Rancho Santiago Adult Education Consortium

RSAEC

Building Skills, Advancing Careers

RSAEC Executive Board Meeting –California Adult Education Program (CAEP)
DATE: April 21, 2026 TIME: 9:00am – 10:00am
ZOOM: 891 3643 5380
PLEASE NOTE: Host Location-Centennial Education Center
2900 W. Edinger, Santa Ana, CA 92704
(714) 241-5700

Members Present: Chrissy Gascon, Amy Avina, Lorena Chavez, Lisa Green, Fatinah Judah
Members Absent: Leticia Alvarado
Executive Director: Chrissy Gascon
Guests: Jim Kennedy, Ed.D., Vice President of Santa Ana College School of Continuing Education, Wendy Rhinehart

MINUTES

Item	Discussion	Action
Introductions	The RSAEC Executive Board meeting started at **9:26AM**.	
Public Comments • Jim Kennedy, Ed.D., Vice President of Santa Ana College School of Continuing Education	**Dr. Jim Kennedy** introduced himself and shared information about Santa Ana College School of Continuing Education, noting how Santa Ana School of Continuing Education has provided services to the community and how the Rancho Consortium has helped promote existing programs and support the development of new ones. **Dr. Jim Kennedy** mentioned that in reviewing the CFAD, he is requesting a change. He indicated that while the consortium will ultimately discuss this, the board has already approved a representative. Based on that designation, it seems appropriate that Lorena serve as the CFAD representative, as she is the board-designated voting representative for the Rancho Consortium. **Chrissy** clarified that she serves as the	

	primary contact for the consortium in her role as director and certifies the CFAD. She does not vote. **Dr. Kennedy** indicated that he just wanted to clarify. **Lorena** said that she was requesting the change under the members not under the primary contact. She mentioned that the information was included in an email she sent to the members on Monday, 4/20. Lorena offered to pull it up, Chrissy asked that it be reviewed after Jim finished speaking. **Dr. Kennedy** stated that having both a primary contact (the director) and a board-approved representative provides better balance in administration. He also requested clarification on the consortium's role on how funded agencies internally allocate their funds, as long as allocations align with the three-year plan and its objectives. **Dr. Kennedy** added that from Rancho Santiago Community College District's perspective, this has been an ongoing discussion and may also be relevant for other members in the future. He further mentioned that at Santa Ana College, internal conversations are underway regarding resource distribution. Although the college serves over 70% of CAEP eligible students in the district, most funding currently goes to Santiago Canyon College. **Dr. Kennedy** noted that this is an internal district matter; however, he is open to consortium-level discussion if appropriate. He asked Lorena to work with the consortium to provide clarification on this process. He concluded by thanking the	

	group for their work and participation.	
Approval of agenda	A motion to approve the agenda was made by **Lisa Green** and seconded by **Amy Avina.** All members voted in favor.	
Approval of consent agenda • Minutes: Approval of Minutes (03/24/26)	**Lorena** added that in the Discussion Items for ELL Healthcare Pathways Grant to include "throughout consortium AI is becoming more prevalent." A motion to approve the revised minutes was made by **Amy Avina** and seconded by **Lisa Green.** All members voted in favor.	
Discussion Items: • **2026-2027 CFAD Allocations and governance** Please see attached CFAD draft	**Lorena** read the email she sent to the members on Monday, 4/20 and her feedback and request would be to update the CAEP consortium documents to reflect the RSCCD voting member. This will help avoid any confusion. She attached the RSCCD Board of Trustees approval for the appointment of herself as the voting member. The rationale which Lorena brought up last year is that it does create some confusion. After reviewing the CFAD, Lorena shared that point number four, reinforced the need for consistency with voting members across the board. In NOVA, Lorena agrees that Chrissy should remain the primary contact, as she serves as the Executive Director and Dean of Instruction. However, Lorena is requesting that she be updated as the voting member to ensure consistency. Lorena mentioned that she emailed the whole screenshot of NOVA that has the distinction between the primary contact and	

	the voting members. **Chrissy** pulled up the CFAD and said she doesn't input that section, instead it pulls directly from NOVA. Chrissy will request that it be updated to reflect the voting member. **Chrissy** shared that since the consortium's inception, it has followed a one-member, one-vote model, with the member defined as an agency representative. Initially, the voting representative was from SCC, as established at the outset. For the past five years, the role has been held by Lorena. **Chrissy** mentioned that when the change from SCC occurred, it was intended to rotate annually, however, this rotation was not implemented, and the role remained with SAC. Chrissy stated that she should remain neutral in her role as consortium director and should not represent one college over the other. She suggested it may be appropriate to consider a one institution, one vote structure so that SCC can have representation at the table without her needing to advocate for either college. This would ensure both SCC and SAC maintain a voice in the consortium for discussion and voting. **Lorena** agreed that SCC and SAC should both have a vote to represent Rancho Santiago. Lorena shared that she and Chrissy have had a lot of conversations and that it is not as though SCC doesn't have representation, previously they met a lot for ELL and then came to a decision. **Lorena** asked Chrissy how it was done in the past. **Chrissy** explained that in the past (at the	

	beginning of AEBG) the two Vice Presidents, two academic senate representatives, and two deans would meet prior to a vote and have a discussion on how the district would vote together on proposed items. Once most of the funding was allocated to the approved proposals, the group disbanded and we continued with workgroups and executive meetings. **Amy** added that she thinks the point is to look at institutions, it would be good to consider having both SCC and SAC as voting members so that the director can be neutral and organize the consortium then that would be put in place for whoever comes in. **Chrissy** responded that she would like to avoid conflict by remaining neutral. An SCC representative would be able to take on those responsibilities and take her out of the equation. **Lorena** agreed. She wants to always advocate for having multiple voices at the table. Lorena added that there's been significant conversations and discussions that have happened, some with her in the room, others with Chrissy and Jim. **Chrissy** emphasized that the concern is not about working relationships or collaboration, but about governance structure. Chrissy reiterated that the intent is to ensure appropriate representation at the table rather than relying on one individual to represent multiple perspectives. **Lisa** agreed with having an SCC rep who is representing SCC. To be a true facilitator, which is what Chrissy needs to be, she needs to be not advocating for one side or the other. There needs to be somebody	

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advocating for SCC's interests, if Chrissy's role is facilitator.

Chrissy mentioned that it isn't her role to advocate for any specific institution. She is there to provide guidance, follow the governance, guidelines and procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vote to Approve:

2026-2027 CFAD Allocations as noted:

GGAE:
Calculated by: .332094842921003
OUSD:
Calculated by: .001537218235963
RSCCD:
Calculated by .666367938843034

Please Note: The percentages were completed using the same calculations as last year. Once the May revise has been completed, CAEP will send us exact amounts for the direct-funded members (GGAE, OUSD & RSCCD). At that time, we will need to update these figures so that they correspond with the percentage rate used by the CAEP office.

CAEP 2026-2027
Preliminary Award: $6,025,790*

Proposed COLA: $141,807
*Final allocations will be awarded with the May revise.
<table>
<tr><th></th><th>FY 25/26</th><th>FY 26/27</th></tr>
<tr><td>Garden Grove USD</td><td>$1,954,040</td><td>$2,001,134</td></tr>
<tr><td>Orange USD</td><td>$9,046</td><td>$9,263</td></tr>
<tr><td>Rancho Santiago CCD</td><td>$3,920,897</td><td>$4,015,393</td></tr>
<tr><td>Total</td><td>$5,883,983*</td><td>$6,025,790</td></tr>
</table>
</td>
<td>Chrissy noted that voting could not occur because all voting members must be present for CFAD approval. A meeting will be scheduled before the May 2, 2026 CFAD deadline.

Chrissy stated that a revised draft would be prepared reflecting a possible shift to a "one institution, one vote" model for review at the next meeting. She also mentioned they would consult with the Chancellor's Office regarding updating CAEP membership representation.

Chrissy confirmed that allocation calculations had been reviewed for accuracy and aligned with resource development. She noted that figures did not yet include COLA adjustments or the May Revision changes, which could impact final allocations.

Chrissy explained that decimal percentages are required for accuracy to avoid rounding discrepancies.</td>
<td>A Doodle poll will be emailed to all members.</td>
</tr>
</table>

*Please note: The 2025/2026 preliminary allocation had a reduction of $7,476 in COLA with the May Revise.		
Vote to Approve: CFAD Governance as written in NOVA (see attachment below)	**Chrissy** reminded members that the next meeting would include a vote and emphasized the importance of full attendance due to CFAD requirements.	
Board Approvals for 2026-2027 • RSCCD – • GGAE – • OUSD – • SAUSD – • OCDE –		• OUSD – Approved. Lisa provided the board approval. It will be added to the upcoming agenda.
Announcements: • **Upcoming Events:** •		
Upcoming 2026 Due Dates and important Information: **April 2026** • **Apr 30:** Student Data due in TOPSPro (Q3) • **Apr 30:** Employment and Earnings Follow-up Survey **May 2026** • **May 2:** CFAD for 2026-27 due in NOVA * **June 2026** • **Jun 1:** 25/26 Member Expense Report due in NOVA (Q3) • **Jun 30:** 25/26 Member Expense Report certified by Consortia in NOVA (Q3) * • **Jun 30:** End of Q4 **Items with an asterisk are consortium deliverables*		

Other: •		
Future Meetings: 4th Tuesday of the month, unless otherwise noted. Location: CWPC Conference Room Time: 9:00am – 10:00am • **2026:** May 26, June 23		