



Addendum to the Protocol for Distance Education Review: A Tool for Peer Reviewers During the Evaluation Process

This addendum is intended to assist peer reviewers in conducting their assessment of the quality of distance education that the institution delivers in accordance with ACCJC's [Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education](#) and the [Protocol for Distance Education Review](#) to verify substantive and regular interaction. All of ACCJC's DE resources are available in Appendix B of the [Accreditation Handbook](#).

Peer Review teams will:

- utilize the *DE Assessment Tool for Peer Reviewers (an Excel spreadsheet)* to determine whether or not an institution meets the 85% threshold for substantive and regular interaction in the sample of course sections it reviews;
- complete this *Addendum to the Protocol for Distance Education Review* to summarize their findings in the course of the peer review process and engage in dialogue with fellow team members; and
- reflect on the *Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education* to provide constructive feedback to the institution on areas where the college could improve in the Peer Review Team Report in the context of Standard 2.6.

Instructions:

Please complete the *DE Assessment Tool for Peer Reviewers* (an Excel spreadsheet) to indicate which course sections met or did not meet the expectations for substantive and regular interaction and then add a summary of your findings below.

If less than 85% of the course sections the team reviews meet the expectations for regular and substantive interaction, then the team must write a core inquiry if the review of course sections occurs leading up to the Team ISER Review, or a compliance recommendation if the review of course sections occurs as part of the focused site visit.

Summary of Findings

- a. Number of course sections provided by the institution and reviewed by the team: _____
- b. Number of course sections that met the policy expectations for substantive and regular interaction:
_____ Met _____ Not Met
- c. Percentage of course sections that that met the policy expectations for substantive and regular interaction:
_____ %

Substantive Interaction:

Each course section reviewed must include **at least two of the following methods** of interaction to qualify as meeting the expectations for substantive interaction per the *ACCJC Policy on Distance Education (DE) and on Correspondence Education*:

- a) direct instruction (only synchronous instruction qualifies);
- b) assessment and feedback on coursework;
- c) information/responses to questions about course content; and/or
- d) facilitating group discussions.

In your assessment of the courses, how well is the institution providing substantive interaction overall?

Include brief narrative to describe your findings:

Regular Interaction:

Each course section reviewed must include **evidence of both activities** to qualify as meeting the expectations for regular interaction per the *ACCJC Policy on Distance Education (DE) and on Correspondence Education*, that the instructor is:

- a) providing opportunity for substantive interaction on a regular and predictable basis, and
- b) monitoring 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.

In your assessment of the courses, how well is the institution providing regular interaction overall?

Include brief narrative to describe your findings:

For Team ISER Review:

If 85% or more of the course sections reviewed met the conditions for substantive and regular interaction, please describe the team's findings within the narrative of the team report in the context of Standard 2.6. Provide strengths and/or suggestions to improve substantive and regular interaction as you consider the *ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education* and based on the sample reviewed.

If fewer than 85% of the course sections reviewed met the conditions for substantive and regular interaction, or the evidence provided is not clear, please describe the team's observations in a Core Inquiry in order to learn more during the Focused Site Visit.

For Focused Site Visit:

If 85% or more of the course sections reviewed met the conditions for substantive and regular interaction, please describe the team's findings within the narrative of the team report in the context of Standard 2.6. Provide strengths and/or suggestions to improve substantive and regular interaction as you consider the *ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education* and based on the sample reviewed.

If fewer than 85% of the sections reviewed met the conditions for substantive and regular interaction, the team must write a Recommendation for Compliance. This type of recommendation is a statement of a peer review team's professional judgment regarding actions an institution must take in order to resolve areas of deficiency or noncompliance related to a Standard, group of related Standards, and/or Commission policy.

If the course sections reviewed seem to be meeting the conditions for substantive and regular interaction at a minimal level (i.e. Initial level which is considered baseline in the *ACCJC Quality Continuum Rubric for Distance Education*), write a Recommendation for Improving Institutional Effectiveness and document your findings in Standard 2.6 to improve substantive and regular interaction. In contrast to recommendations for compliance, recommendations for improving institutional effectiveness do not signify areas of current noncompliance with Standards; rather, they indicate areas where deficiencies may emerge if the institution does not make adjustments to its current practices or policies.