

Budget Committee

MINUTES for Monday, November 3, 2025

1:00 p.m.

Zoom

Members Present:	Jacqueline Sabanos, Andrei Lucas, Catherine Shafer, Karl Cameron, Aaron Iffland, Mark Nesbit, Thu Tran, Myesha Jackson, Stacy Surwilo, Rachel Rose, David Anthon, Bitu Bookman, Armin Rashvand, Claudia Tornsauer, Cynthia Giammarinaro, Francisco Manzano, Megan Leppert, Michelle Gray, Evangeline Akridge
Members not Present:	
Guests:	Brad Dorschel, Franklin Garrett,
Recorder:	Patricia Lopez
AGENDA	
Call to Order 1:02 p.m.	
1. Welcome/Introductions	
2. Approval of Agenda/Minutes	
DISCUSSION	•
CONCLUSION	
3. Student Equity and Achievement Program (SEAP)	
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Garrett provided an overview of the Student Equity and Achievement (SEAP) Program budget on behalf of Dr. Carter. He noted that the majority of the budget approximately 90% is allocated to salaries and benefits for contract and hourly staff. He highlighted key discretionary allocations for the current year, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> \$7,000 for the Office of the Vice President of Student Services to support various activities. \$20,000 for Noncredit Student Support and Success Program (SSSP) activities in Roberta's area. \$20,000 for Student Support Services to fund professional development opportunities or student celebration events. \$5,000 for Instructional Learning Technology. \$10,000 for the ABE/GED/High School Program. \$5,000 for Learning Resources. \$293,000 in contingencies for unanticipated needs. Dr. Garrett also shared examples of programmatic efforts funded through SEAP, such as the Cultural Events Task Force, now entering its second year, and the use of braided funding to support positions and initiatives within Student Support Services. He emphasized that all SEAP funding is directed toward advancing work with disproportionately impacted student populations.
CONCLUSION	
Action Item [Who?]	•
4. Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA)	
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Bitu Bookman provided an overview of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA), a federal grant that supports adult education programs focused on basic literacy, high school diploma completion, and other credentials that help students transition into postsecondary education or the workforce.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • She explained that within the ESL program, WIOA funding supports both ESL courses and Workplace Preparation (vocational ESL for career-focused learners). When students participate in both areas, the program qualifies as Integrated Education and Training (IET), which generates higher levels of funding. • For the 2025–26 fiscal year, the college received \$1,438,000, an increase of approximately \$300,000 from the previous year’s \$1.14 million allocation. Of this amount, the majority about \$1.3 million is designated for ESL courses, while \$100,000 supports GED and basic education. This year, the Integrated English Literacy and Civics (IELC) program has been combined under Section 231 funding rather than its usual Section 243 category. • Dr. Bookman described how payment points are earned under WIOA based on student outcomes and activities, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administering pre- and post-tests (CASAS). - Student learning gains on those tests. - Completion of EL Civics assessments in citizenship, workforce readiness, and community participation. - Dual enrollment in ESL and vocational courses (earning higher “243-level” funding). - Completion of high school or equivalency certificates. - Transitions to CTE or post-secondary programs. - Employment or industry-recognized certification after program completion. • She noted that funding levels decreased during the pandemic but are now rising again. Allowable expenses include instructional activities, materials, and collaborations with other programs. • The majority of WIOA funds are allocated to salaries supporting CASAS testing and EL Civics activities. Current positions funded by WIOA include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - One 80% reassigned WIOA Coordinator (contract faculty). - One Program Software Technician (fully funded). - Two EL Civics Coordinators (100% reassigned). - Nineteen Program Aides (PAs) funded entirely through WIOA. • Remaining funds are planned for curriculum development, professional development, and partnership-building with other programs.
--	--

CONCLUSION	-
------------	---

Action Item [Who?]	
-----------------------	--

5. California Adult Education Program (CAEP)

DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dean Armin Rashvand provided an update on the California Adult Education Program (CAEP) budget for the current fiscal year. He began by thanking Brad and the EPC team for their support during the previous year, noting that due to key decisions and corrections made last year, the program is now in a stronger financial position. • He explained that CAEP expenditures are divided into several major categories, beginning with fixed personnel costs, which account for nearly half of the total budget. These include salaries, benefits, and certain software purchases. • Rashvand outlined a number of college-wide projects supported by CAEP funding, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Collaborative projects with the PR department and Marketing. - Consultant support for the CAEP application process. - Summer assignments for program chairs and faculty engaged in curriculum development. - Support for the Orange Director and curriculum work. - Passport to Success initiative and voucher programs for students pursuing GED, HiSET, or high school diploma completion. - Classified Professional Development sessions, including travel support. - CTE program support, with funds set aside for expansion this year.
------------	---

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Administrative travel allocations, budgeted up to \$15,000. • For fiscal year 2025–26, total planned expenses amount to \$4.8 million. The college’s CAEP allocation through NOVA is \$4,455,000, with an additional \$972,000 carried over from the previous year, bringing the total available funding to \$5,427,000. After accounting for a 5% indirect cost to cover district business office expenses, the available spending balance is \$5,155,000. • After all planned expenses, CAEP maintains a reserve of approximately \$271,000. Rashvand noted that, consistent with other funding sources, the majority of CAEP expenditures — about 76%—are allocated to instructional and non-instructional salaries and benefits. The remaining funds are distributed as follows: 8% for IT costs (5000 category) and 16% for capital outlay or other expenses (6000 category).
CONCLUSION	
Action Item [Who?]	-
6. Strong Workforce Program (SWP)	
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bradley Dorschel reported that this year’s SWP budget presentation was significantly more positive compared to last year, noting that the college now has reserves and contingency funds rather than a deficit. He acknowledged and thanked colleagues Jackie, Armin, Mark, and Cynthia for their collaboration and hard work in improving the program’s financial standing. • He explained that the SWP funding is divided into Local and Regional shares: Local Share: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Allocation for FY 2025–2026: \$1.42 million - Current allocations in NOVA include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CTE projects (culinary kitchen upgrade) \$35,000 - Program management (fixed salaries) \$310,000 - Data and research (salaries and software) \$56,000 - Job development (salaries) - Marketing (salaries and small contract amounts) - Professional development (classified employees) - SD Advance (noncredit-to-credit alignment assignments) - Approximately 20% of the budget (\$200,000) is being held as contingency for shifting institutional priorities or new allowable expenses. Regional Share: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Managed at the regional level (Region 10), where project priorities and funding amounts are set through an RFA process. - Current funded projects include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Counselor Institute 2.0 - Work-Based Learning / Job Placement Case Manager - Accelerating CTE Outcomes - Sector Investment (LVN program development) - Faculty Institute 3.0 • No contingency is allowed for regional projects; funds must be fully expended per the approved scopes.
CONCLUSION	
Action Item [Who?]	-

7. CalWORKS	
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dr. Garrett provided an overview of the CalWORKs program and its funding for the year, noting the total budget of \$7,521,142. The program is broken into several funding streams. The primary program funds allow for carryover and currently total approximately \$6 million. CalWORKs serves about 2,000 students, making it the largest program of its kind in the state, largely due to the diverse population it supports, including Haitian immigrants and other students qualifying for public assistance. The program employs five full-time counselors, six adjunct counselors, and five to six support staff across seven campuses. For federal TANF funds, totaling around \$400,000, the budget supports direct student services, such as laptops, transportation, and food assistance. The program also includes a work-study component, funding 75% of a student's salary while employers contribute the remaining 25%, currently serving about 24–25 students, evenly split between college-based and community-based employment. Additionally, the program receives a childcare fund each year; since many students already receive county childcare, this \$500,000 is typically reallocated to program funds to enhance student services. Overall, CalWORKs provides comprehensive support to its large and diverse student population. Dr. Garrett provided an overview of the Student Support Services, also referred to as Affinity Programs, and their categorical funding allocations. He highlighted several programs under his portfolio, including support for Dreamers, LGBTQIA students, the A2MEND program for Black male students, and the Rising Scholar Program. Regarding Dreamers, of the approximately \$300,000 budget allocated over three years, about \$80,000 remains for salaries and other allowable expenses. For the LGBTQIA program, \$204,000 remains, which can be used for salaries, supplies, and operational costs. The A2MEND program has a total allocation of \$40,000, with \$12,000 remaining, primarily used for sending students to HBCUs and professional development opportunities. The Rising Scholar Program, a new initiative this year, has an annual allocation of \$169,000, usable for salaries, supplies, operational costs, conferences, and some direct student aid. Dr. Garrett emphasized that while these amounts may seem substantial, they are carefully managed to maximize support for students across multiple services, including immigrant support programs. He concluded by noting that most of the funding is human-resource dependent, reflecting the college's strong reliance on staff and faculty to deliver these programs.
CONCLUSION	
Action Item [Who?]	-
8. 2024-2025 Actuals	
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark Nesbit II provided an overview of the General Fund Unrestricted (GFU) actuals for the 2024-25 fiscal year. He noted that 97% of the GFU was dedicated to salaries and benefits, highlighting the college's significant human-resource dependency. The total spent outside of salaries and benefits was \$46,101,114, covering supplies, other operating expenses, and capital outlay. Mark explained key account codes for clarity: 1101 – academic contract classroom (faculty in classrooms), 1201 – deans, 1204 – contract non-classroom faculty assignments, 1205 – primarily counselors, 1301 – adjunct instructional classroom salaries, 1302 – substitutes, 1308 – classroom overload assignments, 1401 – adjunct non-classroom assignments, 1408 – non-classroom overload assignments (noting the different hourly rates for classroom vs. non-classroom work), 2101 & 2201 – classified contracts, 2301 & 2308 – nances and overtime, 2401 – IAS nances, and 3000s – benefits. He further explained that the remaining budget outside salaries falls into three main pools: 4000 accounts – supplies, 5000 accounts – other operating expenses (consulting, travel, software, etc.), and 6000 accounts – equipment and site improvements. Mark emphasized that with 97% of the budget allocated to salaries, there is very limited flexibility for other expenses. He concluded by inviting questions regarding any specifics of the actuals.
CONCLUSION	•
Action Item [Who?]	•
9. Resource Request Process	
DISCUSSION	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Jacqueline Sabanos presented an overview of the annual Request for Resources (RFR) process, which allows anyone at the college to request funding for specific items for their program or department.

	<p>Previously, funding requests were handled in silos by budget managers, which was not transparent or equitable, and many staff were unsure which funding source to approach. The current RFR process centralizes all requests through Administrative Services, ensuring transparency and fairness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests for resources exclude routine supplies and technology, as these are funded through departmental budgets and the college technology plan, respectively. Once submitted, budget managers review all requests to determine which funding sources can be used, based on allowable uses of each resource. Deans then work with program chairs to prioritize requests from each department, and these priorities are reviewed by the VPs and the President. Administrative Services determines the total available funds for the year, including fixed costs, which allows for a final allocation to approved requests. • At the conclusion of the process, in June, the finalized list of funded and unfunded requests is shared with the colleges. Requesters may then begin work on approved projects, and the process repeats annually. Jacqueline emphasized that the Budget Committee plays a key role in reviewing the process to identify areas for improvement. All guidelines and the resource request submission link are available on the Administrative Services intranet. Mark Nesbit II was invited to add additional details as needed. • Mark Nesbit II reminded the committee that if anyone did not receive the email with the resource request information, they should reach out, as it is possible some recipients were missed. He noted that the deadline for submitting all requests is December 16 and encouraged anyone anticipating difficulties to contact Administrative Services as early as possible for assistance. Mark also clarified that the process remains largely unchanged from the previous year, and those familiar with it will find it largely a repeat. New participants were encouraged to reach out for guidance as needed.
CONCLUSION	
Action Item [Who?]	-
10. Adjournment Meeting adjourned at 1:56 p.m.	

NEXT MEETING:
Monday, February 2, 2026. – 1:00 p.m.
Zoom

Minutes submitted by:

Minutes approved: