SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING
MINUTES – October 6, 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**
Jim Kennedy, Co-chair/**Mark Reynoso**	**Reza Mirbeik, Co-chair**		**Jessica Avalos**	TBD
Kristi Blackburn/Bill Reardon (alt)	**Maria Aguilar Beltran**	Jason Huskey	**Chandra Donahoe**	
Vaniethia Hubbard	**Silvia Castillo**	**Kelly Nguyen**	Liliana Oropeza	
Jim Kennedy	**Claire Coyne**	**Merari Weber**	**Mark Ou**	
Jeffrey Lamb	**Andy Gonis**	**John Zarske**		
Lorena Valencia/Mark DeAsis (alt)				
Bold = Present				

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS		Meeting called to order 1:35pm Meeting adjourned at 3:09pm
	Welcome and self-introductions were made.	
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**
	• No public comments.	
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**
	Approval of September 1, 2026 Minutes	Moved to approve: **Reza Mirbeik** 2nd by: **Claire Coyne** Abstentions: **None**
4. ACTION ITEMS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**

Amendment to the Meeting Agenda – Claire Coyne

Reorg. #1489 – District Office and Human Resources

- Prior to consideration of the meeting minutes, Claire Coyne requested an amendment to the agenda.
- Claire moved to add the following item under Action Items:
- REORG 1489 – District Office and Human Resources
- Claire explained that the reorganization item had been presented at District Council the previous day and that Dr. Nery had requested that it be placed on the Planning & Budget Committee agenda for consideration and a recommendation to College Council.

Motion

- Add REORG 1489 – District Office and Human Resources to the meeting agenda as an Action Item.
    - Moved by: Claire Coyne
    - Seconded by: Merari Weber
- The committee was given an opportunity to ask questions or provide comments regarding the addition of the item to the agenda.

Outcome

- Motion passed.
- No opposition was expressed.
- The committee proceeded with the amended agenda.

Faculty Obligation Number (FON) Recommendation – Mark Reynoso

- Mark introduced the item and explained that Dr. Nery had asked the Planning & Budget Committee to develop a recommendation to College Council regarding the number of full-time faculty positions to approve for Fall 2027.

FON Overview

- Mark provided background information regarding the FON:
    - The FON is the number of full-time faculty a district is required to employ each fall under the Education Code and California Code of Regulations, Title 5.
    - The applicable FON is based on the lower of projected fundable growth or the annual percentage change in funded credit FTES at P2.
    - The state provides an advanced FON in the fall, followed by the P2 calculation.
    - Districts must submit their current fall full-time faculty FTES numbers by November 15.
    - Positions and circumstances that may count toward the FON include:
        1. Non-instructional full-time faculty
        2. Grant-funded faculty

3. Faculty reassigned time
4. Unpaid sabbaticals
5. Classified administrators who teach
6. Late retirements within the applicable timeframe

- Non-credit faculty, full-time faculty overload, and full-time substitutes do not count toward the FON.

Fall 2026 FON Compliance

- Mark reported that:
  - The Fall 2026 FON requirement was 341 full-time faculty.
  - The district's actual Fall 2026 FTES was 351.94, approximately 10 FTES above the requirement, placing the district in compliance.

Fall 2027 Advanced FON

- Mark reported that the advanced FON for Fall 2027 was approximately 350.40.
  - Current Fall 2026 FTES: 351.94
  - Advanced Fall 2027 FON: 350.40
  - The district was approximately 1–2 FTES above the advanced FON.
  - Maintaining the current staffing level would place the district near the Fall 2027 FON requirement.
- Mark also noted:
  - Replacing one full-time faculty member costs approximately $200,000.
  - The penalty for failing to meet the FON is approximately $92,000.
  - The final estimated cost would depend on the number of positions approved.
  - The current percentage of full-time faculty was reported as:
    1. Santa Ana College: 69.09%
    2. Santiago Canyon College: 30.91%

Known Faculty Separations

- Mark explained that several known separations, including late retirements, were included in the Fall 2026 FTES calculation but would need to be considered when determining Fall 2027 staffing levels.
- The committee discussed the possibility of additional separations before the applicable deadline and the need to account for them when planning for Fall 2027.

Discussion of FON and Non-FON Faculty Positions

FON vs. Actual Faculty FTES

- Kelly Nguyen asked for clarification regarding the difference between the advanced FON and faculty FTES.
- Mark explained:
  - The advanced FON is the state-provided number indicating the full-time faculty level the district should maintain.

	○ Faculty FTES represents the district's actual full-time faculty staffing level, which was 351.94 for Fall 2026. **Potential Faculty Recommendation** • The committee discussed whether to recommend a specific number of positions or a range. • Reza Mirbeik initially suggested approximately 5–10 FON-funded positions and 2–3 non-FON positions to allow flexibility for additional separations. • Members discussed how retirements or separations before April 1, 2027, could affect the number of positions needed to maintain FON compliance. **Categorically Funded Positions** • Claire Coyne noted that one known position, an EOPS counselor, is categorically funded. Although some Fund 11 support may be required for matching funds, she explained that the position would likely need to be addressed separately. **Budget Considerations** • Claire Coyne asked what the district could financially afford in connection with the proposed faculty recommendation. • Mark explained that: ○ The district expected to receive some growth funding for the fiscal year. ○ A portion of the current year's one-time growth funding was planned for other purposes, including FMRs. ○ Approximately $1 million was identified as potentially available for new full-time faculty positions in the following year. ○ At approximately $200,000 per faculty member, this amount could support about five positions, with additional growth funding potentially available. • Mark clarified that FMR funding would be used for FMRs during the current year but could become available for faculty positions the following year if the college chose to allocate it for that purpose. **Classified Position Considerations** • Claire emphasized the importance of considering classified professionals as part of the institution's broader staffing priorities. • Mark explained that, unlike faculty, classified staffing is not subject to a state-mandated employee number. • Mark Ou added that classified staffing needs are tied to departmental organizational charts. Expanding positions may require a reorganization process initiated by the appropriate manager. • The committee noted that the process for prioritizing classified positions was still developing. **Non-FON Faculty** • Merari Weber discussed including non-FON faculty positions, particularly for Continuing Education.	

	• She noted that faculty counselors count toward the FON, while certain Continuing Education faculty positions are not subject to the same state mandate. She supported considering non-FON positions based on programmatic need.
	• Reza explained that non-FON positions are driven by program growth and institutional needs rather than state requirements.
	• The committee discussed the contributions of non-credit programs to enrollment, FTES, and funding. Reza noted that these programs generate significant FTES and funding that support the colleges' financial position.
	Clarification of Replacement Positions and Faculty Prioritization
	• Silvia Castillo asked whether the proposed five positions would be in addition to the four known faculty separations.
	• Reza clarified that the recommendation was intended to account for known replacements while allowing flexibility for additional separations before April 1, 2027.
	Faculty Hiring Prioritization Process
	• Kristi Blackburn expressed concern about referring to positions as guaranteed replacements and emphasized that:
	  ○ The Faculty Hiring Prioritization process determines which positions are recommended.
	  ○ The committee should focus on the number of positions needed to meet the FON rather than guaranteeing replacements for specific disciplines.
	  ○ The four known separations establish the approximate number of positions that must be accounted for to maintain the current FTES level.
	• Claire Coyne agreed, explaining that:
	  ○ Faculty positions are not automatically prioritized when an individual retires or leaves.
	  ○ Positions are selected through the faculty prioritization process, with the President making final decisions based on prioritization, administrative input, fiscal conditions, and institutional needs.
	• Claire further explained that the Planning & Budget Committee recommends budget parameters for faculty hiring to College Council, providing guidance while preserving the President's discretion over final hiring decisions.
	Development of the Committee Recommendation
	• The committee continued discussing whether to recommend a range or a specific number.
	• Mark Reynoso preferred a specific recommendation, suggesting that the committee:
	  ○ Account for the four known separations and any additional separations needed to maintain current FTES.	

- Consider approximately five additional faculty positions based on the potential $1 million allocation.
- Recognize the President's discretion to approve positions based on fiscal and institutional considerations.

- Reza agreed that the recommendation should address known and future separations while identifying a number of additional positions.

Revised Recommendation

- After further discussion, Claire Coyne proposed a more specific recommendation:
  - Replace the four faculty positions associated with known separations.
  - Add four additional FON positions to provide capacity for future separations and staffing needs.
  - Add two non-FON faculty positions.
- This would establish a recommendation for:
  - Eight FON-funded positions, including the four known separations and four additional positions.
  - Two non-FON positions.
  - The President would retain discretion over the final number and specific positions selected through the prioritization process.
- The committee also discussed three positions associated with failed searches during the previous hiring process.
- Claire noted that these positions were expected to move forward but might fall outside the scope of this recommendation.

Motion – Faculty Hiring Recommendation

- Claire Coyne made the following motion:
  - Recommend that Planning & Budget move forward with:
    1. Replacing the four faculty positions associated with known separations;
    2. Adding four additional FON-funded faculty positions; and
    3. Adding two non-FON faculty positions.
- Motion seconded by Kristi Blackburn.

Discussion

- The committee was given an opportunity for further discussion.
- Members reiterated that the recommendation establishes budgetary parameters and does not guarantee specific faculty hires.
- Final prioritization and hiring decisions remain subject to the faculty hiring prioritization process and the President's discretion.

Roll-Call Vote

- Committee members present were called individually with their vote:
  - Reza Mirbeik – Yes
  - Claire Coyne – Yes

- Merari Weber – Yes
- Maria Aguilar Beltrán – Yes
- Silvia Castillo – Yes
- Andy Gonis – Yes
- Kelly Nguyen – Yes
- John Zarske – Yes
- Jessica Avalos – Yes
- Chandra Donahoe – Yes
- Mark Ou – Yes
- Kristi Blackburn – Yes
- Lorena Valencia – Yes

- The motion received affirmative votes from the members called (13-0).

Outcome

- Motion passed unanimously.

Review & Finalize P&B Committee Goals – Reza Mirbeik

- Reza thanked the subcommittee members for their work developing five goals aligned with the college's Comprehensive Educational Plan. He explained that each goal included proposed activities, measures of progress, and alignment with the plan.
- Reza invited committee members to review the goals and identify one or more to prioritize for the current semester or year. He emphasized the importance of establishing actionable goals, tracking progress, and reporting accomplishments and obstacles to the committee.

Review and Measurement of Goals

- John Zarske requested additional time to review the proposed goals.
- Merari Weber asked whether baseline measurements were available to assess current progress and establish a starting point for evaluating growth.
- Reza explained that some work had already been completed, but baseline measurements had not been established for each goal.
- He acknowledged the need to measure outcomes rather than simply count activities, such as presentations, to determine whether members had gained a better understanding of the college budget.

Discussion of the Five Goals

- Reza highlighted several areas addressed by the proposed goals:
  - Budget Understanding and Participation: Provide learning opportunities and informational materials to improve committee members' understanding of the college budget.
  - Equity and Accountability: Ensure equity and accountability are considered in the resource allocation process.

- Budget Transparency and Communication: Improve access to information regarding college funding, budget decisions, and expenditures.
- Fiscal Sustainability and Effective Use of Resources: Ensure funding requests and proposed expenditures are accurate, sustainable, and appropriate over time.
- Data-Informed Decision-Making: Strengthen the use of data to guide resource allocation decisions and evaluate the effectiveness of expenditures.

- Reza noted that although progress had been made in some areas, additional work was needed to establish measurable outcomes and identify obstacles to achieving the goals.

Prioritization and Next Steps

- Reza recommended that the committee select a manageable number of goals for the current semester or year and establish timelines for implementation.
- He confirmed that the goals document was available on the committee website and asked members to review it before the next meeting.
- Reza confirmed that members would have additional time to review the goals and that the committee would revisit the item at the next meeting, when a motion could be made to select one or more goals to pursue.

Outcome

- The committee agreed to continue the discussion at the next meeting to allow members additional time to review the proposed goals and determine which to prioritize.

Reorg #1489 – District Office/Human Resources – Claire Coyne

Background and Proposed Reorganization

- Claire Coyne explained that several District positions had been presented through reorganizations without following the established process outlined in the District Planning Manual. The process typically includes program review, presentation of resource requests to Planning & Budget, a recommendation to College Council, and subsequent review by District Council.
- The proposed HR reorganization would eliminate the Risk Management position held by Don Maus upon his retirement and:
  - Redistribute his duties among three existing HR employees
    1. Adjust their classifications and salaries
  - Increase another employee's classification
  - Establish a new Principal HR Analyst position
- Claire noted that the proposal had been approved conditionally by District Cabinet and forwarded to District Council without completing all required review steps. The proposal projected approximately $18,000 in initial savings; however, those

savings were expected to diminish, with additional costs eventually passed on to the colleges.

Committee Discussion and Concerns

- Mark Ou questioned whether the employees receiving the redistributed duties had the necessary expertise to perform the specialized safety and risk management responsibilities.
    - Claire acknowledged that concerns had been raised about dividing the work among multiple employees and the potential for increased backlogs.
- Kristi Blackburn emphasized Don Maus' critical role in providing:
    - Immediate guidance
    - Conducting safety walkthroughs
    - Supporting campus risk management
- She expressed concern about eliminating the position and distributing its responsibilities among employees who may not have comparable experience.
- Andy Gonis also opposed eliminating the Risk Management position, questioning how risk-related issues would be addressed without a dedicated position.
- Committee members requested clarification regarding:
    - The proposed organizational chart
    - Revised classifications
    - Potential long-term costs
- Claire explained that if the colleges did not support the reorganization or required additional information, HR would proceed with an interim replacement for the Risk Management position.
- The other proposed changes, including the new Principal HR Analyst position, would not move forward.
- Maria Aguilar Beltrán asked whether the committee could postpone its recommendation to allow additional review.
- Claire explained that delaying the decision would require moving forward with only a replacement hire for the retiring Risk Management position.

Motion – District HR Reorganization Proposal

- Reza Mirbeik made the following motion:
    - Due to insufficient time and information to make an informed decision, Reza moved that the committee **not support moving the District's proposed reorganization forward as presented.**
- Motion seconded by Maria Aguilar Beltrán.

Roll-Call Vote

- Committee members present were called individually with their vote:
    - Reza Mirbeik – Yes
    - Claire Coyne – Yes
    - Merari Weber – Yes

	○ Maria Aguilar Beltrán – Yes ○ Silvia Castillo – Yes ○ Andy Gonis – Yes ○ Kelly Nguyen – Yes ○ John Zarske – Yes ○ Jessica Avalos – Yes ○ Chandra Donahoe – Yes ○ Mark Ou – Yes ○ Kristi Blackburn – Yes ○ Lorena Valencia – Yes • The motion received affirmative votes from the members called (13-0). **Outcome** • The motion passed unanimously, with all 13 members voting in favor of **not supporting the proposed reorganization as presented.**	
5. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**
	• No unfinished business to discuss.	
6. NEW BUSINESS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**
	Overview of Categorical Funds – Mark Reynoso **Comparison of Funds 11, 12, and 13** • Mark Reynoso compared the budgets for Funds 11, 12, and 13. Fund 11 totaled approximately $166 million, Fund 12 approximately $51.3 million, and Fund 13 approximately $16.5 million. • Fund 12 represented approximately 22% of the combined expenditure budgets. • Fund 12 Revenue and Expenditures • Fund 12 revenue consisted of approximately $8 million in federal grants (16%), $42 million in state categorical grants (82%), and $1.3 million in local funding (2%). • Personnel expenses included approximately $5.3 million for managers, $8.2 million for faculty, and $19.1 million for classified employees. **SEAP Budget and Carryover Funds** • Mark provided SEAP as an example of a Fund 12 budget, explaining that funds support programs such as Equity, Basic Skills Initiative (BSI), and Student Success and Support Program (SSSP). • Categorical grants may carry forward unspent funds for use within their respective programs, subject to grant restrictions and approved purposes. • The SEAP committee reviews budgets and expenditure requests, including certain Equity requests. **Oversight of Categorical Funds**	

	• Andy Gonis asked how carryover funds are tracked and controlled. Mark explained that grant administrators manage funds according to program requirements and restrictions. • Reza Mirbeik asked whether funds designated for instructional salaries must remain in that category when carried over. Mark believed they must. • Maria Aguilar Beltrán asked whether block grants and other state funding were included in Fund 12. Mark explained that funding may be assigned to different funds depending on its source and restrictions. **Budget Transparency and Faculty Participation** • Maria requested greater visibility into how categorical funds support instructional programs and student services. • Mark identified the State Chancellor's Office Exhibit A as a public resource listing categorical grants and district allocations. Detailed college-level information may be obtained from grant administrators and Resource Development. • Reza suggested inviting grant administrators to present their funding sources, allocations, and expenditures to improve transparency. • Claire Coyne supported the proposal, emphasizing faculty, classified staff, and student input in decisions affecting student success. • Silvia Castillo noted that district budget reports and grant information are available through Budget Services and related resources. **Next Steps** • The committee will revisit Fund 12 transparency and consider incorporating categorical grant reports and presentations into future meetings.	
7. UPDATES/REPORTS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	**ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS**
	Student Updates/Reports • No student representative was in attendance.	
	SAC Updates/Reports • No updates/reports to discuss.	
8. PERIODIC REPORTS	**DISCUSSION/COMMENTS**	
	• No periodic reports to discuss.	
9. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	• Program Review and New Positions Process – Jim Kennedy • Overall FMR Discussion – Jim Kennedy	
GENERAL INFORMATION		

	Fiscal Resources Committee • Fiscal Resources Committee (rsccd.edu)	
NEXT MEETING	**November 3, 2026**	

Submitted by Norma Castillo