

Santa Ana College Mission Statement: *Santa Ana College inspires, transforms, and empowers a diverse community of learners.*

Administrators	Academic Senate		Classified	Guests	
Bart Hoffman, co-chair	William Nguyen, co-chair	Monica Zarske	Omeline Garcia	Mark Reynoso	Mark Liang
Jim Kennedy	Roy Shahbazian	Claire Coyne	Jimmy Nguyen	John Steffens	
Jeffrey Lamb	John Zarske				
Vaniethia Hubbard			Student Representatives		
Robert Manson			Claire Lyle		
Madeline Grant					
				Bold = present	
1. WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS				Meeting called to order 1:30pm Meeting adjourned at 3:15pm	
	Welcome and introductions were made.				
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	None				
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	Approval of March 2, 2021 minutes			Motion was moved to approve the March 2, 2021 minutes by Monica Zarske and 2 nd by Dr. Lamb. Motion carried unanimously.	
4. BUDGET UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	Budget Updates William Nguyen reported that SAC and SCC had discussions regarding the split revenue. It was agreed that more data was to be gathered and regroup before the next Fiscal Resource Committee (FRC) meeting. Dr. Hoffman added that Adam O'Connor would like to know the status of the meeting outcome that William Nguyen was speaking about. He added that SAC believes that if the District is held harmless the Colleges need to be held harmless too. Both Colleges agreed to this at first. Then SCC changed their opinion. SCC now wants the language to				

remain the same in the Budget Allocation Model (BAM) to show the Colleges not held harmless. There was a workgroup that was created of four voting members from SAC and four voting members from SCC. At a workgroup meeting, there was an interest in getting rewarded for having a better outcome or a better percentage in the split of the revenue, even though we are being held harmless. However, SCC proposed that there should be a threshold cap on the percentage of funding that could shift from one college to the other to prevent irreparable harm. William Nguyen explained that this is considered as Option 3. If there is an increase in the metrics, that College would receive more money, with a cap on the amount. Dr. Hoffman added that this would be for the period that the College is held harmless. He added that in FY 24/25 the BAM will go back to its original language and will be based on the percentage of revenue generated by each College. Dr. Kennedy asked what would happen if one College goes above the 17/18 base and goes outside the hold harmless and the other College is still held harmless which also keeps the District at hold harmless? Dr. Hoffman stated that this was not discussed at the meetings.

Dr. Hoffman reported that the split is calculated annually. He added that he thought about agreeing to a cap, but does not agree to a transfer of funds to SCC via Fund 11 and may agree to using one-time funds while going through this held harmless period due to the pandemic.

William Nguyen reported that from the last meeting, SCC was open to the idea of putting a cap on the adjustment during the hold harmless period. Both Colleges were on the same page to get the money from the state and figure out a way to split the money so that neither College is impacted significantly.

Some of the comments that were made:

Dr. Kennedy – likes the idea of the cap when both Colleges are down.

Mark Liang – if you are not performing at a certain level or you fall below, then you should be held harmless but that doesn't give indication that if you grow, you shouldn't be rewarded for that. He also mentioned that he would not like this to be used against SAC when we grow.

Dr. Lamb – it would be interesting to know what the cost to SCC would be today. And the importance of quantify what the cap means.

Dr. Kennedy – the cap protects and provides some stability to the District.

Dr. Lamb – we are not talking growth; we are talking less of a decline.

Dr. Hoffman will take back the items discussed in today's meeting to the next workgroup meeting.

	<p>COVID-19 Updates: CARES ACT/Block Grant</p> <p>Mark Reynoso reported that the purchasing deadlines have passed, Purchase Requisition's (PR's) and Purchase Orders (PO's) are now in place. The Higher Education Emergency Relief Funds 1 (HEERF 1) Institutional funds began with \$2.7M and have all been planned for. The MSI funds started at \$379,000 and are also planned for. Remaining balances will be used for loss revenue reimbursement such as, the Bookstore, Planetarium, Community Services, Fine & Performing Arts ticket sales and Facility Use Rental Fee's. HEERF 2 Institutional and MSI funds have now been received. HEERF 2 Institutional is roughly \$13M and MSI is roughly about \$939,000, we have one year to spend down HEERF 2 funds.</p> <p>Whatever remaining plans that were not spent under HEERF 1 Institutional have now been shifted to HEERF 2 institutional. There will be a future allocation for HEERF 3 funds, but we do not know any dollar amounts at this time. Mark reported that new guidelines have come out regarding the allowable use of HEERF funds. One of the updates made was that we can now charge loss revenue to HEERF 1 funds as well as indirect costs. This will help offset costs to our Fund 11. We still have to show that the costs are COVID-19 related.</p> <p>William Nguyen asked if the timeline is known to spend down the HEERF 2 funds so that we do not end up returning any of the funds. Dr. Hoffman answered that we are looking at a comprehensive plan to spend the money as long as it falls under the state guidelines. Mark Reynoso added that we are roughly looking at \$6.2M in loss revenue that we can charge to the HEERF funds. William Nguyen will contact Dr. Hubbard to involve faculty in a conversation to identify COVID-19 related expenses that can added to the list of items to pay. William Nguyen also suggested that an additional column be added to the Resource Allocation Request (RAR) for that would identify if a request was COVID-19 related.</p>	
5. SCFF REPORTS		
	<p>SCFF Reports – Progress Toward Metric Improvement</p> <p>Dr. Hoffman explained that there may not be an update report regarding the SCFF because data may only be available at the end of a term. Mark Liang and Robert Manson agreed that a couple of months after the end of a term is the best time to report on the metrics. February would be a good time to report for the Fall term and September for the Spring term.</p> <p>Student Success Metrics – Mark Liang</p> <p>Mark Liang shared his report (here) that goes back to the past three years and broken down by semester. The data in the report is not duplicated.</p> <p>William Nguyen added that the other Divisions can also use this spreadsheet to help them know how they are doing. This Committee can also benefit from the data to see what direction the numbers are going. It can help identify if there is a big decrease and action can be taken. It</p>	<p>Mark Liang will forward the spreadsheet to the committee members.</p>

	would be great to get something similar from FTES area and Robert Manson's area. Supplemental Metrics – Robert Manson – Robert Manson reported that they are down a bit this year. He will also provide the Committee with a report showing month-by-month data.	
6. OLD BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>RAR Reallocation of Funds Mark Reynoso reworded the RAR Special Circumstances Reallocation of Funds and shared with this committee (here).</p> <p>Following recommendations were given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add an example under third bullet • Change Area Vice President to Area Vice President/President • Explanation of the money that is not spent for its intended purpose and is not an extraordinary circumstance, it goes back to the one-time fund • More details in each bullet 	Mark Reynoso will reword the draft and bring back to the committee for review and approval.
7. NEW BUSINESS		ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
8. ENROLLMENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Dr. Lamb shared the RG542 report (here). He reported the headcount is down about 15% and down 15% in FTES. Our decline will be around 12%. The Board asked where the decline is happening. Dr. Lamb shared a PowerPoint presentation (here) that indicates the headcount declines. It also shows what areas were the declines are present. He noted that the Spring term numbers are still not complete.</p> <p>Dr. Lamb added that the Enrollment Management Committee has developed goals and objectives as well as activities associated with the goals. These are also included in his PowerPoint presentation.</p>	
9. STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	None to report.	
10. SACTAC	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	John Steffens reported that at the last SACTAC meeting they discussed the SAC technology plan. The plan has about 20 goals outlined so far. They are also looking at the updated Master Plan and Equity Plan to create an alignment as well as the District's technology plan.	

11. ACCREDITATION	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Monica Zarske reported that the accreditation report is in editing. The Academic Senate has a draft copy of the four standards to review and provide feedback. Their second read will be in May. She also mentioned that she would like this committee to review the parts that pertain to planning and budget. The timeline is the latter part of May being approval time and then to the Board by June.</p> <p>Monica added that, as a committee, we should look at what strategic plan we are referencing as it is written in the current RARs. The last strategic plan is dated 2016.</p>	<p>Dr. Hoffman suggested that the Standard III D be placed on the next agenda under New Business.</p>
11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strategic Planning – Dr. Hoffman 	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<p>https://www.rscdd.edu/Departments/Business-Operations/Pages/Fiscal-Resources-Committee.aspx</p>	
NEXT MEETING	May 4, 2021	

Submitted by Maria Cardona