



SAC BUDGET MEETING
MINUTES – OCTOBER 5, 2010
SAC FOUNDATION BOARD ROOM
1:30P.M. – 3:00P.M.

Approved 11/2/10

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

Administrators	Academic Senate		CLASSIFIED	Guests
Paul Foster, co-chair	Steve Bautista	Jeff McMillan, co-chair	Tom Andrews	John Carter
Norm Fujimoto(a)	Matt Beyersdorf	Monica Porter	Judy Arroyo	
Sara Lundquist	Andy Gonis(a)	George Wright	Joel Sheldon	
Ed Ripley(a)	Ray Hicks	John Zarske	Student Rep.	
	Michael Kelcher		Jose Velasco	
1. WELCOME			Meeting called to order – 1:38p.m.	
			Self Introduction were made.	
2. MINUTES			DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	
			The September 7 minutes were presented for approval.	
			ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS	
			ACTION Motion was moved by J. Arroyo to approve the September 7, 2010 Budget Committee minutes as amended. 2 nd – M. Kelcher Discussion ensued. Motion carried unanimously.	
3. Budget Update			DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	
State Budget Paul Foster			There is a proposal on the table in Sacramento but no action has been taken. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • State still in a terrible situation. • No hard decisions being made. • Payments have been delayed from the State. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ RSSCD is utilizing Fund 11 to get through October. Other funds will need to be utilized if payments continue to be delayed. • Proposed Budget for 2011/2012 due by January 15. • Stabilization discussion has begun at Chancellor’s Cabinet. • SAC has received Federal supplemental funds due October 7 - \$95,000. 	
BAPR Report			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At special meeting of the SAC Planning and Budget committee on September 28 the Budget Assumptions were approved. • BAPR approved the same Budget Assumptions and they were moved forward to the Chancellor. • SCC received an additional \$500,000 to address their shortage in discretionary funds, to take care of their needs associated with the new Science building. 	

Budget Update (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Monies were given with the understanding that there would be no impact to SAC or the District Office. ○ It was also noted that BAPR members agreed that the \$500,000 would not be allocated until all contractual agreements had been met. <p>BAPR members brought forward concerns regarding the process under which the solution was brought forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The topic should have been discussed in BAPR Work Group and forwarded to full BAPRC approval before moving forward to the Chancellor. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ This issue had already received the approval of the Chancellor before it was presented to BAPR. <p>There was clarification regarding a "rebate" that had also been provided to SCC in the amount of \$371,000.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The rationale for the "rebate" was that in the last round of cuts for the previous fiscal year, SCC made additional cuts and the District office and SAC did not because those cuts involved personnel. • President Vasquez did acknowledge at the BAPR meeting that the "rebate" satisfied the aforementioned inequity. <p>The additional \$500,000 request was over and beyond that equity issue.</p> <p>A discussion ensued regarding restoration for the colleges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SAC took a harder hit in the area of faculty separation with 77%. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Restoration of staffing would satisfy that inequity. 	
4. RSCCD Budget Familiarity Review	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<p>The RSCCD budget review began and will continue in an effort for members to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Better understand the overall budget process. • Identify areas of concerns. • Make informed recommendations. • Identify spending trends and address them. • Provide valuable input on future budget development. • Monitor activity. • Indentify inconsistencies. • More familiarity to ask questions. <p>The committee reviewed the 2010/2011 Adopted Budget Expenditure Report as a starting point. The following was noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Format of report can be misleading. • Dramatic changes were identified. • Some budgeted line items seem inconsistent. • Better to have Adopted budget be compared to last year's actuals. • Health and Welfare Benefits are budgeted at the highest rate. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The district negotiates rates come down usually too late to change the budget ○ Over budgeting in benefits creates a larger ending fund balance 	

RSCCD Budget Familiarity Review (cont.)	DISCUSSION/ COMMENTS	ACTIONS/ FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o When an employee leaves the district the health and welfare accounts are not adjusted accordingly. o This area could be tightened. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reserve includes a contingency account for emergencies • There is no specific contingency reserves for SAC. <p>Future discussions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The information is available by site in other formats. • What assumptions have been built into the 3000 accounts? • Compare Adopted 10/11 with Actual 9/10, showing the % change. • Review trends and identify what has been over budgeted. <p>The committee will be provided a budget detail report for their review.</p>	
6. Other		
	Members were reminded that the November 2 meeting will be held in F-126.	

Adjourned – 2:52 p.m.
Next Meeting –Tuesday, November 2, 2010
1:30 – 3:00p.m.
F-126