



SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING
MINUTES – October 4, 2022
1:30PM – 3:00PM
Zoom Meeting

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	Jorge Lopez, co-chair	Monica Zarske	Omelina Garcia	John Steffens	Roy Shahbazian
Jim Kennedy	Jim Isbell	Jennie Beltran	Mark Ou	William Nguyen	
Jeffrey Lamb	John Zarske	Kelly Nguyen			
Vaniethia Hubbard	Merari Weber	Reza Mirbeik	Student Representatives		
Robert Manson	Doug Benoit		Georgina Galindo		
					Bold = present
1. WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS				Meeting called to order 1:49 pm Meeting adjourned at 2:30 pm	
	Welcome and introductions were made.				
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	Approval of September 6, 2022 minutes			Motion was moved to approve September 6, 2022 minutes by Monica Zarske and 2 nd by Doug Benoit. Two members of the committee abstained. Motion passed.	
4. UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
	Resource Allocation Request (RAR) – This item will be moved to the next meeting due to Mark Reynoso’s absence. John Zarske asked if there has been a change in the RAR process. Dr. Hoffman reported that there will be a change and the RAR process will now be tied to the Program Review process.			Move Resource Allocation Request to the next meeting.	

Everyone will be required to perform a program review. In Nuventive Improve you will have the ability to request funds identified in your program review. Monica Zarske added that she felt that this was already happening. She stated that they are being asked to submit a program review to the division. She suggested to relook at the calendar that was created to revamp the timelines. Dr. Hoffman stated that Nuventive Improve will make the aggregation of everybody's request more manageable.

Jorge Lopez added that a timeline should be developed in a way that it makes sense to those that will be affected, including department chairs, divisions, etc. to meet deadlines.

Nuventive Improve/Program Review Timeline – John Steffens reported that they are working with the Budget Office. He added that the RARs come after the program review. If that is a change, it needs to be communicated. The Nuventive system will ask you to map your RARs to one of your goals in your program review. You can also map it multiple ways. The new system is in Beta and all the RAR and program review forms are built into the system. Different areas are being tested. Certain concerns among faculty are the requirement to have everything in Nuventive Improve by the end of the year because the go live date is November. Administrators have been asked to complete their program reviews and have them submitted by the end of November.

He added that Dr. Nery will be sending out communication and faculty do not have to worry about completing a program review in the new system this Fall, only administrators. Faculty will be able to copy and paste what was written for the Spring when they add their RARs for the upcoming fiscal year.

Dr. Weber voiced that in Non-Credit, they put in their requests in the RAR to the Dean, but they do not hear any results of their requests.

John Steffens added that the nice thing of Nuventive Improve, is not only can you put in your request there is a space for the Budget Office to indicate if the item has been funded or not. Then you can go back in and use the filters to see which requests were funded.

Mark Ou asked if Maintenance and Operations participate in the program review and RAR process. Dr. Hoffman reported that they could provide their input to their administrator so that their needs are added to the program review process.

Monica Zarske was wondering why this committee has not mentioned this topic until now. She feels that many do not know much about this system. She also added that when the Deans were given direction from the President to do their program review two weeks after the semester started, it felt like a sudden request. The timelines really need to be looked to make sense of what is being asked of us.

Monica would like more dialogue on the decisions made regarding the Nuventive Improve and RARs processes. John Steffens added that most of the discussions have happened in the Program

	<p>Review Committee meetings.</p> <p>Jorge Lopez stated that we are having discussion on items that have already been decided on. This is not an effective way to do things especially if issues need to be addressed. There is also the concern of faculty having to assist the Deans with the program review the first two weeks after the semester.</p> <p>Dr. Hoffman reported that we will consider the timeline a working document and will make sure that communication is clear, and all groups involved in the process will give their input.</p> <p>Dr. Hubbard added that after checking with Dr. Estrada who is working with Jaki King in regards to the program review, that it is separate program review for managers and that it is not replacing or removing the program review process that is in place, but the timelines do need to be addressed. She added that College Council would be a better place discuss the program review issues.</p> <p>COVID-19 Updates: CARES ACT/HEERF – Dr. Hubbard reported that they are at the point of determining the outstanding allocations. There were a few areas that received HEERF funds that have not utilized the funds. Phone calls and emails were sent to those departments regarding the outstanding funds and a timeline of October 31st was given. The departments need to determine quickly how to utilize the funds so that no dollars are returned. The deadline to spend down the funds is June 30, 2023. Right now, reconciliations of funds are being calculated to determine the remaining funds.</p>	
5. SCFF REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	
	FTES Metrics – No report due to Dr. Lamb’s absence.	
6. OLD BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	Second Reading of the Planning and Budget Committee Goals (linked file reflects amendments).	Motion to approve Committee Goals as amended by Monica Zarske, second by Jim Isbell.
7. NEW BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	Review Planning and Budget Meeting Schedule – Dr. Hoffman/Jorge Lopez	
8. STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	No student reports.	
9. SACTAC	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	No report.	

10. ACCREDITATION	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Monica Zarske shared that she is not officially in the accreditation coordinator position. However, she did report that the ACCJC has been revamping the standards. The standards will look different for the next accreditation. They are going through a 2024 standard review in which Dr. Ortiz was a member of.</p>	<p>Dr. Hoffman will ask Dr. Lamb who he will be the person reporting on accreditation in the future.</p>
11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strategies to improve revenue of Student Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) Metrics 	<p>This item will be moved to New Business for the next meeting.</p>
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<p>https://www.rscgd.edu/Departments/Business-Operations/Pages/Fiscal-Resources-Committee.aspx</p>	
NEXT MEETING	November 1, 2022	

Submitted by Maria Cardona