



**SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING**  
**MINUTES – February 3, 2026**  
**1:30PM – 3:00PM**  
**Zoom Meeting**

**Santa Ana College Mission Statement:** *Santa Ana College inspires, transforms, and empowers a diverse community of learners.*

**MEMBERSHIP**

Administrators	Academic Senate		Classified	Student Representatives
Bart Hoffman, Co-chair	<b>Tommy Strong, Co-chair</b>		<b>Mark Ou</b>	Julian Gonzalez
<b>Jim Kennedy</b>	Claire Coyne	Reza Mirbeik Sabzevary	Jimmy Nguyen	Minh Le
Jeffrey Lamb	<b>John Zarske</b>	<b>Linda Sung</b>	<b>Liliana Oropeza</b>	
Vaniethia Hubbard	Luis Pedroza	<b>Silvia Castillo</b>	Jessica Avalos	
<b>Lorena Valencia</b> /Mark DeAsis (alt)	<b>Kelly Nguyen</b>	<b>Merari Weber</b>		
Kristi Blackburn/ <b>Bill Reardon (alt)</b>				
<b>Bold = Present</b>				
<b>1. WELCOME &amp; INTRODUCTIONS</b>				Meeting called to order 1:34pm Meeting adjourned at 2:56pm
	Welcome and self-introductions were made.			
<b>2. PUBLIC COMMENTS</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>			<b>ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No public comments.</li> </ul>			
<b>3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>			<b>ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS</b>
	Approval of December 2, 2025 Minutes			<b>Moved to approve by:</b> Jim Kennedy <b>2<sup>nd</sup> by:</b> Merari Weber <b>Abstentions:</b> Bill Reardon
<b>4. ACTION ITEMS</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>			<b>ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS</b>
	<b>FY26/27 Budget Priorities for RAR Process (3rd Read) – Mark Reynoso</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3rd Reading &amp; Background               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tommy explained that this was the third formal reading of the proposed 2026–2027 budget priorities.</li> <li>○ Timeline recap:</li> </ul> </li> </ul>			

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Document reviewed during fall meetings (October–December).</li> <li>➤ Revisions were made during the second reading.</li> <li>➤ The committee chose to delay voting at that time to allow members to review the changes more thoroughly before approval.</li> <li>• Final Opportunity for Questions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Tommy emphasized: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ The committee had several months to review the revised document.</li> <li>➤ Questions or clarifications were still welcome.</li> <li>➤ A final vote was required to move forward.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Roll Call Vote <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Mark Reynoso conducted the roll call vote. Votes recorded: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Jim Kennedy — Yes</li> <li>➤ Merari Weber — Yes</li> <li>➤ Silvia Castillo — Yes</li> <li>➤ Kelly Nguyen — Yes</li> <li>➤ Linda Sung — Yes</li> <li>➤ John Zarske — Yes</li> <li>➤ Mark Ou — Yes</li> <li>➤ Liliana Oropeza — Yes</li> <li>➤ Bill Reardon — Yes</li> <li>➤ Tommy Strong — Yes</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Outcome <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Motion passed unanimously.</li> <li>○ The 2026-2027 SAC Budget Priorities were officially approved and adopted by the committee.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
5. UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p><b>Quarter 2 Budget Performance Report – Mark Reynoso</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fund 11 (General Fund) – As of 12/31/2025 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget: \$146M year-to-date</li> <li>○ Expenditures: \$70M (48% of budget), same as prior year Q2</li> <li>○ Hourly Faculty Accounts: \$2.6M over last year, trending to \$12M over budget</li> <li>○ Salary &amp; Benefits: Overall \$11M over budget; partially offset by savings in classified staff and benefits</li> <li>○ Non-salary accounts: \$300K savings in supplies/materials</li> <li>○ Projected Fund 11 Overage: ~\$4.1M due to growth and extra classes</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Fund 13 (One-time/Carryover Funds) – As of 12/31/2025 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Budget: \$14.9M</li> <li>○ Expenditures to date: \$1.9M (13% of budget, compared to 15% last year)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- Facilities/Other Set-Asides: ~\$4M reserved for facilities
- Projected Ending Balance: ~\$5.2M
- Purpose: Offsets Fund 11 overages
- Additional Notes:
  - Growth dollars added to Fund 11: \$5M initially, \$2M spent, \$1.5M added to adjunct accounts
  - RARs (Resource Allocation Requests) help capture ongoing costs and increase Fund 11 budget

**Governor’s Proposed Budget Presentation (2026–27) – Mark Reynoso**

- Key Highlights:
  - COLA: 2.41% proposed (compared to 2.43% last year)
  - No COLA for Strong Workforce or categorical grants (SEEK, SSSP, equity)
  - Growth Funding:
    - 25-26: 1% (~\$55.3M)
    - 26-27: 0.5% (~\$31.9M)
- Unfunded FTES:
  - 24-25: 2,269 unfunded FTES (~\$14M)
  - Funding recal expected February 2026; may roll over to Fund 13 for 26-27
- Revenue Projection: \$42.3M above 25 Budget Act due to strong market
- No deficit factor mentioned for 25-26 or 26-27
- Impact: Additional revenue will support Fund 11 and carryover Fund 13 allocations

**Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) Report – Lorena Valencia & Mark DeAsis**

- Overview of SCFF
  - Introduced to allocate funding based on student success rather than just enrollment.
  - Three main components:
    - Base Allocation: Funding based on full-time equivalent students (FTES).
    - Success Allocation: Funding tied to the completion of degrees, certificates, and transfer-level course achievements.
    - Equity Allocation: Additional funding for students receiving Pell Grants or College Promise awards, supporting underrepresented and economically disadvantaged populations.
  - Optional Regional Living Wage component to account for local cost-of-living differences and workforce alignment.
- Degrees & Certificates
  - Degrees:
    - Tracking growth in associate degrees, bachelor’s degrees, and transfer degrees.

- Focus on trends over time to identify programs with increasing demand or high student completion rates.
- Certificates:
  - Data shows inconsistent trends, often due to program conversions to degree pathways or changes in curriculum.
  - Certificates are critical for career technical education (CTE) pathways and workforce readiness.
- Implications:
  - Data informs program review, resource allocation, and planning to ensure alignment with institutional goals.
- Transfer-Level Math & English
  - Tracks first-time students who complete transfer-level courses in their first year.
  - Highlights early student success and identifies areas needing support, such as pre-transfer remediation or tutoring programs.
  - Important for SCFF success metrics and funding tied to student completion.
  - Plans to analyze data term-by-term for more granular insight.
- Career & Technical Education (CTE)
  - Measures students completing 9 or more CTE units with a grade of C or higher.
  - Highlights programs contributing to workforce development and student career readiness.
  - Supports planning for institutionalizing categorical program staff or funding into the general fund, ensuring sustainability of key positions.
- Student Transfers
  - Data sourced from the National Student Clearinghouse to track transfers to CSU, UC, private, and out-of-state institutions.
  - Helps identify feeder institutions, student pathways, and success rates.
  - Supports strategic partnerships and advising programs for transfer-focused students.
- Equity & Bonus Points
  - SCFF provides additional funding for Pell Grant and College Promise students, encouraging colleges to prioritize equity.
  - Aligns resource allocation with student needs, ensuring support for historically underrepresented populations.
  - Encourages program and service enhancements to close equity gaps.
- Program Review & Resource Allocation
  - SCFF data directly informs program review processes.
  - Essential for Planning & Budget committees to approve new positions, resource allocations, or program expansions.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensures that funding decisions are data-driven and aligned with student outcomes.</li> <li>○ Examples of resource allocation include staff for student support, counseling, tech support, and program coordination.</li> <li>● Dashboards &amp; Data Visualization <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Interactive dashboards track: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Degrees and certificates completed</li> <li>➤ Transfer-level course completions</li> <li>➤ CTE unit completions</li> <li>➤ Student transfers to 4-year institutions</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Dashboards enhance transparency and decision-making, reducing reliance on static PDF reports.</li> <li>○ Future enhancements may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Regional living wage integration</li> <li>➤ Equity metrics by student group</li> <li>➤ Term-by-term completion analysis</li> <li>➤ Visual representation of trends over multiple years</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>● Trends &amp; Observations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Year-over-year growth in associate, bachelor’s, and transfer degrees.</li> <li>○ Certificates require further analysis due to program transitions or inconsistencies.</li> <li>○ CTE completions remain a critical metric for workforce alignment and funding support.</li> <li>○ Dashboards enable real-time analysis, helping administrators and faculty make informed decisions about student success strategies.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Next Steps &amp; Strategic Actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Refine dashboards to include equity, term-by-term analysis, and regional adjustments.</li> <li>○ Use SCFF data to prioritize program funding and institutional support.</li> <li>○ Align resource requests with student outcomes, ensuring funds directly impact student success.</li> <li>○ Schedule ongoing review cycles to track trends, update stakeholders, and optimize institutional strategy.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<b>STUDENT UPDATE</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>	<b>ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● No student updates to report.</li> </ul>	
<b>6. PERIODIC REPORTS</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No periodic reports to report.</li> </ul>	
<b>7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>	<b>ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No periodic reports to report.</li> </ul>	
<b>8. NEW BUSINESS</b>	<b>DISCUSSION/COMMENTS</b>	<b>ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS</b>
	<p><b>2026-2027 School of Continuing Education Program Review &amp; RAR Request – Jim Kennedy</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Role of Program Review in Funding (RAR Process) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Program Review and the Resource Allocation Request (RAR) process are the primary pathways for departments to request additional funding.</li> <li>○ Areas seeking more resources must clearly document needs, justify them, and formally submit requests through Program Review.</li> <li>○ Requests move through participatory governance channels for transparency and shared evaluation.</li> <li>○ This structured process ensures funding decisions are tied to planning, outcomes, and institutional priorities rather than informal requests.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Participatory Governance &amp; Review Process <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Program Review submissions are presented across governance groups for input and visibility, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Planning &amp; Budget Committee</li> <li>➤ College Council</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ This approach increases transparency and allows the campus community to see: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Departmental needs</li> <li>➤ Resource gaps</li> <li>➤ Strategic priorities</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Encourages a more collaborative and inclusive allocation process.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Program Review Highlights (Continuing Education Focus) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Review reflects progress and growth over the past four years, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Increased program activity</li> <li>➤ Revenue growth generated from operations</li> <li>➤ Increased institutional investment in continuing education</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Shift in strategic focus: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Less emphasis on rapid growth</li> <li>➤ Greater focus on student completion, transitions, and support services</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Key strategic goals include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Improving completion rates</li> <li>➤ Reducing barriers to access</li> <li>➤ Strengthening student support systems</li> <li>➤ Expanding educational centers to reach large-center status</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>	

- Growth & Revenue Considerations
  - Achieving large-center status at certain sites could generate significant new revenue annually (estimated in the millions).
  - However, revenue generated does not automatically return to the originating department.
  - There is typically a correlation between revenue generation and institutional reinvestment, but funding must still go through planning and governance processes.
  - Aligning growth with documented needs increases the likelihood of reinvestment.
- Major Resource Allocation Request (RAR) Priorities
  - The most significant request centers on transitioning approximately \$984,000 in positions currently funded by categorical sources into the general fund.
  - Purpose: institutionalize essential operational roles that are currently at risk due to unstable funding streams.
  - Concern that federal and categorical funds (such as workforce-related grants) may be reduced or eliminated, creating structural risk.
  - Emphasis on stabilizing core services that support students and daily operations.
- Key Areas Identified for Institutional Support
  1. Staff Currently Funded by Categorical Sources
    - Admissions & Records staffing currently supported through workforce-related funding streams.
    - Risk identified: if external funding decreases, critical student services could be impacted.
    - Goal: transition these positions to stable, ongoing funding.
  2. Counseling Services
    - Counseling needs exceed current categorical budgets.
    - Proposal includes shifting some counseling costs to general fund support.
    - Counseling identified as a critical service for retention, access, and completion.
  3. Career Education Support
    - Career education staffing currently supported through Strong Workforce Program (SWP) funds.
    - Long-term expectation from grant providers is that institutions will eventually institutionalize these roles.
    - Proposal represents a step toward sustainability and program stability.
- Additional Resource Requests (Operational & Student Support)
  - Continued development of student-facing applications to:

- Reduce enrollment barriers
- Improve access to classes and services
- Ongoing student technology and support services, including 24/7 technical assistance.
- Site directors and coordinators to maintain community presence and outreach.
- Furniture and facility-related needs.
- Technology for staff to support remote and hybrid work environments.
- Ongoing vs. One-Time Funding Needs
  - Ongoing Requests
    - Transition of staff from categorical to general fund (structural, long-term need).
    - Some technology and support services that require continued maintenance.
  - Primarily One-Time or Flexible Costs
    - Furniture purchases
    - Equipment refreshes
    - Initial technology upgrades
    - Certain application development costs (though improvements may continue over time)
- Hybrid/Variable Needs
  - Technology support services may not be contractually permanent but are unlikely to be discontinued due to operational dependence.
- Structural Funding Concerns
  - Heavy reliance on categorical funding creates instability.
  - Some critical services may have originally been placed in categorical funding but now function as core institutional operations.
  - Transitioning them into general fund support is framed as correcting a structural misalignment.
- Connection to SCFF & Institutional Planning
  - Growth, completion, and revenue generation link back to SCFF performance outcomes.
  - Increased completions and program expansion support funding stability.
  - Resource allocation tied to:
    - Student success outcomes
    - Program growth
    - Institutional priorities
  - Program Review serves as the bridge connecting SCFF outcomes to funding decisions.
- Key Strategic Takeaways

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Documenting needs in Program Review is essential to securing funding.</li> <li>○ Participatory governance ensures transparency in how resources are prioritized.</li> <li>○ Institutionalizing critical positions protects student services from funding volatility.</li> <li>○ Resource allocation decisions are increasingly tied to outcomes, completion, and student support impact.</li> </ul> <p><b>Funding for New Classified &amp; Management Positions – Tommy Strong</b> <i>(For information only – will be an Action Item at September’s meeting)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Advance Notice of Potential Classified Hiring Requests <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The committee was informed that a future request is expected for funding new administrative and classified professional positions.</li> <li>○ No specific roles, numbers, or dollar amounts were presented at this time.</li> <li>○ Early notification was provided so the committee can anticipate future discussions and planning needs.</li> <li>○ Formal review and decision-making will likely take place around September, once the college has a clearer picture of next year’s budget, including funded vs. unfunded priorities.</li> <li>○ The Planning and Budget Committee will vote on whether to support the proposed positions and provide justification for its recommendations.</li> <li>○ The idea originated from discussions held during the winter retreat.</li> </ul> </li> <li>● Proposed Approach to Position Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ The process may mirror the faculty prioritization model previously used.</li> <li>○ Under that model, the committee reviewed projected resources and recommended how many positions the institution could reasonably afford.</li> <li>○ A similar framework may be applied to classified professionals, establishing a funding range or allocation target before identifying specific positions.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
<p><b>9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS</b></p>		
	<p><b>Categorical Funds with Sarah Fisher, Assistant Vice Chancellor/Educational Services</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Sarah Fisher will attend a future meeting to provide an overview of categorical funding (Fund 12), including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Where funds originate</li> <li>○ Benefits and opportunities</li> <li>○ Risks and limitations</li> <li>○ Key considerations for moving positions to the general fund (Fund 11)</li> </ul> </li> <li>● This follows ongoing committee discussions about transitioning certain services from categorical to stable general fund support.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assess Tasks on Committee Calendar</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● A goals workgroup is actively developing a planning and task calendar for the committee.</li> </ul>	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress has been delayed due to scheduling challenges, but the group is close to completing a draft to share.</li> </ul>	
<b>GENERAL INFORMATION</b>		
	<b>Fiscal Resources Committee</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <a href="http://rsccd.edu">Fiscal Resources Committee (rsccd.edu)</a></li> </ul>	
<b>NEXT MEETING</b>	<b>March 3, 2026</b>	

Submitted by Norma Castillo