


SAN DIEGO MESA COLLEGE

Budget Allocation and Recommendation Committee April 23rd, 2026 2:30-3:30

MEMBERS

Jacqueline Collins	Brian Mackus	Laurie Strong
Isabel O'Connor (A)	Kevin Branson (A)	Nicole Roesler (consultant)
Cassandra Storey	Virginia Enriquez	Mary Gwin (guest)
Jennifer Carmichael	Alex Berry (A)	
Todd Curan		

<p>Call to Order</p> <p>The committee reviewed minutes and there were no corrections or additions.</p>	<p>Jacqueline Collins</p> <p>Barc Agenda 4.23.26.docx</p>
<p>Survey Results</p> <p>The committee reviewed the meeting preference survey results, which prompted extensive discussion. Following the review, it was agreed that the committee will meet twice monthly on the second and fourth Tuesday's from 2:30-3:30pm. These meetings will be conducted online, and the new schedule is set to take effect at the beginning of the fall semester.</p>	<p></p> <p>BARC New Meeting Preferences Fall 2026.</p>
<p>Updates to BARC Rubric</p> <p>Members discussed the role and objectives, and goals of the committee. J. Collins shared that this year Business Services had to start developing the 26/27 budget due to staffing changes and the quick turnaround. Collins share that she and N. Roesler are documenting the steps taken to develop the 26/27 budget. The plan is to bring that forward to BARC as a shell for input and discussion. Once the committee is ready, the recommendation will be presented to Executive Leadership and PCAB for adoption.</p> <p>M. Gwin shared that L. Legaspi previously provided a document to the committee on their goals and objectives. Gwin also shared that there is language in Mesa's accreditation report and website that lists goals that are not aligned with how the committee has functioned. Collins asked that Gwin share the document L. Legaspi previously shared. Collins will review these items prior to the next meeting.</p>	<p>Change Recommendations Spreadsheet</p>

T. Curran suggested adding additional faculty seats to the committee. Collins shared the Classified Senate had also been in contact about their representatives. The committee agreed to review committee composition during the fall semester.

Additionally, Collins proposed a summer retreat in June to refine the goals and objectives with the committee.

Discussion regarding scope and role for BARC within the college's integrated planning and governance framework.

With the committee's work on ranking requests for the year completed, the committee continued prior discussions from February meetings regarding the review of other college models related to budget committee structures and practices. This discussion was deferred at the prior meeting due to limited attendance, with only one committee member present.

Membership noted this information has been hard to find and compare to Mesa College. M. Gwinn suggested a look at Miramar College's budget committee page. Membership also noted the importance of ensuring any updates to BARC's goals, purpose, or governance role are appropriately reflected in relevant accreditation and governance documents. Updates and clarification regarding BARC's goals include the following:

- Budget Development Process
- Resource allocation process through program review
- District Procedures: Providing input on the process for APs and BPs issued by the district.

Regarding the scope of the committee, L. Strong asked if BARC decides which NANCE requests are funded. J. Collins clarified that funding determinations and implementation decisions are operational responsibilities. She also reviewed how requests were submitted, engaging the campus to submit requests and the executive review process.

M. Gwin asked for clarity on what is meant by operational. J. Collins explained that operational responsibilities include fiscal management, execution of staffing and budget decisions, and clarified that these determinations are administrative responsibilities.

Jacqueline encouraged committee members to send forward any missing actions from BARC so that she can review.

The committee also discussed a proposal to split the request process by using the MIT and Safety and Facilities committees. Under this structure, those committees would independently score and rank technology, facilities, and safety requests before returning them to BARC.

Other committee review has been moved to a standing action item. Currently, the committee has no active action items for review.