

Proposal Related to Regular and Substantive Interaction (RSI) Requirement

Background. One function of the University Senate is to “determine... academic policies that may be made necessary by governmental or accreditation agencies, and make rules to implement these policies” ([GR IV.C.1](#)). In 2020, the U.S. Department of Education (DoE) [clarified](#) the requirement that all courses, with the exception of correspondence courses which UK no longer offers, must include “[regular and substantive interaction](#)” (RSI).

Proposal. The Senate Council modified an [original SCDLeL proposal](#) (see SC [agenda](#) for 12/6/21) with no objections from the SCDLeL, recommending instead the following:

(1) **Add** an RSI policy to the [Senate Rules](#):

SR 6.1.1.6 REGULAR AND SUBSTANTIVE INTERACTION

All credit-bearing courses must support regular and substantive interaction (RSI) between the students and the instructor, regardless of the course’s delivery mode (e.g., in-person, hybrid, or online).

Courses satisfy this requirement when course participants meet regularly as prescribed in SR 10.6, and the Instructor of Record substantively interacts with students in at least two of the following ways: provides direct instruction; assesses students’ learning; provides information or responds to students’ questions; and facilitates student discussions. Some exceptions allowed as per SACSCOC.

For further information about the RSI requirement, see the Regular and Substantive Interaction/Academic Engagement Resources link on the Teaching, Learning and Academic Innovation Compliance page (<https://www.uky.edu/tlaj/compliance-faculty>).

(2) **Require** instructors to include/link to this static (boilerplate) RSI policy in their syllabi,

(3) **Rework** the Senate new course and major course change forms to ask proposers how they will meet the RSI requirement, and

(4) **Remind** deans to check that existing courses satisfy the RSI requirement in keeping with [GR VII.F.2.c](#).¹

To [facilitate compliance](#) with the requirement in (2) above, the expectation is that the Senate Rules and Elections committee ([SREC](#)) in codifying the intent of this RSI proposal will construe the policy in (1) above as an [Academic Policy Statement](#) within the meaning of [SR 6.1.1.2](#). Note that [SR 6.1.1.1](#) (Required Syllabi Components) already requires (para. 20) that syllabi include a “URL/hyperlink to, or copy and paste of, Academic Policy Statements.”

Rationale. This proposal attempts to satisfy the Senate’s responsibilities under [GR IV.C.1](#) and provide a balanced and cooperative approach to quality assurance. The Senate, which “is not assigned any management or administrative functions” ([GR IV.C](#)), will document compliance when courses are newly proposed or significantly changed, and college deans will otherwise ensure compliance managerially, including a review of existing courses.

¹ [GR VII.F.2.c](#) states that deans are in part “responsible for the implementation of the curricula of the college, [and] for ensuring through the faculty the quality of instruction given therein.”