

## **Peer Review Team Follow-Up Report**

Solano Community College  
4000 Suisun Valley Road  
Fairfield, CA 94534

This report represents the findings of the Peer Review Team that conducted a follow-up visit to Solano Community College on April 9, 2026. The Commission acted on the accredited status of the institution during its June 2026 meeting and this team report must be reviewed in conjunction with the Commission's Action letter.

Dr. Mark Sanchez  
Team Chair

## Table of Contents

Solano Community College .....	1
Peer Review Team Roster .....	1
Purpose of Follow-Up Visit .....	2
Team Analysis of Institution Responses to Compliance Requirements .....	3

# Solano Community College

## Peer Review Team Roster

Dr. Mark Sanchez, Team Chair  
Southwestern College  
Superintendent/President

### **ACADEMIC MEMBERS**

Anthony Cuomo  
West Los Angeles College  
Faculty

### **ADMINISTRATIVE MEMBERS**

Dr. Kelly Fowler  
Mt. San Jacinto College  
Vice-President of Academic Affairs

### **ACCJC STAFF LIAISON**

Melynie Schiel  
Vice-President

# Purpose of Follow-Up Visit

INSTITUTION: Solano College

DATES OF VISIT: April 9, 2026

TEAM CHAIR: Dr. Mark Sanchez

## **Purpose of Site Visit**

The peer review team conducted its comprehensive peer review of Solano College on April 9, 2026. At its January 8-9, 2025 meeting, the Commission determined noncompliance with Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.8, I.C.3, II.A.3 (College Requirement 1) and Standard II.A.7, ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education (College Requirement 2), and acted to require a Follow-Up Report due no later than March 1, 2026, followed by a visit from a peer review team. Members of the peer review team conducted its follow-up site visit to Solano Community College on April 9, 2026.

The purpose of the visit was to verify that the Follow-Up Report prepared by the Institution was accurate, through examination of evidence, and interviews with Institution representatives, to determine if the Institution now meets the Standards noted in the following compliance requirements:

Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.8, I.C.3, II.A.3 (College Requirement 1): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires the College defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student-learning support services, communicate the results of student learning, and use them as the basis for improvement.

Standard II.A.7, ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education (College Requirement 2): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires ensuring that there is regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor(s) for fully online courses.

During the visit, team members met with approximately ten (10) faculty, administrators, and classified staff in formal group interviews. The team thanks the Institution staff for hosting the site visit, coordinating meetings, providing additional documentation, and ensuring a smooth and collegial process.

# Team Analysis of Institution Responses to Compliance Requirements

## College Requirement 1:

Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.8, I.C.3, II.A.3: In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires the College defines and assesses student learning outcomes for all instructional programs and student-learning support services, communicate the results of student learning, and use them as the basis for improvement.

## Findings and Evidence:

The College has taken substantial and intentional steps to address the requirements to define and assess student learning outcomes (SLOs) and service area outcomes (SAOs), communicate results, and use those results as the basis for improvement. The team reviewed documentation provided in the Follow-Up Report, examined supporting evidence, and conducted interviews with faculty and administrators to verify implementation.

The College has established a comprehensive framework for outcomes assessment across both instructional and non-instructional areas. For instructional programs, SLOs and program learning outcomes (PLOs) are faculty-developed, aligned through the curriculum process, and maintained in the College's outcomes management system. Faculty complete regular SLO assessments and document reflections that include analysis of student performance, consideration of equity, and identification of planned improvements. The team confirmed through documentation and faculty interviews that these reflections include structured prompts designed to support "closing the loop," including reporting on prior actions and identifying resource needs tied to assessment findings.

The College reports a high level of SLO assessment completion, with approximately 90 percent of course-level SLOs assessed in Fall 2025. Evidence reviewed by the team, and discussions with faculty indicate that assessment practices are increasingly consistent across departments, supported by training, guidance from the Assessment Committee, and department-level discussions. Faculty described engagement in dialogue regarding assessment results during division meetings, FLEX activities, and department chair-led conversations. These discussions are contributing to a deeper culture of inquiry focused on improving student learning.

To address prior concerns regarding non-instructional areas, the College has implemented a new Administrative Program Review (AdmPR) process that requires all administrative and student support units to define and assess SAOs. The team reviewed completed AdmPRs and confirmed that administrative units have developed mission-aligned goals, identified measurable outcomes, and documented assessment methods and results. The AdmPR process includes structured opportunities to communicate results through the Administrative Leadership Group and the College Governance Council, ensuring broad-based institutional awareness and dialogue.

The College has also strengthened the integration of outcomes assessment with planning and resource allocation. Evidence reviewed by the team demonstrates that assessment results are used to inform resource requests, including requests for equipment, staffing, and student support services.

Examples include investments in instructional equipment, expanded tutoring services, and technology resources that were directly linked to identified student learning needs. Faculty and administrators confirmed that these processes are becoming more systematic, with resource requests increasingly tied to documented assessment findings.

At the program level, outcomes assessment is integrated into the Academic Program Review process, where departments are required to analyze SLO and PLO data, evaluate program effectiveness, and identify improvements and resource needs. The team confirmed that program review serves as a structured mechanism for translating assessment results into planning and action, reinforcing alignment between outcomes, program goals, and institutional priorities. For example, in the Automotive Technology (ATEC) – Diesel Trucks: Through SLO assessment, ATEC faculty cited that students needed more opportunity to work on vehicles in small teams to fully develop required competencies. The purchase of three additional diesel trucks increased access, reduced bottlenecks in lab activities, and allowed students more consistent hands-on practice aligned with course SLOs.

The College has made significant progress in addressing the requirement, and some elements of implementation are still maturing. Continued attention to ensuring consistent, ongoing dialogue and sustained use of results across all areas will be important to better institutionalize these practices.

Overall, the team finds that the College has developed and implemented systems and processes that support the definition, assessment, communication, and use of student learning outcomes and service area outcomes, and that these processes are increasingly integrated into institutional planning and improvement.

## **Conclusion:**

The institution has addressed the requirement and meets Standards I.B.1, I.B.2, I.B.4, I.B.7, I.B.8, I.C.3, II.A.3.

## **College Requirement 2:**

Standard II.A.7, ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education (College Requirement 2): In order to meet the Standard, the Commission requires ensuring that there is regular and substantive interaction between the students and instructor(s) for fully online courses.

## **Findings and Evidence:**

The College has developed and implemented a comprehensive and policy-aligned approach to ensure regular and substantive interaction (RSI) in fully online courses. The team reviewed institutional policies, training materials, course design standards, and survey data, and conducted interviews with faculty, administrators, and students to verify implementation.

The College has clearly defined RSI through Board Policy 6115 and supporting procedures, aligning institutional expectations with Title 5 requirements and ACCJC standards. These policies distinguish distance education from correspondence education and establish clear expectations for instructor-initiated, regular, and substantive interaction. The team confirmed that RSI expectations are communicated through the Distance Education Handbook and are embedded in curriculum approval

processes, including required distance education addenda that address how courses will meet RSI standards.

To support implementation, the College has established mandatory RSI training for all faculty teaching online courses. This requirement is formalized through a Memorandum of Understanding with the faculty association and is integrated into both initial certification and ongoing eligibility to teach online. The team reviewed training materials and participation data and confirmed that a substantial number of faculty have completed the training, with additional faculty scheduled to complete it. Faculty reported that the training provided practical guidance on designing courses that incorporate regular and meaningful interaction with students.

The College has also implemented multiple mechanisms to operationalize and verify RSI. These include the use of Canvas course shells with embedded templates that prompt faculty to clearly communicate interaction expectations to students, RSI checklists to document compliance, and review processes through the Distance Education Committee. The team reviewed sample course shells and found evidence of instructor-initiated communication, including regular announcements, timely feedback, and structured opportunities for interaction.

In addition, the College has begun to integrate RSI verification into institutional processes, including faculty preference forms and plans to incorporate RSI into faculty evaluation and recertification processes. These steps demonstrate an effort to ensure that RSI expectations are not only established but also monitored and sustained over time.

The College has also collected and analyzed student feedback to evaluate the effectiveness of RSI implementation. Survey results indicate that a high percentage of students experience regular communication with instructors, including frequent announcements and timely responses to inquiries. These findings provide evidence that RSI practices are being implemented in a manner that supports student engagement.

Interviews with faculty and students confirmed that instructor-initiated communication is occurring regularly in online courses and that faculty are using a variety of methods to engage students. Faculty described intentional efforts to increase interaction through announcements, discussions, and feedback, while students reported consistent communication and access to instructors.

The review team received a random sample of online courses taught in Fall 2025 and found that the sample met the expectations for substantive and regular interaction per ACCJC's Policy on Distance Education and Correspondence Education.

Overall, the team finds that the College has established clear policies, implemented required training, and developed systems to support and verify regular and substantive interaction in online courses, with evidence demonstrating that these practices are being implemented and are improving student engagement.

## **Conclusion:**

The institution has addressed the requirement and meets Standard II.A.7, ACCJC Policy on Distance Education and on Correspondence Education.