

Accreditation & Institutional Quality (AIQ) Report

04/29/26

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.
- Institution Set Standards (ISS) review, **Spring 2026**: no recommended changes at this time, although AIQ recognizes that BC is meeting or exceeding several ISS and aspirational goals that should be reviewed for revisions in 2026-27.

Upcoming Items:

- Continued efforts: Review Process for the RSI review.
 - AIQ Provided Opportunities for Faculty to provide feedback:
 - Public comments at the Tuesday, April 14, 2026, AIQ Committee Meeting not meant for open dialogue but a listening session for AIQ only
 - A couple of guests were present, but no public comments were made
 - Open forums for open dialogue and Q&A time, with approximately 25-35 participants at each forum, on the following dates/times:
 - Wednesday, April 15, 2026, 9 am-10 am and 2 pm-3 pm
 - Tuesday, April 21, 2026, 9 am-10 am and 3 pm-4 pm
 - AIQ ensured that the Review Criteria, previously shared through email and the AIQ Senate report appendix, were published to the faculty resources website.
 - AIQ compiled common questions and responses from the forums into an **RSI Question and Answer** document, attached to this report, that will be emailed to all faculty and published to the faculty resources website.

Respectfully submitted,

Grace Commiso, Faculty Chair

Ximena Ortega, Classified Chair

Jessica Wojtysiak, Admin Chair

I. RSI Standards, Framework, and Reviewer Authority

Which standards apply to RSI review?

Q: *Both standards?*

A: Yes. **Both Substantive Interaction and Regular Interaction** are required to meet RSI standards.

What does “RSI Review Criteria” refer to?

Q: *It currently says RSI Review Criteria—what does that mean?*

A: This refers to the **framework reviewers are using to assess Regular and Substantive Interaction** in courses. There is no rubric being used; faculty either meet standards or they do not.

Can Matt or Alex determine if a course meets RSI when meeting with faculty?

Q: *Is it approved for Matt or Alex to determine whether a course meets RSI during faculty meetings?*

A: Yes. If Academic Technology faculty members, **Matt or Alex, meet with a faculty and determine the course should have passed**, or now passes since the initial review, they will **email the RSI coordinator** confirming that determination.

II. Instructor Presence and Teaching the Content

Do recorded lecture videos count toward instructor presence?

Q: *I record lecture videos with my voice—does that count, or are separate video announcements required?*

A: **Recorded lecture videos absolutely count.** Videos are not required, but it must be clear that the content was curated by the faculty member. It is highly recommended that faculty add clear guidance on how they meet this standard in the required unpublished RSI Notes to Reviewer Canvas page.

Do PowerPoint slides without audio or video count as instructor presence?

Q: *If a PowerPoint is created by the professor without audio or video, does it still count as instructor presence?*

A: A **text header or instructor-created materials can count**, but **slides alone without clear instructor framing, guidance, or interaction may be insufficient**, depending on context and

reviewer interpretation. It is highly recommended that faculty add clear guidance on how they meet this standard in the required unpublished RSI Notes to Reviewer Canvas page.

Does instructor presence require video, especially for OER or textbook-based courses?

Q: *Do I need to create videos to demonstrate instructor presence?*

A: No. **Videos are not required.** Instructor presence can be demonstrated through written content, announcements, discussions, feedback, and guidance—so long as it is clear the material is **curated and provided by the instructor**, not solely by a publisher or automated source.

If departmental faculty co-create course content, does it count as instructor-created?

Q: *If content is created collaboratively by BC faculty, does it still meet RSI expectations?*

A: Yes. The purpose of the criteria is to ensure that **faculty are actively teaching the content**, not merely assigning materials. Content may be **departmentally or collaboratively curated**, but the instructor of record must demonstrate ongoing instruction and engagement with that content. This can be shown through evidence such as **instructor-led lecture videos (one example), guided explanations, or other instructional interventions** that make clear the instructor is teaching and interacting with students around the material—not simply hosting it. Faculty should clarify how this instructional role is fulfilled in the RSI Notes to Reviewer page.

III. Interaction with Students (Discussions, Announcements, Messaging)

Do instructors need to reply in discussion boards to meet the criteria?

Q: *If I have weekly discussions, is that enough?*

A: Not necessarily. **Instructor replies matter.** Simply assigning discussions without **active instructor participation (2+ replies)** will not meet the criteria.

Can referring students to a pinned discussion count as interaction?

Q: *Does referring students to a pinned discussion work?*

A: Yes, **referring students to structured, instructor-managed discussion spaces can count for regular interaction**, if interaction expectations are clear.

Do announcements need to invite students to office hours or messaging?

Q: *I thought announcements had to invite students to office hours or messaging—do they?*

A: Explicit invitations can help demonstrate instructor availability, but they are **not the only way** to meet the standard.

What language helps meet the “student-initiated interaction” criteria?

Q: *How do we encourage students to actually reply or engage?*

A: Reviewers emphasized adding **explicit encouragement**, such as clear invitations for students to reply to announcements, reasons *why* students should engage, and multiple contact options within announcements.

Is there a practical example of an effective contact/interaction announcement?

Q: *What does an announcement that meets RSI interaction criteria look like?*

A: Examples that helped some faculty successfully meet RSI criteria include inviting students to office hours, encouraging replies directly to the announcement, offering Canvas messaging, or using a “Question Café” or community space.

Can instructors create a weekly informal interaction space?

Q: *Would something like a weekly “Ask & Answer” be acceptable?*

A: Yes. A recurring **Ask & Answer or Q&A format** is positively received as a manageable way to demonstrate regular interaction. However, faculty must have interactions in this space, if available, to meet the criteria.

IV. Communication Tools, Analytics, and Documentation

Does responding to Canvas messages through Outlook or email count as RSI interaction?

Q: *If I respond to Canvas messages through Outlook or email, does that count?*

A: While responding via Outlook can support student communication, **email replies do not reliably appear in Canvas analytics or reviewer evidence**. To ensure interaction is visible and verifiable, faculty are **strongly encouraged to respond within the Canvas Inbox**.

How are third-party or external communication tools (Pronto, mobile replies, texting) reviewed?

Q: *How is interaction tracked if I use tools like Pronto or mobile email?*

A: Some third-party tools may be visible to reviewers, but **visibility is not guaranteed**. Interaction that occurs outside standard Canvas tools should be **explicitly explained and contextualized** in the RSI Notes to Reviewer page so reviewers understand how regular interaction is occurring.

How should instructors document interaction that is not obvious in Canvas analytics?

Q: *What if I interact with students, but it doesn't clearly show up in analytics?*

A: The RSI Notes to Reviewer page is the recommended place to **explain where, how, and how often interaction occurs**, especially when analytics may not fully capture it. This minimizes reviewer guesswork.

Why do reviewers value the RSI Notes to Reviewer pages so much?

Q: *Why are RSI Notes pages repeatedly recommended?*

A: RSI Notes to Reviewer unpublished page will be required for all distance education faculty, effective Fall 2026. They show **how the instructor believes they meet each standard**, reduce reviewer guesswork, and minimize misinterpretation of interaction intent.

V. Feedback, Grading, and Learning Activities

Are detailed rubrics alone sufficient to meet feedback expectations?

Q: *If I provide detailed rubrics, are written comments still required?*

A: Detailed rubrics **can count as feedback**, but reviewers must be able to see evidence that feedback is **substantive, instructor-provided, and regularly occurring**. If rubric feedback is not obvious, faculty should clarify their feedback process in the RSI Notes to Reviewer page.

VI. Hybrid, Modality, and Course Design Considerations

Will hybrid (in-person) courses be reviewed under RSI?

Q: *Will hybrid courses be included in the official fall review, and will criteria differ?*

A: Yes, **hybrid standards will be implemented in the fall**. More guidance is forthcoming.

Will discussion post minimums apply to hybrid courses?

Q: *Will online discussion requirements still apply even with in-person discussions?*

A: This is still under consideration, but the **criteria may be adapted** to account for in-person interaction. More guidance is forthcoming.

How should instructors clarify hybrid course format for reviewers?

Q: *Where should we identify whether a hybrid course uses in-person meetings or Zoom hours?*

A: Best practice is to **clearly state this in multiple places**, such as the syllabus, the first module, and the RSI Notes to Reviewer page.

VII. Review Timing, Cycles, and Rereview Process

When during the term are asynchronous and late-start courses reviewed?

Q: *I teach late-start or short-term asynchronous courses. When should I expect my course to be reviewed?*

A: Reviews may occur **at any point during the active term** once meaningful instructional activity is visible.

Will hybrid or DE courses be reviewed before or during the semester?

Q: *If I am teaching a hybrid or DE course, will it be reviewed before the semester begins or while it is in progress?*

A: RSI reviews are conducted **during the semester**, not prior to start.

Will summer DE courses be reviewed, even if they already passed?

Q: *All DE courses held during the summer will also be reviewed, correct? If we already passed our course will we be reviewed again?*

A: Yes. **Summer DE courses are included in the review cycles**, even if the course has previously passed, as part of the RSI pilot.

What is the deadline for rereview after a first-round non-pass?

Q: *When is the hard deadline for rereview for instructors redeveloping asynchronous courses?*

A: Courses that do not pass have a maximum revision period of two weeks. Courses may be re-reviewed anytime after the two-week revision period.

Should I be worried if my course hasn't been rereviewed yet?

Q: *Should we be concerned if it's been more than two weeks without a rereview?*

A: No. Rereviews may take longer than expected, depending on volume and staffing availability.

VIII. Review Outcomes, Consistency, and Faculty Impact

How is reviewer consistency handled across sections or reviewers?

Q: *If two sections of the same course receive different review outcomes, how is consistency ensured?*

A: Reviewers use the same RSI Review Criteria framework, but **variation can occur** due to differences in visible evidence or interpretation.

What should faculty do if two reviews of the same course reach different conclusions?

Q: *Who has final authority when review outcomes conflict?*

A: Conflicting outcomes should be escalated to **Academic Technology faculty (Matt or Alex)**.

Why do reviews feel strict or unforgiving?

Q: *Why are reviewers erring on the side of “no”?*

A: Reviewers were instructed to **err on the side of not passing if unsure**, to ensure the institution **passes the ACCJC review**.

What happens if a faculty member fails RSI during summer but is already scheduled to teach online in fall?

Q: *How does a summer RSI non-pass affect already scheduled fall courses?*

A: RSI review is an **ongoing, iterative, and conversational process**, not a one-time or automatic determination made in isolation. Outcomes are handled **on a case-by-case basis**, with the goal of ensuring compliance while minimizing disruption.

IX. Office Hours and Faculty Availability

How are office hours handled for asynchronous instructors?

Q: *What is the RSI-approved way to handle office hours for asynchronous (especially adjunct) instructors?*

A: Full-time faculty are required to hold a minimum of five office hours each week, whereas Adjunct faculty are not. Availability must be clearly communicated.

Do adjunct faculty have to hold office hours for RSI?

Q: *I was told I needed office hours, but I am adjunct—has that changed?*

A: Adjunct faculty are **not required** to hold formal office hours. Availability—not formal office hours—is the RSI focus.

X. Resources, Exemplars, and Tools

Are there additional RSI examples or models beyond the DE Handbook?

Q: Are there additional guidelines or exemplars we can use? I followed the DE handbook but still didn't pass.

A: Faculty are encouraged to look at the RSI Review Criteria on the BC website.

Where can I find the official RSI rubric online?

Q: Where exactly is the RSI Review Criteria located on the BC website?

A: Go to BC website → Employees → Faculty Resources → Teaching Resources → Handouts & Resources → BC Basics → RSI Review Criteria.

Are standardized Canvas shells being considered?

Q: Has there been discussion about standardized Canvas shells for faculty?

A: Yes. The idea has been raised, but there is no requirement to use one at this time.

How do Starfish announcements factor into RSI review?

Q: Should "Starfish" be included in announcement titles?

A: Yes. Including "Starfish" in the announcement title helps reviewers recognize that the announcement may not appear weekly.