



District Academic Senate Minutes

Tuesday, Feb. 10th, 2026. Room 112, District Office

Present:

John Banks (SJECCD Treasurer & SJCC Academic Senate Treasurer)
Phil Crawford (SJCC Academic Senate): Remote
Grace Estrada (EVC Academic Senate)
Henry Estrada (EVC Academic Senate President)
Fabio Gonzalez (SJECCD Senate): Remote
David Hendricks (SJECCD District Academic Senate President & EVC Academic Senate Treasurer)
Mark Branom (SJECCD Academic Senate VP & SJCC Academic Senate President)
Kelly Nguyen-Jardin (EVC Senate VP)

Guests:

Jeremy Brown, Vice Chancellor of Educational Services (VCES)
Audrey Blumeneau, SJCC DE Coordinator
Tejal Naik, EVC DE Coordinator
Jory Segal, Executive Director, FA6157

CALL TO ORDER 4:00

I. ADOPTION OF AGENDA Kelly 1st; Henry 2nd

1. Addition/Deletion/Corrections
2. Approval of Agenda

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES Henry 1st; Mark 2nd

III. PUBLIC COMMENTS (Each public comment is limited to two minutes)

IV. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Dual Enrollment

David noted the current excitement over the idea of Dual Enrollment. The program is being promoted by the State Chancellor's office in "Vision 2030". SJECCD is promoting it and developing MOUs with local school districts. While the benefits of Dual Enrollment are vast, the role of faculty is generally at the margins. As Dual Enrollment proceeds, there needs to be more inclusion of faculty perspectives to ensure that students of these programs are receiving the appropriate curriculum and instruction. These are considerations under the Senate's 10+1 purview, so inclusion of faculty voices is vital to the success of Dual Enrollment.

Phil noted the longstanding Dual Enrollment options that SJCC has offered. Yet, the Senate has not been included to advise on MOUs or on instruction. There are several considerations that come into play, both when SJECCD faculty teach at other institutions, and when students are in our classrooms on the campuses. Each scenario requires some training and understanding by faculty of students' special needs to achieve student success. Mark added that if we have faculty who are unprepared for working with younger students, which could be setting both the faculty and students up for failure. These classes are an opportunity to recruit students to the District, so we need to take it seriously and offer the best instruction so as to make our campuses viable and attractive options when students matriculate to becoming full-time college students.

David noted that a 2024 Memo from the CCCCO and ASCCC emphasized the importance of quality instruction and the centrality of faculty's role in shaping Dual Enrollment programs. It affirms both the role of instructional faculty and counselors and the need to work with high school faculty. Dual Enrollment courses are college courses that need to be taught by faculty who meet minimum qualifications. These are transferrable courses and we need to be mindful of this reality to ensure the best design.

Phil and Kelly recommended that Dual Enrollment faculty receive stipends to encourage participation and provide training. The key to success is quality training so that faculty are prepared.

Fabio reiterated that Dual Enrollment is not new. The current push is to extend the benefits to a wider range of students. The current intent is to democratize access, but this needs to be done with sensitivity to ensure that students have a good experience. Meaning the role of counselors, wrap-around support services, and continuous follow up to ensure success. The faculty are central on matters of curriculum, but we cannot dictate which courses will be taught. Current laws that promote and create CCAP pathways place much of the authority over the structure in the MOUs, since partnering schools get to select which courses they would like to offer to their students.

David noted that one area that hasn't been addressed is the evaluation of Dual Enrollment faculty. While they teach at different locations, they still are a part of the SJECCD faculty. Yet, there is too little effort to ensure that our Dual Enrollment faculty are connected more directly to the campus faculty. There ought to be some consideration for collegial collaboration and mentorship among the program faculty and campus faculty.

Henry pointed out that while there have been Dual Enrollment options in the past, that the modern trend is more toward providing instruction at the high schools themselves rather than travelling to the college campuses. The key is to be sure that the high school faculty who are being asked to teach these courses have FSAs to teach our courses.

David noted that the current push toward the CCAP model of creating opportunities for students at the high schools needs to be done with more intentionality to ensure that the courses that students are offered fulfill a specific need or fit a transferrable pathway. He also pointed out that students need to fully understand that they are taking on college courses and that failure in them carries graver consequences than failing a high school course.

John raised a concern that offering Dual Enrollment sections at remote locations could take away needed resources for offering sections on our campuses.

Phil pointed out that a recent MOU with Milpitas was not brought to the Academic Senate for consultation. The ASCCC recommends that faculty have some involvement and should be consulted. Faculty involvement could ensure the quality of instruction.

The current MOU partnerships with local high school campuses constitute a golden opportunity to reach students who often are recruited away from our area to other community colleges.

2. AP 4021 – Program Viability Review Process Proposal (Tabled)

3. PVR Task Force Composition (Tabled)

4. DE Qualification Maintenance

David noted that there is an active MOU between FA 6157 and the District Office that put in place a structure for establishing a faculty member's qualifications to teach their courses through distance education. This has implications for the Senates as it lays the foundation for minimum qualifications and ongoing training for our faculty. While we have made great progress in establishing a framework, there are some differences between the campuses that need to be ironed out so that our faculty who teach on both campuses are operating under a single, predictable set of expectations. We need consistency, simplicity, and protections for our faculty.

David introduced the two DE Coordinators from the two campuses as well as the Executive Director of FA 6157.

Jory explained that there needs to be consistent rules for the two campuses, otherwise the union will be unable to enforce the provisions of the MOU. She presented some ideas to ensure consistency. The campuses should offer refresher training at each Professional Development Day (PDD); this will help faculty maintain their status and will ensure that Associate faculty have an opportunity to be paid for their training. She argued that there should be two expiration dates, one at the end of each semester. This will avoid faculty losing their status mid-semester. It also would make maintaining faculty qualification lists easier. Having fewer expiration dates also would make it easier for Deans to check on a faculty member's status when drafting

future schedules. There also needs to be a grace period and advocated one year, but noted that there may be special circumstances where additional time would be appropriate. During a grace period, faculty could take the requisite training to cover their expired qualification retroactively and then fulfill their ongoing obligation. Having the certification list be readily available across the District would make it easier for Deans at the campuses to verify qualifications. The Academic Senates need to get involved to ensure consistency across the District. We need to be mindful that the DE certification has employment and health care coverage implications for our faculty, particularly our Associates. Ideally we can create a system that is consistent, easy to administer, fair, and non-punitive.

Audrey noted that the number of faculty who have gotten DE certification and who are maintaining their status has increased dramatically since the pandemic. With experience, the system has gotten better and most faculty have adapted successfully. One issue is that when there is turnover at the Dean level some of the incoming administrators don't fully understand the system and have been rigid in enforcing recertification deadlines. This led to discussions about the need for formal grace periods. Currently, the OAS at SJCC creates a list of faculty whose qualifications are nearing their expiration and Audrey works with faculty to keep them in compliance. Both campuses operate similarly, though there are some differences in the renewal process. These need to be smoothed out.

Jory commented that creating a clean, clear process that cannot be misinterpreted by new Deans would help to preserve faculty employment and healthcare and would make it easier and more predictable for faculty who work on both campuses.

Tejal noted that while the intent of the MOU was positive, that some vague language has led to some misinterpretation. Stricter language would help to define faculty obligations more clearly, and would make the renewal date more concrete. Further discussion is necessary.

Jory asked that these conversations happen soon so that some language can be incorporated into the Collective Bargaining Agreement. Mark recommended that the meetings happen soon in order to hammer out language by the middle of March to present to the Senates for validation.

5. Facility Access Process (Tabled)

V. ACTION ITEMS

VI. CONSENT ITEMS

VI. REPORTS

1. Evergreen Valley College Academic Senate
2. San Jose City College Academic Senate
3. District Academic Senate

VI. RECOGNITIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS (3 minutes)

VII. ADJOURNMENT 5:07pm

Move to adjourn: Grace 1st; Henry 2nd