



SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING

MINUTES – May 5, 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 1:33pm Meeting adjourned at 2:59pm
	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 April 17, 2026 Minutes	Moved to approve by: Claire Coyne 2 nd by: Silvia Castillo Abstentions: Merari Weber, Liliana Oropeza, Jimmy Nguyen, and John Zarske
4. ACTION ITEMS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	Technology Replacement Plan (2nd Read & Recommendation) – Ron Gonzalves <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ron Gonzalves presented the proposed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Computer Replacement Plan Classroom Technology Remediation Plan 	

Budget and Cost Increases

- Computer replacement costs have significantly increased due to industry-wide pricing changes.
- Examples shared:
 - Desktop computers increased from approximately \$900 to \$1,300–\$1,400.
 - Laptops increased from approximately \$1,200 to \$1,600–\$1,800.
- Total proposed technology replacement budget estimated at approximately \$3.2 million.

Peak Replacement Cycle

- Next fiscal year is projected to be a peak replacement year.
- Approximately:
 - 1,000 computers scheduled for replacement next year.
 - 1,100 computers projected for replacement the following year.

Funding Discussion – Fund 13 Allocation

- Bart Hoffman explained that technology replacement funding typically comes from Fund 13.
- Current tentative allocation is approximately \$10 million across multiple campus priorities.
- Additional year-end balances may become available to support the technology replacement plan.

Discussion on Specialized Labs – Apple and Grant-Funded Labs

- Kristi Blackburn raised concerns regarding specialized Apple computer labs originally purchased with grant or CTE funding.
- Concern expressed that these labs may not automatically be included in ongoing replacement schedules.

Response from Technology Services

- Ron Gonzalves confirmed:
 - Several Apple labs have now been folded into the replacement plan.
 - The Fashion Program lab is currently included in the refresh cycle.
- Acknowledged there is no formal institutional process yet for automatically incorporating grant-funded equipment into long-term replacement planning.
- Recommendation made to develop a formal mechanism moving forward.

Lottery Funds and Mediation Projects – Additional Funding Sources

- Mark Ou clarified:
 - Lottery funds are used to support instructional computer replacements.
 - Approximately \$500,000 in ongoing funds are set aside for computer replacement support.

Classroom Mediation Timeline

- Technology mediation and infrastructure upgrades require lengthy approval processes.
- Some projects initiated in 2023–24 are still pending installation.

DSA Approval Process

- Ron Gonzalves explained:
 - Technology remediation projects are considered public works projects.
 - Projects require:
 - District Facilities review
 - DSA approval
 - Structural and ADA compliance inspections
 - Typical approval timeline ranges from 12–18 months.

ADA Compliance Discussion – Classroom Accessibility Requirements

- ADA compliance requirements include:
 - Three feet of clearance around lecterns and instructional spaces.
 - Accessible wall-mounted technology controls and displays.
- Classroom layouts may need to be reconfigured to meet compliance standards.

Motion on Technology Replacement Funding – Initial Motion

- Jim Kennedy proposed approval of the technology replacement plan contingent upon available funding.

Motion Amendments

- Committee discussion determined that:
 - Computer replacement needs are immediate.
 - Classroom mediation projects may require additional review and future discussion.
- Tommy Strong proposed bifurcating the plan:
 - Approve computer replacement funding now.
 - Postpone mediation funding discussion until a later date.
- Friendly amendment accepted by Jim Kennedy.

Final Committee Action – Approval of Computer Replacement Funding

- Motion approved to move forward with full funding for computer replacements only.
- Funding remains contingent upon final available budget allocations.
- No opposition or abstentions recorded.
- Committee agreed to revisit classroom mediation funding in the fall.

District Resource Requests (2nd Read & Recommendation) – Mark Reynoso

- Mark Reynoso introduced the district resource request discussion.
- The tentative budget included approximately \$687,000 in projected costs related to processing payroll for employees living out of state.

- Discussion indicated there are approximately 12 out-of-state employees.
- Costs included:
 - Approximately \$16,000 annually for the third-party payroll processing company Green Shades.
 - Funding for 4 additional district employees to manage increased payroll processing workload.

Committee Concerns

- Committee members raised multiple concerns and requests for clarification:
 - John Zarske questioned why processing payroll for approximately 12 employees would require such significant costs and additional full-time staff.
 - Requested more detailed justification for the staffing and operational expenses.
 - Tommy Strong explained that district representatives stated many costs are fixed regardless of the number of employees in each state.
 - Noted that employees reside in multiple states, requiring compliance with different tax and payroll regulations.
 - Acknowledged that committee members still wanted additional information.
 - Claire Coyne asked how these costs had previously been handled if the issue was not new.
 - Later noted that FRC had presented multiple budget scenarios, some of which may not have included these costs.
 - Suggested the committee not support this portion of the tentative budget assumptions.
 - Recommended pursuing a district policy limiting out-of-state employment.
 - Jimmy Nguyen stated discomfort voting on the request without additional information.
 - Requested a breakdown of employee classifications (faculty, classified, student employees) without requiring employee names.
 - Mark Ou commented that many private companies prohibit out-of-state employment due to similar administrative costs.
 - Expressed concern regarding cost effectiveness.
 - Kelly Nguyen asked whether the district had previously been paying these costs.
 - Asked whether the out-of-state employees were newly hired or existing employees.

- Questioned why out-of-state employees were hired instead of California-based employees.
- Asked what effect the committee's vote would have if the recommendation was rejected.
- Later asked whether the four proposed positions would be permanent or temporary.
- Reza Mirbeik asked whether the four proposed employees would solely process payroll for the 12 out-of-state employees.

Additional Clarifications

- It was clarified that the proposed four positions were intended to support payroll processing related to out-of-state employees.
- The district reportedly indicated existing staff no longer had sufficient capacity to absorb the workload.
- Green Shades services had already been used previously.
- Discussion acknowledged the district currently has no policy prohibiting employees from living and working out of state.
- Tommy referenced policies adopted by other districts, including MiraCosta College, restricting out-of-state employment.

Motion

- Claire Coyne proposed:
 1. That the committee recommend against approving this portion of the district tentative budget assumptions at this time.
 2. That the committee recommend review of the MiraCosta out-of-state employment policy through College Council and the Board Policy Committee.

Second

- Motion seconded by Merari Weber.

Vote Outcome

- No opposition or abstentions were noted.
- Motion passed unanimously.

Follow-Up Items

- Request additional information from FRC regarding:
 - Breakdown of out-of-state employees by classification.
 - Whether employees were hired out of state or relocated later.
 - Whether proposed positions are permanent or temporary.
 - Operational details regarding workload distribution.
- Review MiraCosta College policy regarding residency/location requirements for district employees.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forward committee recommendations to College Council and the Board Policy Committee. <p>Additional Clarification</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart Hoffman also noted that Fiscal Services declined to provide identifying information regarding out-of-state employees due to privacy concern. 	
5. STUDENT UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Student Updates – Leticia Perez/Public Relations Commissioner</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASG representatives were not in attendance. 	
SAC UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Surplus Revenue Follow-Up – Bart Hoffman</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart Hoffman followed up on questions regarding surplus revenue generated from auctioned equipment. • Information from Fiscal Services indicated: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Auction proceeds are deposited into the Budget Stabilization Fund. ○ This process is established in the Budget Allocation Model (BAM). ○ Revenue is not tracked or separated by campus location. ○ Surplus property may be auctioned, donated to nonprofits or school districts, or discarded if unusable. 	
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>SAC CEP Goals Worksheet & Assessment of Committee Goals – Bart Hoffman</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members acknowledged the extensive amount of work required to complete the worksheet. • Claire clarified that committees are not expected to address every institutional goal or objective. • Discussion focused on the difficulty of tracking progress across all identified goals. • Committee members discussed narrowing priorities to a more manageable number of goals. <p>Committee Direction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The worksheet was treated as a first read. • Members will revisit the document after additional review and discussion. 	

	<p>Scheduling Efficiency Forecasting Tool Presentation – Matt Morin and Paula Kincaid</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Matt Morin and Paula Kincaid presented a scheduling efficiency forecasting tool under development in Academic Affairs. • The tool is designed to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Project FTES based on schedule builds. ○ Compare projected FTES against prior actual FTES. ○ Analyze instructional costs through LHE data. ○ Assist divisions and departments in establishing scheduling targets. <p>Features Discussed</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pulls schedule data directly from Colleague. • Allows divisions to enter projected schedule information before schedules are finalized. • Uses historical enrollment averages to estimate projected FTES. • Supports future analysis of instructional efficiency and budget forecasting. <p>Committee Feedback</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Members expressed strong support for the tool. • Mark Reynoso suggested future integration of actual instructional salary costs and differentiation between full-time and adjunct faculty LHE. • Tommy encouraged continued presentations and updates to the Planning and Budget Committee. • Kristi Blackburn asked questions regarding implementation workload and integration into existing scheduling processes. <p>Next Steps</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deans will review and test the tool during upcoming meetings. • Chairs will later be incorporated into the process. • Future committee updates will be provided. 	
9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No future agenda items to report at this time. 	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<p>Fiscal Resources Committee</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal Resources Committee (rscdd.edu) 	
NEXT MEETING	May 26, 2026	

Submitted by Norma Castillo