



SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING

MINUTES – April 17, 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	Tommy Strong, Co-chair		Mark Ou	Minh Le
Jim Kennedy	Claire Coyne	Reza Mirbeik	Jimmy Nguyen	Leticia Perez
Jeffrey Lamb	John Zarske	Linda Sung	Liliana Oropeza	
Vaniethia Hubbard	Luis Pedroza	Silvia Castillo	Jessica Avalos	
Lorena Valencia/Mark DeAsis (alt)	Kelly Nguyen	Merari Weber		
Kristi Blackburn/ Bill Reardon (alt)				

Bold = Present

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS		Meeting called to order 1:34pm Meeting adjourned at 2:56pm
	Welcome and self-introductions were made.	
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No public comments. 	
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	Approval of March3, 2026 Minutes	Moved to approve by: Claire Coyne 2 nd by: Tommy Strong
4. ACTION ITEMS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	SAC Marketing Plan (Recommendation) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marketing Plan total: \$670,000 Previously presented at last committee meeting Motion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Motion to approve marketing plan and forward recommendation to College Council 	

- Moved by: Claire Coyne
- Second: Reza Mirbeik
- Motion passed unanimously

Discussion

- Tommy Strong shared positive feedback from campus departments
 - Reported increased enrollment trends linked to marketing efforts

Technology Replacement Plan Presentation (Review & Recommendation) – Ron Gonzalves/District IT

SAC 5-Year Computer Replacement Plan (CRP FY 26-27) – February 2026 Overview

- Annual presentation of campus computer replacement cycle
- Focus on replacing end-of-life (5-year cycle) devices
- Includes instructional and non-instructional technology

Device Standards

- New systems include:
 - Desktop and laptop configurations optimized for AI workloads
 - Updated Intel processors
 - Increased memory/storage capacity
- Devices rated using TOPS (Trillions of Operations Per Second) metric
- All systems include a 5-year warranty

Replacement Scope

- Upcoming fiscal year:
 - Approximately 1,033–1,095 computers replaced
- Replacement schedule follows cyclical pattern:
 - High-volume replacement years followed by lower-volume years
- No growth inventory included (only replacements of expired devices)

Asset Utilization & Redistribution

- Underutilized devices (e.g., Health Sciences building):
 - Reallocated for:
 1. New employee onboarding
 2. Emergency replacement of failed equipment
- Older assets from other buildings may be reassigned across campus

Cost Overview

- Estimated cost for upcoming cycle: \$1.61 million
- Cost drivers:
 - Significant increase in memory (RAM) pricing
 - Industry-wide demand driven by AI computing needs
- Per-unit desktop cost increase:

- Approximately \$900 → \$1,300–\$1,400

Surplus Process

- End-of-life devices:
 - Data wiped securely
 - Sent to district warehouse surplus
 - Auctioned off
- Revenue distribution from surplus auctions:
 - Not clearly defined during meeting; may be managed by purchasing/warehouse

Mac Buyback Program (New Initiative)

- Apple buyback option under consideration for end-of-life Macs
- Potential credit applied toward future Mac purchases
- Intended to offset replacement costs

Health Sciences Equipment Utilization

- Concern raised regarding underutilized desktop computers
- Response:
 - Devices are redistributed for staffing needs and equipment failure coverage
 - Some devices were transferred from older decommissioned buildings into Health Sciences

Laptop vs Desktop Mobility Needs (Financial Aid Example)

- Concern raised about limited mobility of desktops for outreach work
- Response:
 - Laptop conversions allowed at end-of-life replacement stage
 - Mid-cycle conversion requires departmental funding and coordination
 - Laptops require additional infrastructure (docking stations, accessories)
 - Recommendation for broader institutional/district-wide discussion on device standards
 - Acknowledged cost differences between laptops and desktops

Committee Discussion Summary

- Key themes:
 - Rising technology costs driven by AI-related industry demand
 - Need for strategic planning around mobile workforce technology
 - Device redistribution is a key operational strategy
 - Consideration of district-wide standardization for laptops vs desktops
 - Clarification needed on surplus revenue allocation process

Technology Replacement Plan Presentation (Review & Recommendation) – Ron Gonzalves/District IT

SAC 7-Year Classroom Technology Refresh Plan (CTRP FY 26-27) – February 2026 Overview

- Instructional laptops:
 - Typically stored in carts for classroom use
- Instructional desktops:
 - Located in computer labs
- Lectern computers:
 - Installed in every classroom and included in total inventory

Utilization & Cost Concerns

- Concerns raised regarding:
 - Increasing cost of laptops vs. desktops
 - Underutilization of classroom devices
- Observation:
 - Many students use personal laptops or tablets instead of classroom devices
- Suggestion:
 - Reduce number of devices per classroom
 - Consider shared laptop cabinet model with flexible allocation

Efficiency & Cost Containment Strategies

- Focus on:
 - Sustaining long-term technology costs
 - Improving efficiency of resource use
- Potential strategies:
 - Virtualization (cloud-based computing)
 - Shared lab environments
 - Consolidation of computer labs
- Collaboration needed with:
 - Facilities
 - Faculty and academic departments

Future Planning

- A formal presentation on virtualization and cost strategies will be developed and presented to the committee.

Laptop Loan Program Discussion

- Alternative proposed:
 - Expand use of Digital Dawns Laptop Loan Program
- Clarification:
 - ITS advises on purchasing
 - Program support handled by a third party

Benchmarking

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other institutions (e.g., Coastline Community College) noted for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Successful use of cloud computing solutions <p>CEC Building Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues reported: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shared computers fill quickly ○ Performance slowdowns and crashes • Response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Many systems recently upgraded ○ Plan to provide larger hard drives (up to 2TB) for shared-use environments <p>Classroom Technology Replacement Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 7-year replacement cycle (compared to 5-year computer cycle) • Includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Projectors, screens, speakers ○ Document cameras ○ AV systems and infrastructure <p>Technology Enhancements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New features include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Touch panels for controlling classroom technology without logging in ○ Plug-and-play laptop connections (HDMI/USB-C) ○ Assistive Listening Systems (ALS) for ADA compliance ○ Sit-stand ADA-compliant lecterns <p>Assistive Listening Systems (ALS)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classrooms will include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Required infrastructure • Equipment: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stored at division offices ○ Available for checkout as needed <p>Upcoming Replacement Schedule</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target areas for next fiscal year: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Buildings C, G (gym), H, N, and athletic fields • Total: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Approximately 29 classrooms <p>Future-Year Projects</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planned upgrades include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I Building ○ Continuing Education ○ Phillips Theater ○ D Building 	
--	---	--

- Additional planning in progress for:
 - A, S, W, and G buildings
- Flexibility in Planning
- Plans are not fixed
 - Adjustments will depend on:
 - Building usage
 - Institutional priorities
 - Facilities planning decisions
- H Building Discussion
- Concerns:
 - Whether to upgrade or potentially demolish
 - Considerations:
 - Possible conversion into a Welcome Center
 - Evaluating cost-effective reuse vs. rebuilding
- I Building Update
- Project delays due to:
 - DSA approvals
 - Coordination with larger construction efforts
 - Timeline:
 - Projects may take 6–12 months once initiated
- Math Center Feedback
- Observations:
 - Too many computers currently installed
 - Increased student reliance on personal devices
 - Recommendations:
 - Reduce number of computers
 - Increase availability of power outlets for student use
- Standardization of Technology
- Emphasis on maintaining:
 - Consistent classroom technology across campuses
 - Benefits:
 - Easier maintenance
 - Faster troubleshooting
 - Note:
 - Limited customization to avoid complexity
- Scope of Classroom Modernization
- Includes:
 - New projectors, displays, and speakers

- New lecterns and cabling (25-year warranty)
- Electrical upgrades
- HyFlex-ready infrastructure
- Remote troubleshooting capability
- Spare equipment inventory

Cost Overview

- Estimated cost for next fiscal year:
 - ~\$1.64 million
- Covers:
 - Equipment
 - Engineering and installation
 - Spare parts

Committee Feedback on Budget

- Request for:
 - More detailed cost breakdown (key equipment categories)
- Proposal:
 - Treat as a “first read” before approval
- Response:
 - Agreement to provide additional cost details (e.g., projectors, touch panels)

SACTAC Input – John Steffens

- Observations:
 - Significant increase in cost compared to previous years
 - Inclusion of new cost elements (e.g., ADA-compliant furniture)
- Plan:
 - Further review of cost drivers in future discussions

Key Themes

- Need for:
 - Cost control and sustainability
 - Efficient use of technology resources
 - Standardization across campuses
 - Flexibility in long-term planning

Conclusion / Action Items

- Proposal designated as a First Read
- Committee will revisit at next meeting:
 - May 5, 2026
- Next steps:
 - Ron Gonzalves to provide:

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Detailed cost breakdown of major equipment categories 2. Additional clarification as needed 	
5. STUDENT UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Student Updates – Leticia Perez/Public Relations Commissioner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leticia manages social media (e.g., Instagram) • Shared recent and upcoming student activities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Rivalry Week Event <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Santa Ana College women’s softball team defeated SEC 6–1 ○ Sustainapalooza (Earth Day Event) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Scheduled for Monday (Earth Day celebration) ➢ Time: approximately 11:00 AM – 1:00 PM ○ Support A Friend Event <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Scheduled for next Thursday, 1:00–3:00 PM ➢ Focus: recognizing Sexual Assault Awareness Month ○ “Juice It Up with the Candidates” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➢ Meet-and-greet event for 2026–2027 ASG candidates ➢ Opportunity for students to ask questions and engage with candidates 	
SAC UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Approval of 2026–2027 Meeting Calendar (Second Read with Amendments) – Bart Hoffman</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart Hoffman introduced the item and asked Norma to review updates <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Yellow highlights: items discussed at the previous meeting ○ Technology Replacement Plan and Marketing Plan were consolidated into one presentation ○ Plan adjusted to be presented with recommendation in a single meeting (March) rather than separate first read and recommendation meetings <p>Motion & Discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Motion to approve calendar: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Moved by: Tommy Strong ○ Second: Kelly Nguyen <p>Floor opened for discussion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Committee Feedback <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ John D. Steffens noted: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SACTAC may not be able to provide a recommendation by early March due to limited meeting schedule 2. Additional review time is often needed for the Technology Replacement Plan 	

Amendment to Calendar

- Based on feedback, proposal made to:
 - Move Technology Replacement Plan presentation from March to April

Revised Motion

- Motion to approve calendar with amendment (move item to April meeting):
 - Moved by: **Tommy Strong**
 - Second: **Silvia Castillo**
 - Motion passed unanimously

Review Tentative Budget Assumptions & District Resource Requests – Mark Reynoso

Key highlights:

- FTES growth exceeds funded levels, leaving unfunded enrollment
- 2024–25 recalculation increased revenue (~\$7M increase)
- Ongoing unfunded FTES:
 - ~1,348 FTES (~\$8.2M) in 2024–25
 - ~2,605 FTES (~\$16M) projected in 2025–26 (P1)
- COLA projected at 2.4%, growth at 1.5%
- Cost pressures:
 - Categorical programs (e.g., SEEP) do not receive COLA but still incur salary increases
 - Adjunct vs. full-time faculty cost comparison shared
- ADA settlement: Final \$2M contribution scheduled for 2026–27
- Estimated \$3.8–\$4M unallocated revenue, largely benefiting SAC

District Resource Requests Discussion

Key issues:

- Campus safety costs exceed parking revenue (~\$859K gap)
- Proposal (not approved) to eliminate student parking fees could cost ~\$400K–\$500K
- Out-of-state payroll processing request (~\$687K):
 - Includes new staff and vendor (Green Shades)
 - Driven by ~12 employees living out of state

Additional context from Bart Hoffman:

- Payroll handled by county; not equipped for multi-state compliance
- External support and staffing required if out-of-state employees remain

Concerns raised:

- Mark Ou questioned high-cost relative to number of employees
- James Kennedy:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stated employees moved out of state (not originally hired that way) ○ Questioned need for 4 positions for limited staff ○ Requested more detailed justification <p>Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Item designated as first read ● Additional information requested ● To return for further review at May 5, 2026 meeting 	
6. PERIODIC REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No periodic reports to report. 	
7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No periodic reports to report. 	
8. NEW BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Items Deferred</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● SAC CEP Goals Worksheet ● Budget Allocation Model Draft (2026) → Both postponed to May 5, 2026 meeting 	
9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Scheduling Efficiency Forecasting Tool Presentation (May 5, 2026) – Daniel Martinez & Matthew Morin 	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<p>Fiscal Resources Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fiscal Resources Committee (rscdd.edu) 	
NEXT MEETING	May 5, 2026	

Submitted by Norma Castillo