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**	Julian Gonzalez
Jim Kennedy	**Claire Coyne**	**Reza Mirbeik Sabzevary**	Jimmy Nguyen	Minh Le
Jeffrey Lamb	**John Zarske**	Linda Sung	Liliana Oropeza	
Vaniethia Hubbard	Luis Pedroza	**Silvia Castillo**	**Jessica Avalos**	
Lorena Valencia	**Kelly Nguyen**	**Merari Weber**		
Kristi Blackburn				
Bold = Present				

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS		Meeting called to order 1:33pm Meeting adjourned at 2:58pm
	Welcome and self-introductions were made.	
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**

	Rubric for Resource Allocation Requests (RARs)
	• Kelly Nguyen asked whether there is a rubric or formal guidelines for RARs, citing a rejected Math Center request.
	• Mark Reynoso clarified:
	    o There is no formal rubric for RAR approvals.
	    o Budget priorities are embedded within the RAR form.
	    o Departments are encouraged to consult with their Dean or VP for feedback.
	• It was noted that Math Center chairs are expected to be replaced, with Dr. (Saeid) Eidgahy working with a furniture vendor.
	Clarification on Resource Allocation Process
	• Jeff Lamb clarified that the RARs are part of the program review process, not a standalone request system.	

	• Resource requests are:
	   ○ Prioritized within divisions through department chairs.
	   ○ Reviewed collaboratively at Academic Affairs meetings.
	   ○ Evaluated based on available funding, divisional priorities, and college-wide needs.
	• There is no standardized rubric due to varying funding sources and priorities.
	• Feedback is informal and typically occurs through discussions with Deans.
	• Demand exceeds available funding (approximately $1M available vs. $8M in requests).
	• Math Center chairs are likely to be replaced during an upcoming move.	

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	Approval of November 4, 2025 Minutes	**Moved to approve by:** Merari Weber **2nd by:** Kelly Nguyen **Abstentions:** Vaniethia Hubbard

4. ACTION ITEMS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS

	Budget Priorities for RAR Process (2nd Read) – Mark Reynoso
	• Mark Reynoso clarified that the document applies to FY 2026–2027 (correcting an earlier date reference).
	• The first reading occurred at the November 4, 2025 meeting.
	• No written feedback or emailed comments were received following the first reading.
	• The proposed budget priorities remain unchanged from FY 2025–2026, and members agreed they are still relevant.
	• Mark Reynoso explained that:
	   ○ Budget priorities are embedded in the Program Review / RER process in Nuventive.
	   ○ They appear on the RER homepage and should be considered when submitting RARs.
	   ○ This meeting served as an opportunity to add, revise, or remove priorities if needed.
	Faculty Feedback & Context
	• Tommy Strong shared that he received faculty feedback outside the normal submission process and would present the comments to the committee.
	   ○ He noted the timing was impacted by the holiday period and apologized for the late submission.
	• Bart Hoffman stated that a motion would be requested after discussion, allowing for the possible inclusion of faculty comments.
	Historical Context of Budget Priorities – Tommy Strong
	• Budget priorities are intended to reflect baseline and essential funding priorities, not	

aspirational or "blue sky" goals.
- The framework was originally developed during periods of potential budget shortfalls.
- Priorities represent areas the college would aim to protect from cuts, with legal mandates and compliance ranked highest.
- The intent is to guide difficult funding decisions under constrained financial conditions.

Suggested Revision
- Vaniethia Hubbard recommended revising Priority #3 to explicitly include equity alongside Guided Pathways.
- She noted:
  - Increased integration of Guided Pathways and Equity planning.
  - Alignment of these efforts within a single plan submitted to the State Chancellor's Office.
  - Significant overlap in work, planning, and meetings across both areas.

Committee Discussion & Proposed Revisions
- Bart Hoffman invited committee members to share any additional comments or proposed changes to the budget priorities, noting that most priorities appeared consistent with the prior year.
- Mark Reynoso stated that the existing priorities largely remain relevant and could be retained, with flexibility to add or adjust language as needed.
- Vaniethia Hubbard clarified that references to Guided Pathways and Equity should be framed using "AND" rather than a slash, emphasizing that both areas are inclusive and not an either/or proposition.
- The committee agreed that priorities should be added to or refined, rather than removed, where appropriate.

Facilities & Maintenance Considerations
- Jeff Lamb raised the question of whether the committee should explicitly highlight the significant investment in facilities maintenance and smaller capital projects, noting recent expenditures exceeding $23–26 million.
- Bart Hoffman acknowledged the importance of the investment but noted that:
  - The budget priorities are intended to guide RAR submissions broadly, not reflect year-specific funding levels.
  - Facilities-related investments are already encompassed under Facility Support Services (Priority #1).
- No additional facilities-specific language was added at this time.

Technical & Language Corrections
- John Zarske recommended revising language related to FTES production, suggesting:

- o Replacing "continuing education" with "noncredit", as FTES refers to instructional type rather than site.
- The committee agreed with this correction.
- James Kennedy clarified that "noncredit" should be written without a hyphen and with a lowercase "c."
- Mark Reynoso confirmed these corrections were made.
- Additional typographical corrections were noted, including:
  - o Revising "FTS Support" to "FTES Support."

Public Safety & Legislative Language Updates
- Jeff Lamb recommended removing references to public safety (police/fire) under specific priorities, suggesting a focus instead on CC-approved off-site and off-campus centers.
- The committee agreed to delete the public safety reference.
- Jeff Lamb also proposed replacing the specific reference to AB 705 with broader language referencing "legislative mandates," to encompass additional statewide initiatives such as:
  - o Common Course Numbering
  - o Cal-GETC
  - o Credit for Prior Learning (CPL)
- The committee agreed to remove "AB 705" and replace it with "legislative mandates."

FTES & Student Success Metrics
- Claire Coyne suggested that, since FTES production is identified as a priority, supplemental and student success metrics should also be explicitly reflected within the specific priorities.
- Bart Hoffman acknowledged the comment and noted it would be addressed alongside the faculty feedback being presented by Tommy Strong.
- Tommy Strong clarified that he had submitted multiple faculty comments via chat and apologized for any confusion in how they were displayed.

Transition to Faculty Feedback
- Bart Hoffman confirmed that all general committee comments had been addressed.
- The floor was then formally turned over to Tommy Strong to present and discuss faculty feedback related to the budget priorities.

Faculty Feedback on FTES & Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF)
- Tommy Strong presented faculty feedback regarding FTES support, emphasizing that the college must not only focus on enrollment volume but also on optimizing the SCFF.
- He noted that SCFF includes supplemental and success metrics, which require intentional monitoring and resource alignment beyond unit accumulation.

- A recommendation was brought forward to:
  - Explicitly reference SCFF supplemental and success metrics within the budget priorities.
  - Ensure that tools, technology, and institutional supports align with SCFF-related outcomes.

Structural Reorganization of Budget Priorities
- Jeff Lamb suggested that FTES production should be clearly aligned with the General Priority of maintaining large college status, as FTES is the defining metric for that designation.
- He recommended:
  - Moving Specific Priorities, Section 3 (FTES production) under General Priorities #4 (Maintain Large College Status).
  - Reframing the existing FTES Support category to focus instead on SCFF support, recognizing its broader institutional impact.
- Jeff clarified that the Planning & Budget Committee's role is resource allocation, not strategy development or implementation, which remains the responsibility of Enrollment Management and other operational units.

Clarifications & Committee Consensus
- Tommy Strong agreed with the distinction between resource support versus strategic execution, noting the importance of aligning budget priorities with institutional enrollment and funding goals without prescribing operational tactics.
- Vaniethia Hubbard raised concerns about placement within the document, which led to further clarification and refinement of the structure.
- Consensus emerged to:
  - Retain FTES production under General Priorities #4 (Maintain Large College Status).
  - Rename the former FTES Support section to SCFF Support, reflecting its broader scope.
- Mark Reynoso implemented the changes live during the meeting, with acknowledgment that numbering and formatting adjustments would be finalized later.

Outcome
- The committee agreed that the revised structure:
  - Better reflects the relationship between FTES, SCFF, and institutional resource allocation.
  - Provides clearer guidance for future RAR submissions.
- Tommy Strong confirmed that his faculty comments were adequately captured in the revised language.
- Bart Hoffman asked if there were any additional comments to address; none were

raised.

Refinement of SCFF and FTES Support Language
- Vaniethia Hubbard raised concerns regarding the accuracy of the revised SCFF Support language, noting that the prior FTES Support wording more precisely reflected the listed components.
- Discussion clarified that FTES is a component of SCFF, alongside supplemental and success metrics.
- Jeff Lamb explained that functions such as Admissions & Records, Financial Aid, Counseling, Tutoring, Marketing, and Enrollment Management tools directly support SCFF outcomes, including retention, persistence, and completion.
- It was acknowledged that certain elements (e.g., institutional effectiveness and assessment) do not align as cleanly with SCFF but can be reasonably connected through outcomes and completion measures.

Clarification on Noncredit Inclusion
- Vaniethia Hubbard and Jim Kennedy noted that SCFF does not include noncredit FTES, and that the revised language could create confusion.
- To address this, the committee agreed to modify the section title to "SCFF and FTES Support," ensuring clarity and inclusivity of both credit and noncredit considerations.
- Consensus was reached that using "and" (rather than replacing FTES) best reflected the scope of the section.

Additional Revisions and Corrections
- Bart Hoffman reminded the committee to incorporate John Zarske's earlier comment, correcting references from "Continuing Education" to "noncredit."
- Mark Reynoso confirmed the correction would be made.

Removal of Outdated Priority Supplemental Retirement Plan (SRP)
- Jeff Lamb questioned the continued relevance of Specific Priority #2: Restore essential and strategic services lost due to SRP, noting the program concluded several years prior.
- Jim Kennedy and Bart Hoffman agreed that the college has fully recovered and exceeded pre-SRP staffing and service levels.
- The committee reached consensus to delete Specific Priority #2 from the document.

Next Steps and Action Item
- Mark Reynoso proposed making all agreed-upon edits live, followed by a vote on the revised document.
- Claire Coyne recommended tabling the vote to allow review of a clean, perfected version for a third reading at the next meeting.
- Tommy Strong seconded the motion.
- It was confirmed that postponing the vote would not negatively impact planning timelines, and that a final reading and vote would occur at the February 3rd meeting.

- The committee agreed to proceed with this approach.

Clarification of FTES Targets and Reflection Process
- Merari Weber asked whether FTES production is tied to defined goals or percentage targets, similar to goal-setting used in program review and learning outcomes.
- She also inquired whether there is a formal reflection process to evaluate what targets were met or achieved in the prior year to inform future planning and priorities.

Administrative Response on Targets and Review
- Jim Kennedy confirmed that the college establishes annual FTES targets for both credit and noncredit, which are reflected in the adopted budget.
- He noted that performance against these targets is reviewed at year-end through the final apportionment process, including:
  - Submission of the recalculation report
  - Receipt of final results in January
  - Assessment of whether targets were met and the resulting budgetary impact

Suggested Language Refinement
- Jim Kennedy suggested revising the language from "FTES production" to "achieving established FTES targets," to better reflect goal alignment and accountability.
- Jeff Lamb supported this approach, noting that referencing FTES targets allows flexibility in both growth and contraction scenarios.

Consideration of Productivity and Efficiency
- Jeff Lamb added that beyond meeting targets, the college also monitors productivity and efficiency metrics, particularly on the credit side.
- He acknowledged, however, that such operational metrics may extend beyond the scope of the current high-level budget priorities document.

Consensus and Conceptual Alignment
- Merari Weber agreed that referencing targets rather than production alone implies reflection, goal-setting, and alignment with institutional objectives.
- General agreement emerged that "FTES targets" provides clearer intent and better framing within the document.

Discussion on Including SCFF and Apportionment Metrics
- Tommy Strong recommended explicitly incorporating SCFF considerations into the FTES production section, noting that earlier discussion had drifted without formally adding it.
- He proposed either:
  - Making SCFF a subcategory under FTES production, or
  - Adding it as a separate general priority, to ensure clarity and completeness.

Structural Reorganization Suggestions
- Claire Coyne suggested consolidating the section to emphasize FTES as a core priority

tied to maintaining large-college status, with subcategories such as:
- o Credit FTES targets
- o Noncredit FTES targets
- o Supplemental and success metrics
- This approach was supported by Tommy Strong as a clearer and more organized framing.

Administrative Perspective on Apportionment
- Jim Kennedy noted that:
  - o Maintaining large-college status was historically significant but is less critical now, as the college exceeds the threshold.
  - o FTES and SCFF are both apportionment mechanisms, and suggested using the broader term "apportionment targets" with FTES and SCFF listed underneath.
- He also raised concerns that SCFF does not apply to noncredit, recommending careful wording to avoid inaccuracies.

Consensus Building and Real-Time Edits
- Jeff Lamb proposed revising the section title to "Apportionment Targets", with a structured breakdown including:
  - o Credit FTES
  - o Noncredit FTES
  - o Success metrics
  - o Supplemental allocations
- He emphasized keeping the document high-level and strategic, rather than overly operational.
- The committee worked collaboratively to edit the document in real time, adjusting headings, sub-bullets, and formatting for clarity.

Enhanced vs. Non-Enhanced Noncredit Funding
- A discussion occurred regarding whether to retain enhanced and non-enhanced noncredit distinctions:
  - o Bart Hoffman and Vaniethia Hubbard supported retaining both, citing their continued relevance and differing funding rates.
  - o Jim Kennedy acknowledged the funding differences but noted either approach would be workable depending on clarity.

Alignment and Resolution
- The group agreed that:
  - o Credit FTES and noncredit FTES should be listed as subcategories, rather than standalone priorities.
  - o Enhanced and non-enhanced noncredit designations should remain visible.
- Minor formatting and structural adjustments were made to reflect this consensus.

Reflection on Process
- Bart Hoffman emphasized the importance and value of the discussion, noting its significance for year-round budget planning.
- Committee members expressed appreciation for the collaborative dialogue, thoughtful input, and respectful disagreement, recognizing the process as both productive and informative.

Acronym Clarity and Document Accessibility
- Mark Ou recommended that all acronyms be fully defined at least once to ensure clarity for new readers and future reference.
- He emphasized that acronyms can be confusing for newcomers if not clearly explained.
- Tommy Strong supported the suggestion and proposed an alternative approach of adding a legend or glossary to preserve document conciseness.
- Jeff Lamb and Bart Hoffman agreed that a footnote or legend would be preferable to defining acronyms repeatedly throughout the document.
- Merari Weber supported adding a legend at the bottom of the document for easy reference.
- The committee reached consensus to add an acronym legend, and Mark Reynoso was tasked with including a note indicating that the legend would be added.

Next Steps and Timing
- Mark Reynoso confirmed he would:
  - Add the acronym legend
  - Incorporate the agreed-upon edits
  - Bring the revised document back for review at the February meeting

Motion to Table Approval
- Bart Hoffman recommended tabling the vote on the budget priorities until the revised document could be reviewed in its corrected form.
- A motion to table approval until the February 3, 2026 meeting was made by Tommy Strong.
- The motion was seconded by Claire Coyne.
- The committee conducted a vote:
  - No objections
  - No abstentions
- The motion passed unanimously.

5. UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	No updates/reports to report.	
STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS

	No student updates to report.	
6. PERIODIC REPORTS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	
	No periodic reports to report.	
7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**
	No periodic reports to report.	
8. NEW BUSINESS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**

	Categorical Funds – Mark Reynoso & Tommy Strong
	• Tommy Strong reviewed the previous committee document showing federal, state, and local portions of Fund 12, including allocations for administrative salaries.
	• Faculty engagement at the Academic Senate meeting revealed interest in understanding categorical funds one layer deeper, including grant-specific details and staffing.
	• Proposal to invite Sarah Fisher, Assistant Vice Chancellor of Educational Services, to provide insights on categorical funds and grant management in a future meeting.
	• Clarification that categorical funds are restricted, often linked to specific initiatives or programs (e.g., Strong Workforce, Guided Pathways, equity programs).
	• Jeff Lamb emphasized the complexity of categorical funds, highlighting that there are hundreds of grants, some long-standing, some temporary, and that the committee does not oversee each individually.
	• Committee members discussed the risk assessment aspect for categorical funding, especially regarding positions potentially moving to the general fund (Fund 11).
	    ○ Claire Coyne noted that tracking categorical-funded positions is critical for planning if they become institutionalized.
	    ○ Tommy Strong emphasized understanding funding history, size, and risk, highlighting that some funding has existed for decades, while other funding is short-term.
	• Vaniethia Hubbard recommended incorporating categorical-funded positions into program review to evaluate sustainability and funding needs.
	Next Steps:
	• Invite Sarah Fisher to a future Planning & Budget Committee meeting to provide additional insights on categorical funding and grant oversight.	

9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	Assess Tasks on Committee Calendar • To be reviewed by the Goals Work Group (meeting on December 4th). • Progress on goals is ongoing, with some overlaps between different goal-related	

	artifacts discussed in today's meeting.	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	Fiscal Resources Committee • [Fiscal Resources Committee (rsccd.edu)](rsccd.edu)	
NEXT MEETING	**February 3, 2026**	

Submitted by Norma Castillo