Accreditation & Institutional Quality (AIQ) Report

02/25/26

Charge of the Committee:

1. Ensure accreditation is an on-going process by guiding preparation of the self-evaluation, midterm, and follow-up reports.
2. Review and monitor collection of evidence and progress on actionable improvement plans, accreditation recommendations, and institutional effectiveness indicators.
3. Inform, engage, and involve the college community in accreditation policies and institutional effectiveness practices.
4. Review and monitor evaluation activities to ensure they result in integrated, meaningful, and sustained college improvement.

Announcements:

- N/A

Completed Items:

- AIQ Survey for Fall 2025 results will be presented to the Senate at an upcoming meeting this Spring 2026.

Upcoming Items:

- Continued efforts: **Review Process for the RSI review**. RSI reviews will begin in March for all courses that have a DE component. The reviews will happen in three groups (short-term courses, full-term courses, and late-start courses). Please see the attached documents for more details on the process and specific review criteria:
  - Appendix A: **DE Review Process Timeline & Workflow**.
  - Appendix B: **Review Criteria**
- Institution Set Standards (ISS) review, **Spring 2026**.

Respectfully submitted,

Grace Commiso, Faculty Chair
Ximena Ortega, Classified Chair
Jessica Wojtysiak, Admin Chair

Appendix A: DE Review Process Timeline & Workflow

Timeline & Workflow

Action	Date	Activity	Details
Complete	09/23/2025	AIQ Committee Meeting	First read of the draft pilot review process. Initial feedback gathered.
Complete	09/24 – 10/13/2025	Office Hours	AIQ Faculty Chair held open office hours to collect feedback and revise the draft. Participants included AIQ members, Academic Technology Faculty, and DE Taskforce Discipline Faculty.
Complete	10/14/25	AIQ Committee Meeting	Second read of the revised process. Vote postponed to allow for further revisions.
Complete	10/28/2025	AIQ Committee Meeting:	Final revisions to the pilot process and timeline approved. Committee agreed to conduct vote virtually.
Complete	10/29/2025	AIQ Committee Virtual Vote	Formal vote on the finalized Pilot Review Process and timeline.
Complete	10/29/2025	Academic Senate	AIQ report presented as an information item.
Complete	10/30/2025	Volunteers Invitation Sent	Academic Technology will email all online faculty seeking volunteers for the pilot review. A minimum of 20 faculty needed. Volunteers must have taught a Fall 2025 online course.
Complete	11/04/2025	AIQ Special Meeting	Pilot reviewers will be trained and normed using a shared course shell. Reviewers will compare evaluations to ensure rubric validity and consistency. • Committee met and normed Substantive Interactions. Work still to be done to norm Regular Interactions. 11/4/25 GC
~~Removed~~	~~11/05 - 11/17/2025~~	~~Pilot Review Period~~	~~Assigned reviewers will evaluate volunteer course shells. AIQ Faculty Chair will host drop-in hours for support and troubleshooting.~~
Complete	11/05 – 11/12/2025	AIQ Committee Virtual Correspondence	AIQ committee members with approved guests, excluding educational administrators, will engage in virtual correspondence on norming the last section of the RSI Rubric for Regular Interactions.
Complete	11/13/2025	Office Hours	AIQ Faculty Chair will hold office hours for AIQ members and approved guests, excluding educational administrators, to review final revisions to the Regular Interactions section of the RSI Rubric.
Complete	11/17/2025	Assignments for Review	The AIQ faculty chair provided a video demonstration to reviewers on how to use the draft pilot review rubric. AIQ members with approved guests, excluding educational administrators, assigned to volunteer course shells to begin review at AIQ on 11/18/25.

Action	Date	Activity	Details
Complete	11/18/2025	AIQ Committee Meeting	Time allocated ~~for remaining reviews and process check-in~~ to begin the review process in assigned groups. Educational Administrators are excused during review discussions.
Complete	11/19 – 12/01/2025	Office Hours & Post-Pilot Debrief	AIQ Faculty Chair held office hours to provide additional support to reviewers. Review will wrap up with a debrief at the next AIQ committee meeting.
Complete	12/02/2025	AIQ Committee Meeting	Final review wrap-up. Review teams will finalize reviews and debrief.
Complete	12/03 – 12/12/2025	Reviewers Post-Pilot Survey	A structured post-pilot survey will be distributed to all reviewers, and the results will be reviewed in the Spring semester.
Complete	12/03/2025	Academic Senate	AIQ report presented as an information item.
Complete	12/04/2025	Feedback to Volunteer Faculty	Feedback will be provided to volunteer faculty on how their course was reviewed.
Complete	12/08 - 12/11/2025	Finals Week RSI Workshops	Finally, Academic Technology will host workshops during finals week for any faculty interested in learning more about the review criteria and how to ensure their online courses meet RSI standards with small strategic changes.
Complete	01/15/2026	Spring Opening Day	VPI Wojtysiak shared the faculty RSI training cohort data with the campus community.
Complete	01/28/2026	Academic Senate	VIP Wojtysiak and Faculty Chair Commiso shared with the Academic Senate recommendations regarding the inclusion of hybrid sections in the RSI review process.
Complete	02/05/2026	College Council	VIP Wojtysiak and Faculty Chair Commiso shared with the College Council the recommendations regarding the inclusion of hybrid courses in the RSI review process.
Complete	02/06 – 02/25/2026	Additional Reviewer Recruitment & RSI Trainings	Recruitment for additional faculty reviewers for the Spring 2026 review. Recruitment through AIQ/RSI representatives, GPS Faculty Leads, and an announcement at the 02/11/2026 Academic Senate meeting. Academic Technology faculty host training opportunities through short professional development workshops, individual appointments, and open office hours for faculty seeking assistance with self-reviewing RSI in their courses.

Action	Date	Activity	Details
Complete	02/11/2026	Academic Senate	The Senate voted to adopt the AIQ recommendation to include hybrid courses in the RSI review process and require hybrid instructors to complete the RSI training to be approved to teach hybrid effective Fall 2026. Additionally, the Senate approved 18 faculty members-at-large to AIQ to support the Spring RSI reviews.
Complete	02/12/2026	Feedback	Fall 2025 RSI Rubric Testing: The AIQ Faculty Chair sent participants a one-question Academic Technology survey to help better support faculty moving forward.
Complete	02/12 – 02/24/2026	AIQ Committee Virtual Vote	AIQ unanimously approved a timeline and group structure for RSI reviews: **Timeline** **February 27th**: In-person reviewer training **Week of February 24th**: Zoom Training with Academic Technology, for those unable to attend on the 27th (*dates and times TBD*) **March 1st- March 15th**: Group 1 reviews (about 200) - Deadline for revisions**: March 29th** **March 15th-April 12th**: Do Group 2 review (about 500) (*Note: Spring Break falls within this period*) - Deadline for revisions**: April 26th** **April 12th-April 26th**: Do Group 3 review (about 200) - Deadline for revisions: **May 10th** **Groups** - Group 1: 6- or 8-week courses offered from the start of the semester - Group 2: Semester-long courses - Group 3: 8-week courses beginning mid-semester
Complete	02/23/2026	CCA Agenda Item	Proposal for the inclusion of an unpublished RSI page for reviewers. CCA unanimously supports the proposal.
Complete	02/24/2026	AIQ Committee Meeting	Proposal for the inclusion of an unpublished RSI page for reviewers. AIQ unanimously supports the proposal.
	02/25/2026	Academic Senate	Proposal for the inclusion of an unpublished RSI page for reviewers. AIQ is looking for the Senate's support. Additional faculty on the consent agenda for approval as faculty members-at-large to assist with the reviews.

Action	Date	Activity	Details
	02/26 – 03/02/2026	AIQ Committee Virtual Vote	AIQ to conduct a virtual vote on the communication timeline for reviewers. This will determine the turnaround time for reviews and the method of communication that faculty will receive once the review is complete.
	02/27/2026	Reviewer Training	Academic Technology is hosting a new reviewer training for those recently approved by the Senate. The training will help reviewers learn how to norm reviews and ensure consistency in the review process.
	03/02 – 03/15/2026	RSI Reviews	Group 1 reviews (about 200) Individual communication about review status (pass/fail) should be sent to faculty within a (TBD – pending AIQ virtual vote) timeframe. Faculty who do not pass any portion of the review will be encouraged to make corrections by **March 29th,** with a re-review to occur no later than April 10th.
	03/10/2026	AIQ Committee Meeting	A portion of committee time will be allocated to perform reviews.
	03/15 – 04/12/2026	RSI Reviews	Group 2 review (about 500) (*Note: Spring Break falls within this period*) Individual communication about review status (pass/fail) should be sent to faculty within a (TBD – pending AIQ virtual vote) timeframe. Faculty who do not pass any portion of the review will be encouraged to make corrections by **April 26th,** with a re-review to occur no later than May 1st.
	04/12 – 04/26/2026		Group 3 review (about 200) Individual communication about review status (pass/fail) should be sent to faculty within a (TBD – pending AIQ virtual vote) timeframe. Faculty who do not pass any portion of the review will be encouraged to make corrections by **May 10th,** with a re-review to occur no later than May 15th.

This is a living document and may be updated as the process evolves and new insights emerge.

Appendix B: Review Criteria

Substantive Interaction:

Is engaging students in teaching, learning, and assessment consistent with the content under discussion, and also includes **at least two of the following criteria**:

Criteria	Standard	Observed	Notes for Reviewer	Evidence Locations
Criteria A: Providing direct instruction. (Note: this method only applies in synchronous courses.)	Does the syllabus indicate scheduled Zoom class sessions?	True/False	Fully online asynchronous courses will not meet this standard as they do not have scheduled meeting times. The face-to-face component of a hybrid course will not meet this requirement either as this is measuring the DE portion of the course only.	Look at the course syllabus either as a liquid syllabus or a linked document from the left-side menu, for scheduled required meeting times.

Criteria	Standard	Observed	Notes for Reviewer	Evidence Locations
Criteria B: Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework.	Does the instructor provide constructive feedback on 75% of all student coursework?	True/False	Unless otherwise specified in the orientation module, welcome module in week 1, or the communication plan provided to students, the course must demonstrate feedback on 75% of assessments (verbal feedback in synchronous courses, or publisher content cannot count as constructive feedback for the DE portion of a course). Canvas quizzes designed by the instructor with detailed feedback for incorrect responses are acceptable, as long as the instructor provides weekly feedback via submission comments or rubrics on other assignments. Review the RSI hidden page, if available, for the instructor's feedback on how they plan to meet this standard. Use a sample of A, B, C, D, & F students to verify that 75% of their coursework has constructive feedback. Additionally, use a sample of assignments' SpeedGrader comments to provide substantive feedback to all students.	Review SpeedGrader submission comments annotations on written assignments, free-form commentary within detailed rubrics (consisting of constructive feedback for each criteria), audio or video feedback, etc. Select Grades from the left-side menu > select the ellipsis menu dots next to an assignment title to open SpeedGrader.
Criteria C-1: Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency.	Are two announcements sent each week that go beyond reminders (e.g., sharing trends in assignments, highlighting key concepts, and/or synthesizing concepts)?	True/False	***All four questions under Criteria C must be true to pass the criteria:*** Scheduled announcements are ok, but need to demonstrate meeting the standard and be related to course content.	Review the announcements tab in the left-side menu.

Criteria	Standard	Observed	Notes for Reviewer	Evidence Locations
Criteria C-2: Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency.	Is there instructor presence in each module (e.g., video, audio, or recorded presentations or interactive lessons created or mediated by the instructor)?	True/False	***All four questions under Criteria C must be true to pass the criteria:*** Demonstrated on at least one page in each module. Can you tell that the instructor has curated the content on at least one page in each module? Linking to videos or outside content/websites without connecting them to the content is not sufficient.	Review pages within the modules. If the modules are not linked from the home page, navigate to the modules from the modules tab in the left-side menu.
Criteria C-3: Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency.	Does the instructor encourage questions and student participation in learning activities weekly (e.g., invitations to attend office hours, special study sessions)?	True/False	***All four questions under Criteria C must be true to pass the criteria:*** Unless otherwise specified in the orientation module or welcome module in week 1 (e.g., is there a Q&A board where the instructor is actively participating and encouraging student participation)?	Review the announcements tab from the left-side menu. Are there weekly announcements that encourage participation and learning (e.g., an invitation to attend office hours)? Review discussion boards for instructor participation in encouraging student participation by selecting Discussions in the left-side menu. Additionally, review weekly module overviews. Is the instructor encouraging students to participate in learning activities? Both the announcements and the discussion boards have search features, search for keywords.

Criteria	Standard	Observed	Notes for Reviewer	Evidence Locations
Criteria C-4: Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency.	Does the instructor respond to student questions within 48 hours?	True/False	***All four questions under Criteria C must be true to pass the criteria:*** Unless otherwise specified in the orientation module or welcome module in week 1.	SpeedGrader submission comments (are there student responses/questions and instructor responses). Additionally, review course analytics > select students > select a student > select communication > communication bars indicate direct messages between the student and the instructor. Use a sample of students to determine whether an instructor is responding to communications within the designated 48hr timeframe.
Criteria D	Does instructor actively participate in regular discussions?	True/False	Discussions are to occur throughout 50% of the course. Faculty are to provide 2+ comments in the main discussion and/or replies to students in the discussion board. Faculty commentary needs to go beyond simple approval by posing questions, proposing alternative viewpoints, connecting ideas, and encouraging struggling students.	Review the discussion boards tab in the left-side menu. In the search bar at the top of the discussion board, type the instructor's name to narrow the search.

Regular Interaction:

Between a student and an instructor(s) is **demonstrated by the two following criteria**:

Criteria	Standard	Observed	Notes for Reviewer	Evidence Locations
Criteria A: Providing the opportunity for substantive interactions with the student on a predictable and regular basis commensurate with the	Does the instructor provide weekly opportunities for interaction?	True/False	Possible options: Does the instructor enable students to comment on announcements? Are the announcements scheduled weekly? If not, are there enough opportunities between the	If there are weekly discussions scheduled that meet this standard. Review the announcements and discussion boards in the left-side menu. If the instructor is providing weekly feedback and opportunities for the

Criteria	Standard	Observed	Notes for Reviewer	Evidence Locations
length of time and the amount of content in the course or competency.			announcements and discussion boards to count as weekly interactions?	student to respond, they meet this standard.
Criteria B: Monitoring the student's academic engagement and success and ensuring that an instructor is responsible for promptly and proactively engaging in substantive interaction with the student when needed on the basis of such monitoring, or upon request by the student.	Is there evidence that the instructor is monitoring student performance?	True/False	Possible options: Does the instructor outline, in an orientation or welcome week module, the communication plan provided to students, and the syllabus, how they will monitor student performance (e.g., participation in Starfish progress reports, monitoring student participation, etc.)? And/or does the instructor provide constructive feedback for how to improve on 75% or more of assessments?	Review the first module, the syllabus, and announcements for instructions on monitoring student performance (e.g., Starfish progress reports, inactivity policy, and any other reminders on how the instructor monitors student performance, such as on missed or late assignments, etc.). Review SpeedGrader submission comments for comments on how to improve. Review the communication tab in course analytics (course analytics > select students > select a student > select communication > communication bars indicate direct messages between the student and the instructor).