

ORANGE COAST COLLEGE

Academic Senate Meeting | Oct. 29, 2024 | 11:30 am - 12:30 pm | Student Union 214/Zoom Link: <https://cccd-edu.zoom.us/j/83950717582>

Academic Senate Member Attendance

Jason Ball, <i>Part Time Faculty</i>	Present	Kate McCarroll, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Carol Barnes, <i>Counseling</i>	Present	Irene Naesse, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Lauren Becker, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Jeanne Neil, <i>Business & Computing</i>	Absent
Allissa Blystone, <i>Math & Sciences</i>	Absent	Leland Paxton, <i>Part Time Faculty</i>	Present
Eric Budwig, <i>Technology</i>	Absent	Lori Pullman, <i>Curriculum Chair, Parliamentarian</i>	Present
Jodie Della Marna, <i>Library</i>	Present	Loren Sachs, <i>at-Large</i>	Present
Rendell Drew, <i>at-Large, President</i>	Present	Katherine Sheehan, <i>Visual & Performing Arts</i>	Present
Carly Gonzalez, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Jordan Stanton, <i>Social & Beh. Sciences</i>	Present
Lee Gordon, <i>at-Large, Vice President</i>	Present	Lily Ei, <i>ASOCC Student Representative</i>	Absent
Marilyn Kennedy, <i>Lit & Lang, PDI Chair, Secretary</i>	Present	Vacant, <i>at-Large</i>	Vacant
Jodie Legaspi-Kiaha, <i>Athletics & Kin</i>	Present	Vacant, <i>Part Time Faculty</i>	Vacant
Vesna Marcina, <i>at-Large</i>	Present	Vacant, <i>Consumer & Health Science</i>	Vacant

Please see the Voting Tally Chart after these minutes for individual members' votes.

Guests (Optional & Voluntary Sign-In): Rupa Saran, Anna Hanlon, Laura Behr, and Tara Giblin.

1. Preliminary Matters

- A. **Call to Order:** President Drew called the meeting to order at 11:30 A.M.
- B. **Public Comments:** No comments.
- C. **Approval of the Minutes:** *Motion 1: Senator Kennedy moved to approve the October 15, 2024, meeting minutes;* seconded; approved. *Motion 2: Senator Kennedy moved to approve the October 22, 2024, meeting minutes;* seconded; approved.
- D. **For the Good of the Order:**

Senator Rendell Drew: I would like to express my gratitude to Vice-President Lee Gordon for his leadership in organizing the recent celebration of life for our esteemed colleague, Professor Dennis Kelly. It was meaningful to have his wife, Laurie, along with other family members and friends in attendance. I also appreciate the support from my colleagues at the Academic Senate that allowed Vice-President Gordon and me to make this motion at our meeting.

2. Consent Agenda:

- A. **Academic Standards Committee Representative:** Jessica Asbell
- B. **Online Advisory Board (OAB) Representative:** Melissa Barrios
- C. **College Technology Committee Representative:** Laura Reese
- D. **Accreditation Coordinating Committee Representative:** Charlene Reed
- E. **Transparency Committee Representative:** Andy Stuart
- F. **IPC Handbook – The words “in person” were removed from Item 12 on the IPC Handbook [page 6]:** “Co-chairs will lead the agenda and assure facilitation and mediation of discussion.”

Motion 3: Senator Gordon moved to approve the consent agenda; seconded; approved.

3. Officer, Senator, & Committee Reports

A. Academic Senate President and Vice President Reports:

1. **President Rendell Drew:** I would like to extend my sincere thanks to Vice President Lee Gordon for organizing a special meeting last week to honor our esteemed colleague, Dennis Kelly. The event provided an opportunity for us to engage in public humility and reflect on our humanity. It is important to recognize significant contributions from colleagues like Dennis, who dedicated many years to our aquarium and community.

Sylvia Mendez: I also want to highlight the unveiling of a historical plaque for Sylvia Mendez today in the Allied Health Division from 3:00 to 3:30 PM at the Consumer Health Sciences Division office. This is a meaningful event, especially in light of Assembly Bill 1805, which was passed with bipartisan support. This legislation enables us to include the historical context of Mendez et al. versus Westminster School District in California's educational curriculum, a vital step in acknowledging our past.

Academic Rank: Regarding faculty matters, the OCC faculty can petition for a change in academic rank this fall. Those who received tenure should have been notified of their upgrade to assistant professor. If you wish to submit a petition, please do so by November 25, and you will receive feedback by the end of the month.

UDolt Advantage Volunteers: Additionally, Dr. Andreea Serban has sent out a call for faculty volunteers to evaluate the UDolt Advantage and the Pope Tech accessibility dashboards. Each college is asked to provide 20 volunteers. If you are interested, please let me or Beatriz know so we can track participation.

State Academic Senate: I am also advocating for greater involvement at the state level by requesting a state-level presenter for our Academic Senate. I welcome your suggestions on topics of interest, such as AI or academic freedom, as we develop a new AI policy and clarify the principles of the 10 +1.

Coast Colleague of the Year: Lastly, nominations for the Coast Colleague of the Year award are now open. If you know a professor who goes above and beyond to ensure student success, please encourage them to be nominated. The nomination period closes on November 13.

2. **Vice President Lee Gordon:**

Sylvia Mendez: As President Drew indicated; this afternoon, there will be an unveiling of a plaque dedicated to Sylvia Mendez in the Allied Health Building of the ABC Buildings complex.

By now, the extraordinary accomplishments of Gonzalo and Felicitas Mendez, of David Marcus and of the Guzmán, Palomino, Estrada and Ramirez families are probably familiar to the members of the Academic Senate and to the OCC community.

It is a story of *Ordinary* people doing something extraordinary. They got together and organized and financed a case entered on the legal argument that segregation in education *violated* the equal protection clause of the 14th Amendment. The plaintiffs *prevailed* in the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals to end segregation in education in California. This was a tremendous accomplishment, and it should serve as an inspiration to future generations

There are tributes to Mr. and Mrs. Mendez and to the case. In Westminster there is the Mendez Tribute Monument Park and in Santa Ana there is the Mendez Fundamental Intermediate School. But the plaque at OCC is different. The OCC plaque is *specifically*

dedicated to Sylvia Mendez, who kept the story of her family's triumph alive and who worked so hard and so effectively to make this story widely known in this state.

Sandra Mendez Duran, Sylvia Mendez's younger sister, was born *after* the historic events of the Mendez v. Westminster case. When Sandra Mendez was in college, one of her classes assigned this textbook, "North from Mexico". Sandra came to this section, "The Westminster Case" and Sandra Mendez saw her parents' and her siblings' names in this book, and she learned for the *first* time about the historic case that *her* family had played the central role in. You see, after a couple of decades, the case had faded from memory, and it is possible that we would not know of the Mendez v. Westminster case today but for the persistence and commitment of one of OCC's greatest alums, Sylvia Mendez. Sylvia's Mendez's success in promoting this inspiring story into becoming a key part of California history is worthy of our celebration.

I want to thank Dr. Drew for championing the Sylvia Mendez Plaque, Dr. Suarez for her support and our friends and colleagues at the CHS Division and especially the Allied Health faculty and the interim Deans for being so responsive to President Drew and me when we pitched the plaque idea to them. Sylvia Mendez is an Allied Health alum of OCC and I'm excited that the *idea* of a plaque in the Allied Health Bldg. honoring her is now a *reality*.

B. Accreditation Coordinating Committee (ACC) Co-Chair Anna Hanlon:

You have been receiving weekly emails regarding the ISER review, and I would like to encourage your participation. If time is limited, please prioritize providing feedback on Standards 2.1, 2.2, and 2.3, which focus on essential aspects of our curriculum. Standard 2.5 addresses scheduling, while Standard 4 includes 4.1 on academic freedom and 4.2 on decision-making. Your input is valuable, and a second review will take place in November.

4. Unfinished Business

A. Coastline Process to Address RSI - Laura Behr, Anna Hanlon, and Dan Johnson (See their handout in the Appendix of these meeting minutes.):

Anna Hanlon: I would like to introduce Dan Johnson, a colleague from Coastline College. Dan will share Coastline's process for addressing RSI and ensuring regular substantive interaction in their classes. He has agreed to provide context on what led to this initiative and to explain their current practices.

Dan Johnson: I am a full-time faculty member at Coastline College, where I teach history. I also serve as co-chair of the Social Sciences Department, Executive Director of the CFE, a member of the Curriculum Committee, as well as the RSI Task Force.

I became involved in RSI policy at Coastline in 2016 while serving as the coordinator of the Faculty Center. During that time, we received a visit from the Federal Department of Education, which was investigating financial aid issues in the District. As part of this investigation, they examined our distance education courses and determined that a significant percentage were classified as correspondence courses due to insufficient RSI. The potential consequences were serious, including the possibility of having to repay millions of dollars to the federal government and risking our students' eligibility for federal financial aid, which could have effectively shut down our college.

In response, the Senate leadership met with the College President and the Vice President of Instruction to emphasize that this was a faculty issue and that we should take the lead in addressing it. If we could not address the issue, they indicated that more drastic actions would be necessary due to its significance as a major compliance concern.

The first step taken by the Senate was to pass a general policy on RSI, outlining its definition and expectations for faculty. However, we recognized that this policy was insufficient and required more detailed standards. To address this, we proposed department-level RSI plans to establish minimum acceptable levels of instructor presence in virtual classrooms. In correspondence courses, the instructor is not present, while in distance education courses, the instructor should engage similarly to an onsite instructor. We chose to implement this at the department level rather than college-wide, understanding that different disciplines approach RSI differently.

For example, social sciences differ from math in their methods. Fast forward a few years: we conducted college-wide reviews of our courses and successfully demonstrated to the Department of Education that a sufficient percentage of our courses were true distance learning with adequate RSI. This allowed us to avoid penalties and maintain federal financial aid eligibility. However, we understood that future reviews could occur, prompting us to continue college-wide assessments with a specific focus on adherence to department plans.

We undertook a review three years ago, which proved logistically challenging and met with significant faculty resistance. Despite our efforts to clarify that this was not an evaluation but a review, many faculty felt otherwise. This process highlighted issues with the department plans, such as complexity and lack of clarity. Some faculty were effectively providing RSI but not conforming to the prescribed plans.

Consequently, we decided to take a new direction, which we have been refining over the past three years through numerous discussions and multiple Senate meetings. The current task force is finalizing a draft of the plan, which we aim to roll out in the spring. Our goal is for faculty to develop individualized RSI plans based on standardized guidelines and templates created by the Senate.

We previously approved a draft last year, and with an upcoming ACCJC visit, we are refining our approach to ensure compliance with the clearer guidelines established by the Department of Education and adopted by the state and ACCJC. I participated in a work group over the summer to develop the rubric and guidelines for RSI review, providing us with a clear understanding of the expectations for the visit. Our focus remains on compliance and, equally important, on enhancing the student experience in online courses.

One significant area of discussion has been the definition of "regular" interaction, which the Department of Education left to our discretion. We recognize that regular engagement means some form of RSI each week. Our review process identified different levels of RSI, including low contact RSI, which involves posting substantive announcements or creating other course content. This level of engagement does not require extensive individualized feedback and can often be automated. We also defined high contact RSI as more individualized interaction, such as participation in discussion forums or providing feedback on assignments. While high contact is not required every week, we established standards for the number of weeks in a course that should include this level of engagement. To support implementation, we created a template embedded within courses, allowing instructors to indicate the type of RSI used each week. This template offers standardized categories for high contact, such as participation in discussions or providing individualized feedback, while also allowing for additional activities proposed by faculty, subject to review. Our objective is to provide faculty with the flexibility to teach according to their style while maintaining essential standards. We have confirmed with ACCJC that our approach aligns with their definition of RSI.

Senator Kennedy: Many of us who teach hybrid courses where we meet on Zoom or in person for half the class with half the class on Canvas incorporate both high and low

contact strategies during Zoom or in-person sessions each week. I have noticed that when I send students links separately from class meetings on Zoom or in Canvas, they don't like having to look in many different places for things and this can lead to confusion. I am concerned about adding more layers of communication saying the same thing. As someone who interacts with students in Zoom and conducts frequent conferences, I find that increasing emails/announcements makes it less likely for students to read them, as students become overwhelmed and stop reading them altogether. **Dan Johnson:** Please note that this does not pertain to Zoom classes. However, I believe the ACCJC has a different definition and will evaluate live online classes as distance education. The Zoom component is automatically considered to meet the requirements for regular and substantive interaction (RSI). **Senator Kennedy:** Yes, however, we have been informed at OCC that some elements need to be within our Canvas portion. Since I teach half of my classes on Zoom and the other half on Canvas, I want to clarify that I typically handle most of these activities within either platform. When I add extra resources, such as links, outside of the Canvas or Zoom classroom, students often become confused and lose track. They prefer having everything integrated directly into the Canvas classroom or the Zoom session, rather than requiring them to check a third location. Does that clarify my point? **Dan Johnson:** Yes, embedding content is an option. For example, if you have a curated video from YouTube, you can embed it directly into the course instead of sending a separate link. This approach helps keep everything organized and easily accessible for students, which I also find effective.

Vice President Gordon moved to extend this agenda item for additional five minutes; motion seconded; motion approved unanimously.

Vice President Gordon: I would like to follow up on Senator Kennedy's point for clarification. Professor Johnson mentioned that the guidelines apply to asynchronous courses, as stated at the top of his document. Senator Kennedy raised an important issue: for those of us who teach classes that meet two days a week—one day on campus and one day via Zoom—these classes would not fall under the same requirements. Is that correct, would those classes be exempt from the guidelines you are discussing? **Dan Johnson:** Regarding our plan and the college, yes, the ACCJC has indicated that they will not evaluate hybrid courses, but they will assess live online courses. This distinction is somewhat puzzling, but that is the information we have received. **President Drew:** I have a question about the use of emails in relation to the RSI requirement. Has this issue been discussed at your college? **Dan Johnson:** This is always a concern. One issue is that if instructors use resources that are not easily accessible in Canvas, it becomes difficult to evaluate. We pressed the ACCJC on this point, and they reiterated that the college must provide full access to the course materials. Another issue is whether responding to student emails constitutes RSI. We had an interesting discussion on this. The Department of Education has determined that office hours count as RSI. If an instructor has regularly scheduled office hours, any interaction during that time is considered RSI, even if it is not substantive. I raised the point that I do not receive much student interaction during office hours because I offer multiple ways for students to reach me—through email, Canvas messaging, or texting. I asked if my regular responses to student questions, clearly stated in my syllabus, would count as RSI. They responded that it does not, as it is not considered regularly scheduled interaction. **Senator Ball:** As a part-time representative, I have a question regarding labor hours. Part-time faculty are contracted for a specific number of hours, typically for a standard 4-unit, 16-week class that meets for 3 hours per week. In an online class with 40 students, it appears that 12 weeks require substantive RSI. If an instructor spends just 5 minutes per student each week, they would already exceed their contracted hours. This calculation does not include additional tasks such as preparing videos or other course materials, which can be very time-consuming. While experienced instructors may have streamlined processes, I am concerned about the

strictness of these requirements, particularly for newer faculty who may feel pressured to work beyond their contracted hours. With 40 students and 5 minutes of interaction each week, the workload quickly adds up and does not account for all the other responsibilities involved in teaching the course. **Dan Johnson:** One important point we did not discuss is that we establish certain standards. For instance, we do not expect instructors to provide feedback to every student, as that would be unrealistic. When giving feedback on assignments, it is not necessary to respond to each student individually, especially if many students perform well. Similarly, in discussion forums, it is impractical to respond to every student, especially in large classes with over 100 students. Therefore, we recommend that instructors aim to engage with approximately 20% of participating students. This approach takes workload considerations into account.

President Drew: I would like to thank you for addressing the OCC Academic Senate and sharing your perspective on the utilization of RSI from Coastline. The questions and concerns raised here are valid, and it seems you have made significant advancements in establishing your policies compared to our current situation. The Senators have highlighted important points regarding the additional time required, and I appreciate the graph you created. I also understand Senator Ball's remarks about the increased workload and the necessity of tracking those hours.

Anna Hanlon: I would like to clarify that Coastline is not asking faculty to do additional work. They are simply requesting that faculty identify how they are conducting their work once per semester on a designated form, which is then uploaded into their Canvas course in a hidden shell. After this, faculty can continue with their regular responsibilities. The goal is to ensure that faculty are not required to do more than what they are already doing effectively in a good online course. I would like to continue this conversation from this perspective. **Laura**

Behr: I would like to note that Dan has provided numerous examples of methods, but we only need to implement two in our courses. Most of us are already doing this.

B. Board Policy and Administrative Procedures (BP/AP) Report - Marilyn Kennedy:

AP 3503 Missing Student Notification: This is nearly complete except for verification of a link intended for reporting or accessing safety information.

AP/BP 6400 Audits: This is the auditing policy; I want to explain why this discussion is important. There are two types of auditors: financial auditors and internal process auditors. My focus is on the internal audit section.

Right now, if you have concerns about processes, fraud, waste, or ethics violations, there is a reporting link on our OCC home page if some process or official protocol is being violated. You can report with your name or do so anonymously. The investigations include looking at the processes and speaking with those involved in the processes.

I highlighted some changes in the internal auditing policy language referring to the Independent Internal Auditor Department that concern me, and it will be the resultant language, if approved:

The Department shall have no direct operational responsibility or authority over any of the activities that it reviews. Accordingly, the Department will not implement internal controls, develop procedures, install systems, or engage in other activities that may impair its judgment. The Department does not prepare the financial statements, tax records, or any other material of the District. **The Department does not conduct investigations into employee or other matters under the purview of Human Resources. The Department refers to Human**

Resources personnel matters that may arise during the course of its work.

At the meeting I asked what would occur if there was an issue in HR, and I was told that HR would investigate itself, and report HR to someone who reports to the Chancellor or the Chancellor himself. This raised significant questions for me in terms of an unbiased review. The response was that processes and people are separate. That didn't quite seem correct, as unless there is an equipment malfunction, processes and people are usually intertwined. This should not mean that internal audit works as HR does; rather, it reviews issues independently and reports problems with processes it discovers. It needs to talk to people involved to get that information.

Furthermore, I reviewed two California education codes—California Education Code 87031 and Labor Code 1198.5—that were referenced to those of us at the meeting to support this language change. Neither code excludes HR from the auditing process, which raises further concerns. My division has experienced several issues with HR, and if HR complaints are now reported to the internal auditor, this language change will move the investigation to HR itself. This situation challenges transparency and accountability.

I wanted to share these concerns with the Senate and to welcome any feedback or insights from others on this matter. **Vice-President Gordon:** Thank you, Senator Kennedy. This matter falls clearly within the scope of the Transparency Committee. I would ask if you would bring this issue to tomorrow's Transparency Committee meeting. It is important and may not fit within the time constraints of a Senate meeting today, but it could be further developed in the Transparency Committee. **Senator Kennedy** agreed to do so and report back.

C. Development of the Faculty House Move – President Drew:

This will be a tabled matter, as it is still in progress. I want to report that I have connected with Rich Pagel, and we hope to schedule a visit to the Faculty House next week. During this visit, I will take pictures to share with you, so you can see the condition of the house without experiencing any unpleasant odors. We will also discuss potential improvements, such as new flooring and wall painting. When I provide my next update, I will have more detailed information and a timeline for moving back into the Faculty House. Dr. Pagel indicated that the earliest completion date is fall 2025.

Vice-President Gordon: I want to thank President Drew for his commitment to this issue. The reason we can achieve this timeline is that he completed all the necessary preparations for the new flooring a couple of years ago. This groundwork ensures we are ready to proceed as soon as funds become available. Thank you for your leadership.

Senator Kennedy: I have three aesthetic questions: Will we be keeping the shower, the fireplace, and the prior Senate President photos? **President Drew:** Yes, all three remain. I want to move to that space because it has a kitchenette with a refrigerator and stove. This will allow us to have snacks and refreshments during meetings, creating a warmer atmosphere. We intend to keep all existing amenities in place. Regarding the shower area, it is currently used for storage, but we will review its condition. We will provide further updates as we move forward.

5. New Business

No items under new business.

6. Adjournment

President Drew adjourned the meeting at 12:20 p.m.

Minutes Approved: November 5, 2024

MINUTES: First draft written by Beatriz Rodriguez Vaca, Administrative Assistant to the Senates. Revision of first draft and Senate-approved drafts written by Senate Secretary, Marilyn Kennedy, who also distributes the final Senate-approved version to the Chancellor, Board of Trustees members and secretary, union presidents, GWC and Coastline Academic Senate presidents, OCC College President, and faculty as per OCC Senate bylaws.

Senate Membership & Voting Tally Chart	Motion 1 Minutes 10/15/24	Motion 2 Minutes 10/22/24	Motion 3 Consent Agenda	Motion 4 Extend time for 5 minutes
Ball, Jason: Part-Time Senator (2024-2025); 11:35am	Absent	Absent	Absent	Aye
Barnes, Carol: Counseling Senator (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Becker, Lauren: Senator at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Blystone, Allissa: Math & Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Budwig, Eric: Technology Senator (2023-2026)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Della Marna, Jodi: Library & Learning Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Drew, Rendell: President, Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Carly Gonzalez: Senator at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Gordon, Lee: Vice President, Senator-at-Large (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Kennedy, Marilyn: Secretary, Lit. & Lang. Senator (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Legaspi, Jodie: Athletics and Kinesiology Senator (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Marcina, Vesna, Senator-at-Large (Fall 2024)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Kate McCarroll, Senator-at-Large (2024-2027)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Naesse, Irene: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Neil, Jeanne: Business and Computing Senator (2022-2025)	Absent	Absent	Absent	Absent
Paxton, Leland: Part-Time Senator (2024-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Sachs, Loren: Senator-at-Large (2022-2025); 11:45am	Absent	Absent	Absent	Aye
Sheehan, Katherine (2024-2027); 11:36am	Absent	Absent	Absent	Aye
Stanton, Jordan: Social & Beh. Sciences Senator (2022-2025)	Aye	Aye	Aye	Aye
Vacant: Senator-at-Large (2023-2026)	---	---	---	---
Vacant: Part-Time Senator (2024-2025)	---	---	---	---
Vacant: Consumer Health Sciences Senator (2023-2026)	---	---	---	---

Appendix:

Coastline Academic Senate: Plan to Ensure Regular and Substantive Interactions (RSI) in Asynchronous Online Courses

State and federal regulations and accreditation standards require that all courses taught partially or wholly in an asynchronous online format have Regular and Substantive Interactions (RSI) provided by the instructor of that course.¹ California Title 5 regulations also stipulate that all courses which the college approves to be offered in a distance education modality must have a separately approved addendum to the course outline which shows "... how the portion of instruction delivered via distance education meets the requirement for regular and substantive interaction."² Therefore, all courses approved by the Coastline Curriculum Committee, under the authority of the Academic Senate, include in the Distance Education Addendum a statement that the course will conform to all college and department RSI plans. Coastline's Academic Senate has approved the following college plan to not only ensure compliance with regulatory requirements, but also to establish high standards of instruction which will promote student retention and success.

1. All instructors will create their own RSI plan based on the guideline and template approved by the Academic Senate.
2. There will be RSI for every week in a course. **Every week will include some form of low contact interaction such as substantive announcements or some other form of instructor created or curated instructional content (such additional audio or visual materials, curated links to external resources, etc.)**
3. **In addition, some weeks will also include high contact interactions such as the instructor actively posting on a discussion forum or providing individualized feedback to students on assignments.**
4. The minimum number of weeks with high contact interactions will be determined by the total units or hours of online instruction and the total weeks of instruction (see tables below).
5. An unpublished RSI module will be embedded in the Canvas shell for all courses offered wholly or in part in an asynchronous online modality. This module will roll over when the course is copied in subsequent semesters. The instructor will create their plan using the template and guidelines provided in the module and every semester the instructor will review their plan, make any desired changes, and complete a statement acknowledging that they have done so. Each semester department chairs will receive a report indicating which instructors within their disciplines have completed the acknowledgement statement.

¹ Fed. Code Regs. tit. 34 CFR § 600.2; Cal. Code Regs. tit. 5 § 55204; ACCJC, *Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education*, January 2024

² Cal. Code Regs. Tit. 5, § 55206

6. RSI methods not specifically described on the template need to be approved by the Faculty Center and a description of the approved RSI method included in the Canvas RSI module. **These methods must fit within one of the following definitions of RSI:**

- a) Providing direct instruction (this needs to be synchronous instruction such as a live lecture)
- b) Assessing or providing feedback on a student's coursework
- c) Providing information or responding to questions about the content of a course or competency
- d) Facilitating a group discussion regarding the content of a course or competency
- e) Other instructional activities approved by the institution's or program's accrediting agency

All courses will regularly use at a minimum two different types of RSI from the list indicated above.

8. In addition to regularly scheduled instructional interactions, the instructor is required to follow state and federal regulations and accreditation standards by “[m]onitoring the student’s academic engagement and success and ...promptly and proactively engaging in substantive interaction with the student when needed on the basis of such monitoring, or upon request by the student.”

Minimum Number of Weeks* With High Contact RSI, by Units

Course Units	4 Week Class	8 Week Class	12 Week Class	16 Week Class
1 Unit	2 wks	2 wks	3 wks	4 wks
2 Units	3 wks	4 wks	6 wks	8 wks
3 Units	4 wks	6 wks	9 wks	12 wks
4 Units	4 wks	6 wks	9 wks	12 wks
5 Units	4 wks	6 wks	9 wks	12 wks

* In all weeks where there is not High Contact RSI, there will be at least some form of Low Contact RSI.

Minimum Number of Weeks* With High Contact RSI, by Hours of Instruction**

Hours of Online Instruction	4 Week Class	8 Week Class	12 Week Class	16 Week Class
1 to 18 hours	2 wks	2 wks	3 wks	4 wks
19 to 36 hours	3 wks	4 wks	6 wks	8 wks
37 to 54 hours	4 wks	6 wks	9 wks	12 wks
55 to 72 hours	4 wks	6 wks	9 wks	12 wks
73 to 90 hours	4 wks	6 wks	9 wks	12 wks

* In all weeks where there is not High Contact RSI, there will be Low Contact RSI.

** This table is primarily for hybrid courses where only part of the instruction is offered in an asynchronous online format. If unsure of the number of hours, refer to the class schedule or the course outline of record.

Instructor RSI Plan																	
Interactions		Week 1	Week 2	Week 3	Week 4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8	Week 9	Week 10	Week 11	Week 12	Week 13	Week 14	Week 15	Week 16
High Contact Interactions																	
	Instructor Interactions on the Discussion Board (see note #1 below)																
	Individualized feedback on student assignments (see note #2 below)																
	Other approved forms of high-contact RSI (see note #3 below)																
Low Contact Interactions																	
	Substantive class announcements																
	Other forms of instructor created or mediated lesson content such as videos or instructor curated links to additional external resources																
	Other approved forms of low-contact RSI (see note #3 below)																

1. The number of substantive posts will be equal to or greater than direct replies to at least 20% of the total number of students posting in that discussion. Care will be taken to vary the set of students replied to in the total set of discussions in the course.
2. At least 25% of students submitting an assignment will receive substantive individualized feedback in addition to their grade. Use of robust grading rubrics is encouraged.
3. RSI not specifically described on the template must be approved by the Faculty Center with the description indicated below. [no description below ...]

