



Santa Ana College

Planning & Budget Meeting

September 1, 2015



SAC Planning and Budget Committee
September 1, 2015
1:30p.m. - 3:00 p.m.
S-215

THE PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE is the participatory governance committee responsible for recommending budget priorities, procedures, and processes to the College Council. The Planning and Budget Committee also functions as a community liaison for fiscal affairs with the college community.

Santa Ana College Participatory Governance Structure Handbook

(May 8, 2013)

Agenda

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| 1. Welcome and Introductions | |
| 2. Public Comments | |
| 3. Approval of Minutes for May 5, 2015 | ACTION |
| 4. Budget Update | INFORMATION |
| 5. Enrollment Update | INFORMATION |
| 6. Student Update | INFORMATION |
| 7. SACTAC | INFORMATION |
| 8. Marketing Update | INFORMATION |
| 9. Old Business | INFORMATION |
| 10. New Business | INFORMATION |
| • Planning & Budget End of Year Report 14/15 | |
| • District/SAC Adopted Budget Assumptions | |
| • Planning & Budget Effectiveness Survey | |
| 11. Future Agenda Items | |
| 12. Other Business | |

Next Meeting – October 6, 2015

The mission of Santa Ana College is to be a leader and partner in meeting the intellectual, cultural, technological and workforce development needs of our diverse community. Santa Ana College provides access and equity in a dynamic learning environment that prepares students for transfer, careers and lifelong intellectual pursuits in a global community.

The mission of Santa Ana College is to be a leader and partner in meeting the intellectual, cultural, technological and workforce development needs of our diverse community. Santa Ana College provides access and equity in a dynamic learning environment that prepares students for transfer, careers and lifelong intellectual pursuits in a global community.

| Administrators | Academic Senate | | CLASSIFIED | GUESTS | |
|---------------------------|--|---------------|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| Mike Collins, co-chair | Ray Hicks co-chair | Monica Porter | Tom Andrews(a) | Esmeralda Abejar | Rhonda Langston |
| Jim Kennedy | Pat Mansfield | John Zarske | Denise Hatakeyama(a) | | |
| Lilia Tanakeyowma(a) | | | Jimmy Nguyen | | |
| Omar Torres(a) | Student Rep. | | Leslie Wood-Rogers | | |
| | Briana Brennan | | | | |
| 1. WELCOME | | | | Meeting called to order 1:31p.m. | |
| 2. PUBLIC COMMENTS | DISCUSSION/COMMENTS | | | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS | |
| | The committee took a moment to remember the 45th anniversary of the tragic shootings at Kent State on May 4, 1970. | | | | |
| 3. MINUTES | DISCUSSION/COMMENTS | | | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS | |
| | The April 14, 2015 Planning and Budget minutes were presented for approval. | | | ACTION Motion was moved by B. Brennan to approve the April 14, 2015 Planning & Budget Committee minutes. 2 nd – J. Nguyen Minutes were unanimously approved. | |
| 4. BUDGET UPDATE | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | | | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS | |
| | State: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> With collections to date running about 16% above the daily forecast level, the state could be on track to exceed the April forecast by \$2 billion if these trends continue. Also recall that coming into April, the state was already ahead of the forecast by \$1.3 billion through March 2015. An upward revision of current year revenues exceeding \$3 billion now seems possible. We expect the May Revision (May 14) to be positive, but likely very complicated this year. More money means more choices. | | | | |

| BUDGET UPDATE (cont.) | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
|-----------------------|--|---------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The statutory cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) has now been determined for 2015-16 and it will be 1.02%. This is significantly lower than the estimated COLA of 1.58% released in January with Governor Jerry Brown's 2015-16 State Budget Proposal. The U.S. Department of Commerce released the latest quarterly data for the Implicit Price Deflator for state and local government purchases of goods and services. This data allows for the determination of the 2015-16 statutory COLA, which is calculated by comparing the change in this index over the most recent four quarters to the previous four quarters. <p>District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No real new news. Colleges working to bring their Tent. Budget into alignment with the new faculty costs. • Waiting for May Revise for the updated revenue numbers. <p>College:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Working really hard to identify areas to cut budget in order to meet our \$2.8 million price tag for the new faculty. EVERYTHING IS IMPORTANT! • We have identified cuts in existing budget that we will make in 15/16. • We are looking at about \$1.5 million ending balance- we will go over this budget today • Our schedule costs continue to escalate, but for tentative we will roll out Fall/Spring/Intercession/Summer costs for 14/15 into 15/16, with an increase for growth. • VERY critical that we are productive/efficient with our schedule and in producing FTES • We are committing to funding instructional equipment for 14/15 and 15/16, so much so that we are front loading some of the highest priority IE for 15/16 in the 14/15 budget year. • Classroom mediation will continue in 15/16 in accordance with SAC TAC implementation schedule. <p>Members were reminded that the College's first obligation is to fund the Full Time Faculty Obligation. As promised the membership was provided an overview of 15/16 Tentative Budget Reductions that were made. The cost of funding the new full time is \$2,802,540.</p> <p>Cost Savings/Reductions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Defunding of vacant positions – \$1,646,722 • Shifts to categorical funding - \$626,495 <p>In addition it was noted that actual costs were reviewed and expended costs were forecasted in determining where to make other reductions. These reductions will cover the new faculty cost.</p> | |

| 5. ENROLLMENT UPDATE | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | |
|----------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Jim Kennedy provided a brief update to the membership.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC is showing about 1.5% growth and SCC is roughly estimated at 5% growth for the year. These numbers will put the district just a tad above 1%. • The revenue split will change with SAC at 70.3% and SCC at 69.7%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Members were reminded that as we grow our FON obligation will grow. ◦ More revenue comes with more expenses however the revenue outweighs expenses. • College is very close to being inside the Budget Model. • Efforts continue on Enrollment Management. • Working with ITS on improving reporting capabilities. • Concentrating on also being more efficient. More efficiency improves the college's ability to serve students. • The non-resident enrollment has been increasing. • SAC has approximately 1000 more students this spring than last spring. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Important to interest new students and retain current students by getting them through their pathways. | |
| 6. STUDENT UPDATE | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | |
| | <p>Briana Brennan presented her student update report (see attached). Additional comments as noted. The Public Safety Town Hall meeting went well.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In an effort to continue the dialogue a document is being created that could be emailed and capture professor and department input. This document will be sent to the Board of Trustees. • Sensitivity training important to students especially in dealing with students with disabilities. • Important to interface with Health and Psychological services. <p>Students very interested in continuing the dialogue and be a part of the decision making.</p> <p>Student Senate for CCC, Spring Assembly</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ASG has now become a 501C3 non-profit status. • 6 SAC students attended the assembly. • One of the workshop attended was titled Reinvigorating the Master Plan. The delegation looked at various funding sources for colleges. • The delegation created a Veteran's Caucus – lots of student interest. Plans to create a resolution to present to the legislature are underway. <p>Lots of resolutions concerning homeless/underserved students were discussed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • One of the way focuses was facilities, and the creation of food pantry through the local student government. | |

| 7. SACTAC | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
|-------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>The following was reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee is working on goal setting as part of the update to the Technology Plan. • Progress continues in the area of classroom mediation. • Pilot project was approved to consider lamp less projection. This is a much more sustainable option along with less impact to M&O department. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Important to make sure that this option works for instructional purposes. • Computer replacement program is moving forward. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ By the end of the year, there should be no computers on campus that are older than 5 years. • A SACTAC task force will prioritize the 15/16 RARS related to instructional equipment and media needs. The prioritized list will come back to SACTAC and then through SAC Planning and Budget. <p>There was an inquiry on improving the Wi-Fi on campus, especially in the Village.</p> | <p><u>FOLLOW UP</u> Jim Kennedy will follow up with District on the Wi-Fi issue in The Village.</p> |
| 8. MARKETING UPDATE | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
| | <p>Dr. Collins updated the committee on the following: A SAC Marketing Team has been established by Dr. Collins at the request of Dr. Martinez. The team will focus on the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enrollment • Marketing to our new and current students. • How do we attract new students and retain the current? • How do we approach these targets? • SAC has massive competitors for students. • What sets SAC apart? • A marketing plan has been drafted. • A budget of \$20,000 for Marketing/Enrollment has been included in the FY 15/16 Carryover Fund 13. <p>Once the plan is complete, it will come back to the Planning and Budget for regular updates and feedback.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will also be important for the committee to evaluate the results. | |
| 9. OLD BUSINESS | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
| | | |
| 10. NEW BUSINESS | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
| | | |
| 11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
| | | |
| 12. OTHER BUSINESS | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
| | <p>Carryover Fund 13 An overview of Fund 13 was provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1.6mil is the Carryover Estimate for 15/16. • Marketing/Enrollment new category. | |

| OTHER BUSINESS (cont.) | DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS | ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS |
|------------------------|--|---------------------|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction in Catalogs Schedule/Printing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Reduced catalog and schedules orders as most students access information online as opposed to a hard copy. ◦ The importance to make sure that our online resources are accurate and easily accessible was noted. • Holding account - monies set aside in case there is an increase in the 1310 account. • PT Academic Management and Instructional Agreement funding are ongoing expenses that continue to be funded by Fund 13. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ The goal is to eventually transition these expenses to Fund 11. <p>Dr. Collins extended his thanks and gratitude to Esmeralda Abejar for her work with the budget.</p> <p>Updates to the Schedule There was an inquiry regarding keeping the online schedule updated. Discussion ensued:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most students download the online schedule as a PDF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ PDF is easier to do a find, easier to navigate. • Changes that occur are only reflected in WebAdvisor. • What are the options for updating the schedule as changes occur. • Currently the Schedule is manually pulled from Datatel. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Instant updates could be labor intensive? • This issue will be taken to SACTAC and TAG for discussion and consideration. • It was noted that at the present, it is important that the right messaging is posted until a longer term automated solution is available. <p>Gratitude and appreciation was shown to ASG representative Briana Brennan for her outstanding dedication and participation on the committee.</p> <p>Members were advised that the June 2 meeting will more than likely not be held unless there is a significant change to what has been reported to the SAC Planning and Budget committee. It was noted that after the May Revise, Dr. Collins will also send out a campus-wide communication.</p> | |

Submitted by Geni Lusk
June 5, 2015
Next Meeting – August 4, 2015



SANTA ANA COLLEGE
Participatory Governance Committee
End of Year Report 2013/14

COMMITTEE –PLANNING AND BUDGET COMMITTEE
CO-CHAIRS – Michael Collins
Ray Hicks

DATE: September 1, 2015

MEMBERSHIP

| | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Michael Collins | Denise Hatakeyama | Jim Kennedy | Leslie Wood-Rodgers |
| Ray Hicks | Pat Mansfield | Monica Porter | Lilia Tanakeyowma |
| Tom Andrews | Brianna Brennan | Jimmy Nguyen | Omar Torres |
| | | | John Zarske |

| Goals | Completely met | Partially met (Please explain) | Not met/ should be carried over (Please explain) | Not met/ should not be carried over (Please explain) |
|---|----------------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| 1. Clarify and communicate the planning and budgeting process within the committee and across the campus. | | | | |
| 2. End the fiscal year with a positive balance and contingency reserve. | | | | |
| 3. Perform an annual institution –wide evaluation of the effectiveness of the Resource Allocation Process and analyze the results to enable for continuous improvement. | | | | |
| 4. Engage in implementing a more robust total cost of ownership program and utilize it as a budgeting tool. | | | | |

Recommended goals 2015/2016:

What outcomes and/or body of work have been generated by this committee?



Santa Ana College Summary of the Staff and Faculty Responses to the Institutional Effectiveness Survey, Spring 2015

June 2015

Though Santa Ana College (SAC) fully reaffirmed its accreditation status from the October 2014 peer team visit, the college continues its work to ensure institutional effectiveness. At the end of spring 2015, the President invited staff and faculty, full- and part-time, to voice their opinions to an online survey, that was also implemented in 2008 and 2013, in four areas of institutional effectiveness: institutional mission and effectiveness, student learning programs and services, human, physical, technology, financial resources, and governance and leadership.

Two hundred fifty-three individuals participated (50% faculty, 21% confidential/classified, 5% administration/supervisory and 24% “not reported”) with representation from all divisions of the college, including the School of Continuing Education. The following is a summary for areas of strengths and areas in need of attention.

The original survey has been modified to only reflect only that information related to Planning and Budget. Detailed data and comments by employee group are listed below.

| | Count | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree (1) | Mean Rating* | Don't Know |
|---|-------|-----------------------|-------|---------|----------|--------------------------|--------------|------------|
| I am aware that budget, technology, and personnel allocations are directly linked to department and area planning efforts. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 116 | 35% | 34% | 15% | 10% | 6% | 3.81 | 8 |
| Classified/Confidential | 47 | 23% | 38% | 27% | 6% | 6% | 3.66 | 4 |
| Administrative/Supervisory | 13 | 62% | 31% | 0% | 7% | 0% | 4.46 | 0 |
| Not Reported | 50 | 22% | 42% | 24% | 8% | 4% | 3.70 | 9 |
| Total | 226 | 31% | 36% | 20% | 8% | 5% | 3.79 | 21 |
| Total | 216 | 29% | 44% | 16% | 6% | 5% | 3.85 | 31 |

*Average of responses from 1 to 5, 5 being “strongly agree” and 1 being “strongly disagree.” “Don’t know” responses were excluded from calculation of means.

| | Valid Responses | | | | | | | Don't Know |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|------------|
| | Count | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree (1) | Mean Rating* | |
| All constituencies at SAC have an appropriate opportunity to contribute input to institutional plans and budgets. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 101 | 15% | 36% | 27% | 14% | 8% | 3.36 | 24 |
| Classified/Confidential | 40 | 13% | 30% | 32% | 10% | 15% | 3.15 | 10 |
| Administrative/Supervisory | 12 | 33% | 67% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.33 | 1 |
| Not Reported | 18 | 11% | 28% | 33% | 17% | 11% | 3.11 | 6 |
| Total | 171 | 15% | 36% | 28% | 12% | 9% | 3.35 | 41 |

| | Valid Responses | | | | | | | Don't Know |
|--|-----------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|------------|
| | Count | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree (1) | Mean Rating* | |
| SAC's budget process is open, transparent, and includes input from staff. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 105 | 12% | 28% | 30% | 18% | 12% | 3.10 | 21 |
| Classified/Confidential | 40 | 8% | 40% | 24% | 15% | 13% | 3.15 | 9 |
| Administrative/Supervisory | 13 | 31% | 54% | 0% | 15% | 0% | 4.00 | 0 |
| Not Reported | 17 | 18% | 12% | 17% | 41% | 12% | 2.82 | 6 |
| Total | 175 | 13% | 31% | 26% | 19% | 11% | 3.15 | 36 |
| Program review is used as part of the planning, budgeting, and resource allocation process at SAC. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 103 | 18% | 49% | 16% | 7% | 10% | 3.55 | 20 |
| Classified/Confidential | 40 | 10% | 53% | 27% | 3% | 7% | 3.55 | 10 |
| Administrative/Supervisory | 13 | 38% | 62% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.38 | 0 |
| Not Reported | 18 | 22% | 33% | 33% | 6% | 6% | 3.61 | 6 |
| Total | 174 | 18% | 49% | 19% | 5% | 9% | 3.62 | 36 |

| | Valid Responses | | | | | | | Don't Know |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|------------|
| | Count | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree (1) | Mean Rating* | |
| Appropriate and timely financial information is provided regularly to SAC constituencies. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 101 | 11% | 25% | 33% | 22% | 9% | 3.07 | 25 |
| Classified/Confidential | 39 | 8% | 44% | 25% | 10% | 13% | 3.23 | 10 |
| Administrative/Supervisory | 12 | 33% | 42% | 17% | 8% | 0% | 4.00 | 1 |
| Not Reported | 17 | 17% | 17% | 54% | 0% | 12% | 3.29 | 7 |
| Total | 169 | 12% | 30% | 32% | 16% | 10% | 3.20 | 43 |

*Average of responses from 1 to 5, 5 being “strongly agree” and 1 being “strongly disagree.” “Don’t know” responses were excluded from calculation of means.

| | Valid Responses | | | | | | | Don't Know |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|-------|---------|----------|-----------------------|--------------|------------|
| | Count | Strongly Agree (5) | Agree | Neutral | Disagree | Strongly Disagree (1) | Mean Rating* | |
| Planning processes at SAC are reviewed to identify needed areas of improvement. | | | | | | | | |
| Faculty | 100 | 10% | 54% | 22% | 8% | 6% | 3.54 | 22 |
| Classified/Confidential | 40 | 10% | 45% | 27% | 5% | 13% | 3.35 | 11 |
| Administrative/Supervisory | 13 | 54% | 39% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 4.46 | 0 |
| Not Reported | 19 | 16% | 27% | 37% | 10% | 10% | 3.26 | 4 |
| Total | 172 | 14% | 48% | 23% | 7% | 8% | 3.53 | 37 |

About the Respondents

| | Faculty n=127 | Classified n=52 | Administrator/ Supervisor n=13 | Not Reported n=61 | Total n=253 |
|--|------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Status | | | | | |
| Full-time | 69% | 75% | 100% | 5% | 57% |
| Part-time | 28% | 25% | 0% | 2% | 20% |
| Not reported | 3% | 0% | 0% | 93% | 23% |
| Division | | | | | |
| Administrative Services | 0% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Business | 4% | 2% | 8% | 8% | 3% |
| Counseling | 6% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 5% |
| Fine & Performing Arts | 6% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4% |
| Humanities & Social Sciences | 20% | 4% | 8% | 8% | 11% |
| Human Services/Technology | 11% | 6% | 8% | 8% | 8% |
| Kinesiology, Health & Athletics | 4% | 0% | 8% | 8% | 3% |
| Library | 2% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 2% |
| Science, Mathematics & Health Sciences | 20% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 12% |
| Student Services | 4% | 30% | 23% | 23% | 9% |
| School of Continuing Education | 9% | 11% | 23% | 23% | 8% |
| Not Reported | 14% | 11% | 14% | 14% | 33% |