis of 1,400 adjunct faculty we are formally requesting that
adjunct faculty be included in the college's proposed 2013-14 pay raise.

We have just been made aware that in the proposals for a pay increase that
were prepared for the board of governors review and decision on April 19, 2013, the (inaudible), were not included in any of the four proposals each of which requested increased compensation for quote, regular faculty. Exempt and non-exempt and administrators. We ask the oversight be amended so the college's adjunct faculty will benefit along with regular faculty -- by the proposed pay increase.

A year ago on April 6, 2012, at the request of the adjunct faculty Senate committee this faculty Senate endorsed the principle that all faculty, full time, regular, and adjunct be included in the college's proposed pay raise. Once again, the adjunct faculty committee now asks the faculty Senate reaffirm their earlier reinforcement. All faculty be included in the college's current proposed pay raise, we're also requesting all parties responsible for preparing the budget for 2013-14, be informed the adjunct inclusion in a timely manner.

Mr. President, may I ask you call for a confirmation of last year's recommendation.

>> Before we do that, does anyone have questions or comments?

>> Jeannie. I think, looking at this, is this related to this rejected request to increase --

>> Yes it is, Jean, by board policy, 4001 PCAA is limited to advocating for full-time faculty only. However, my backdoor for helping my colleagues out is to request an increase in the overload rate. Our contracts say overload contract when we teach an extra class everyone knows it's the same amount, because we as full-time people get overloads. I can ask for increase in the overload rate. And we had such a proposal, -- the hourly rate went up by a
dollar. I was denied that question. (inaudible), he told me at the table, that the budget is very tight this year and they are working hard on a number of issues and they did not have funding available to increase the overload rate or supplemental hourly rate.

>> (inaudible). You have supplemental and overload rate. Different -- in the sense you are not allowed to negotiate for us. You are asking for overload rate for full time faculty. This is a totally different proposition.

>> I cannot write the proposal for adjunct faculty. For the last 40 years, the dollar amount is identical.

>> We are asking approval that the adjunct faculty deserves a raise.

>> He had that from me (inaudible)

>> One of the adjunct faculty that have been in touch with me. Really want to feel they belong. Feel we are valued. Of all the people that work for this college we are not on the list.

You know how it makes you feel? I'm sorry; we teach side-by-side with everyone on our respective campuses. I know adjuncts and so do you, that have taught from 13 to 20 years. We are not fly-by-nighters. We have a true and genuine and deep conviction, and a loyalty to the college. And quite honestly, we deserve more than to be ignored.

Thank you.

>> (inaudible)

>> My suggestion is I think this is a really good time to approach the board directly as adjunct faculty with the HLC visit. Shared governance, a buzz word in existence right now as in having a voice. And I think we have at least one very supportive board member, but maybe you can have a meeting
face-to-face with the board. They were kind enough to do that with the meet and confer team this year.

>> If you give me an endorsement from the Senate I will happily do that.

You have to realize, we have no voice. Our Adjunct Faculty's Senate Committee is the only voice. I went through all of this last year. So if I go to the Board of Governors, which I did last year and am happy to do it this year, but if we go with the Senate's endorsement that means a lot. And it means a lot to the adjunct faculty as well. I'm really asking you give us your vote of endorsement and we will continue. Thank you.

>> Can I make a motion?

>> You don't have to.

This is what we'll do. We'll vote, the people in the room, yes or no. In terms of endorsement. And then the proxies. (inaudible). First around, all in favor of the statement of support for adjunct faculty. Raise your hand.


>> All right. (inaudible) Okay. Thank you.

>> I want to thank all of you from the bottom of my heart. Thank you so much.

>> Okay. CCA?

>> We need to document what we refer to as the (inaudible) case. So this is a summary front and back. You get kind of a summary at a glance what we accomplished and how we feel. You notice the rejecting, (inaudible), the upside, the number one, is probably for many of us the more substantive.

The board surprised the heck out of me, saying they could fund full-time
faculty at three percent, when I was assured by Scott Collins it will enable full
time faculty. (inaudible). The redistribution of campus enrichment fund.
The funds, personal development, you go to attend a conference, graduate
class; I didn't even want to try it again. This was the third time and it actually
passed. I was blown away. Northwest Campus, and community, -- it
distributes to each campus, per the number of faculty FTE that they have on
the campus. Which ensures every single person in the room regardless of
campus, has equal access to request the funds. And put in a timeline for
getting an answer back from your campus president, 15-day window of time,
because it was noted that some professional development opportunities are
time sensitive. There's a time limit. Or the cost goes up or you are too late.
Sometimes a non-answer turns into a no. We put a timeline, when we need
a response, and it has to be a rationale if there's a refusal. And all the
campus presidents turning in information to human resources so we can
track approvals denials and rationales and how the funds are handled. We
asked for the data in the past and told, we don't know. It won't wash
anymore.
I won't go over all this, it's quite detailed.
I have been asked by the President to give a few other announcements.
She and Scott Collins worked on the faculty evaluation of administrators.
Due to recent events, we are including a section on board of governor’s
members and key (inaudible) that survey will be out later today or Monday
at the latest.
We already previewed the draft. This is a busy time of year; take the time to
give your administration a feedback. Especially when it's good. We get to
interact with a lot of administrators at different levels and we could not get done what we get done without their interaction, views, and this is actually a chance, besides yell, to pat somebody on the back if they deserve it. Don't forget to do that. Right now the president slipped out of the room. She has been conducting open forum meetings. So faculty can air their concerns, make plans of action on how we help guide the college out of the crisis. That's where she is at. PCC has been taking the opportunity, as our HLC friends advised us, to meet with group from other parts of the college and business and community leaders from outside the college. We met with (inaudible) you're staying strong in the future. Do you want to address that? She'll report on it later. We're talking opportunities to build more interconnections and communications that I hope in the long run will make the college stronger and what we do through PCCA stronger. Thank you so much.

Questions?

>> Did you know that our student leader (inaudible) she puts in so much extra time and (inaudible) she has done a really great job.

>> I don't want to brag too much. She is taking over next year.

Perhaps -- (inaudible).

Thank you.

>> Thanks.

Item 7.2. Kim needed to leave. And I'll do the report. We go to the meetings. Tell them to go, they stay.

>> I'll do it from here. In the interest of time I wanted to pick up a couple highlights. The theme is we're going to be really busy year, and to make you
aware of things that we're going to incorporate into self-study. We are making plans for administering two surveys, one done in the past. Community college survey of student engagement. It's typical we are asking what the students think. Those reports are nationally normed. Good data, we will likely, it's late-breaking within the last couple of weeks, we signed a tentative agreement, and we will be working with the organization that publishes the surveys. We need help administering them. Unfortunately, they are not online. They are pencil and paper. And we have to figure out a strategy for doing random surveys and those things. I wanted to give you heads up, the community college survey of student engagement is in the works as well as another one, SENSE, and it's the survey of entering student's engagement. I don't know if it's right, that's for new students. And the other is for returning students. It's important to have a good sense of what the students are saying, and how we use the process for self-improvement.

There's another thing unrelated to the HLC. But nevertheless, something to be aware of. As we work with financial aid, it's just one of the things we end up having regulations we might wish we didn't have to deal with, but we have to. One of the things we learned, we had a site visit this past spring semester.

And they say we need to beef up verification of attendance. And we need to add it earlier in the semester. They are saying, because you wait so long, you have students collecting money and it's really hurting our default rates. We are thinking to build in a verification process probably at the end of the first two weeks. We're working through the details and keep you posted. I want to give you a heads up. You heard Dr. Harris talk about developmental
Ed. We need to kick off a major taskforce to look at developmental education. We will do it next fall. Just a heads up at this point in time. We have a lot of issues we need to figure out how to do a better job of integrating. Strategizing, I wish I could give you details but there are no details. You heard we're doing a program review on student services. We want very thorough, thoughtful review of student services and think about how we move to more of a student success model. We're good on the intake side, I should say, oriented to intake, lots of the students.

We need to think more about advising, a lot of things you heard about today I'm nervous about jumping in and doing. We need to step back to our homework in a thoughtful methodical way and look at best practice, and that will happen next fall in addition to self-study. There are plenty of opportunities to participate in a lot of activities. Any questions, I'll do my best.

>> So, East Campus. When it comes to attendance, I would like to ask if we consider online attendance. It's hard --

>> That's a good point.

>> Did they attend, if you have homework before 45 days, it's all right. But even if you don't they may be able to pass the class.

>> I'll add it to the list of things we need to think about. It's an excellent point. I wish I had an answer.

>> Rosa Morales. My question is regarding program (inaudible), last year I attended the group, the DSR program review. And I think it was beneficial to have different opinions among the staff. I was the only faculty member attending. My question is, do you think it's possible in the future that those
going through the program review, (inaudible)

>> Yes. And students. I think it's important we have students in student services review.

>> I included students, because they were not included. The committee agreed I could survey some of the students into the survey of services. And I was able to be their voice.

>> Diane Porter. I'm almost embarrassed to ask. The student response work committee. Is that pushed aside to deal with later, or still in the process?

>> Actually, we have several meetings scheduled that HLC has assigned. It's still in the works. I wish I could tell you more. I don't know more.

>> 7.6.

>> Mary -- West campus, in order to better reinforce my role model Dr. Bigler, I'm talking to this microphone here.

I'm going to give you an update on the -- on time registration work group. The faculty senate (inaudible), that brings me to one of the first points. We've been taking about the importance of framing, -- for 20 years, talking about abolishing late registration. As the committee started to meet, we got philosophical, we realized what we're really trying to do is encourage student enrolling on time and it's important to bring what we're doing in the affirmative rather than framing things that seem like we're taking rights away. The work group that you approved the existence of when you voted overwhelmingly to abolish late registration -- on time registration workgroup.

Okay, so speaking of not wanting to suggest we're talking away rights, I
want to re-emphasize that even though there are plans afoot to shorten the
(inaudible), faculty are retaining the privilege of being able to sign in a
student at any time for any reason, at any point during any semester. A
kind-hearted colleague reminded me to remind you of that. To reassure that
faculty at their discretion can sign in a student at any time for any reason.
Even though we are trying to shorten it, don't worry. You can still open the
floodgates and let the troubled students into classes.

There's another item in my report, we need additional members. We
have been privileged to have the brilliance of Pat (inaudible), but she is
transitioning out of involvement in the group. She has found a replacement.
Rob Wakefield. I'm happy to meet him if he is here. I want to encourage
additional faculty. Especially people not from west campus, if you think you
are interested in joining the on time registration workgroup. Contact me.

So I'll hit the highlights of what we did on the meeting of May 1, we have
been active. I made 15 agenda items, 15 different things.
We have been crafting, revising surveys, you will be receiving sometime early
in the fall. And it's going to ask you about your preferences for shortening
the window of final for the added period.

So we're still working on the wording of that, but we want to know your
feelings. When I say, you, I mean all faculty. And a bunch of other people
such as exempt and non-exempt, I don't know how to say the classifications.

Many different types of faculty.
Including educational support faculty.
Okay, we are going to continue to acknowledge what we're doing, doing
things slowly, carefully. Avoiding unintended consequences and just
beginning to think about shortening the window for 60 week classes only.

Not any other length of classes.

So I want you to know we are carefully, being gentle, gradual, we're thinking of like should we shorten the window by one day, in the fall of 2014. Something like that.

However, there were a number of other things that we were talking about in a very fruitful set of discussions about all the many ways we can ensure student success. One of the things we have been thinking about is revival of mandatory (inaudible).

The history of mandatory orientation. And this is a way of telling students, show up on the first day of class. That's something what we talked about. And also thinking about bringing back advising, in which case faculty will be allowed to have conversations with students about the responsibility of showing up to class, and not registering three weeks into the semester.

Advising outreach to the PCC activity matrix. All of us trying to get a step can check a box to get credit if we are doing something like visiting area high schools, and talking about what PCC can do for them. But with the emphasis on, you have to play by our rules, like registration on time and showing up to close on time.

Another thing is that we are trying to coordinate work in parallel, with the prerequisite workgroup. And ideally we are (inaudible), working in conjunction with the (inaudible), to make sure some of their work, that we're not reinventing the wheel. We're on the same page with the idea about what promotes student success.

We have discussed moving a date earlier. There's an official name.
Student for non-payment date. If it can be moved (inaudible), as students are swept out for non-payment. That's a good idea. And a lot of modular parallel, characteristics, such as early bird discount for registering early. Maybe prizes for students first to register, trying to think of any way we can to get student to behave in a timely manner in terms of registering as well as showing up for class on the first day. It's so important. That's like a fly-over of a meeting that had 15 items.

I'm trying to talk fast. It's late in the day.

Are there questions or snarky remarks. Rob?

>> (inaudible)

>> It's going to all faculty, whether the faculty are full time, adjunct faculty or educational support faculty. I think that's the only three categories. If I'm leaving out one, we have a person knowledgeable that knows all the categories. I think we're sending the survey to everybody other than anybody in administrative positions.

I'm not sure.

JEANNIE: Why are you not giving it to administrators? Don't you think their input is part of the decision making? Like it or not, I think they are a valuable source of information.

>> Um, there was a person much better able at thinking fast on their feet that made a well-reasoned argument that I cannot recall as to why we were not including them in the scope of who we are sending it to. It's not to say we won't change our minds.

JEANNIE: You separate the groups out and get influence. That may be another piece of the picture to see if we have that kind of (inaudible) this
Right. In theory, I agree with what you are saying.

Rosa, West Campus. What about including the administrators that teach? Including them as teachers (inaudible)

Right.

(inaudible)

I will make a note to take that back to the committee. That's a good point.

Any other questions or comments?

Thanks. Okay, a couple different things. I've met with a group called Moving Forward. And that has representatives, (inaudible), a couple of administrators working with us, too, Michael and Brian. Basically it's a brainstorming group working with facilitators that identify the values important for us to move forward in some of the obstacles we are facing. That will be something as we go forward. I'll let you know about it. I'm going to meet with various people around town.

I met with (inaudible), that's a group of business people, heavy hitters in Tucson. They have gotten (inaudible), a very interesting group. I think they are going to continue, they also want to support a recall effort. And they have the resources and money to do it. That's a long process in itself, but they are committed to changing the government.

The Senate leadership met with two board members this past week (inaudible), Marty Cortez, and they reiterated the Senate's position, (inaudible), we would like them to resign and also enable the search process. They
(inaudible) I asked them if they were going to resign after that. I didn't get an answer. We (inaudible), I think we can handle the HLC situation. The governance issue is a larger problem and that takes time to wind down.

Student success oriented and opportunity to push things now we depth have a year ago. In that sense, we look as a great opportunity and we should take advantage of it. I think we can (inaudible) straighten out the governance part.

One thing (inaudible), we may not always see eye to eye but they are influential. We need to go after bonds. These are the kind of people. They hire our graduates and have a perspective that we don't have in-house. Again, (inaudible). Good things have come out of this whole bizarre situation.

I want to remind you about the solidarity march next Wednesday. Symbols do count for things. We are diligent in terms of our approach. Board meetings, we should be proud of ourselves. And if you have the opportunity on Wednesday, come out, these are important. It's a very visual media event.

We had a good year, we opened up a lot of issues and I think it's been successful. I want to thank you all for you are participation and interest. It's been a good year. I want to thank the senate officers for being supportive and I'm looking forward to going out, the governance crisis is a terrible thing. We have a lot of opportunities and keep our heads up and make the most of it while we can. With that in mind, do I have a motion to adjourn?

Second, all in favor. Aye.

Thanks a lot.