



SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING

MINUTES – September 3, 2024

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	Tommy Strong, co-chair		Mark Ou	Kelvin Leeds	Daniel Martinez
Jim Kennedy	Claire Coyne	Marty Rudd	Jimmy Nguyen	Mark Reynoso	Kristi Blackburn
Jeffrey Lamb	John Zarske	Kelly Nguyen	Liliana Oropeza	Mark DeAsis	John Steffens
Vaniethia Hubbard	Merari Weber	Reza Mirbeik	Student Representatives	Ron Gonzalez	
Robert Manson	Luis Pedroza	David Sauber	Lexi Burnett	Bill Reardon	
			Jesse Torres		
			Tukwot Gollette	Bold = present	
1. WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS				Meeting called to order 1:31 pm Meeting adjourned at 2:59 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 May 28, 2024			Motion moved to approve minutes by Claire Coyne and 2 nd by John Zarske Abstention: Kelly Nguyen	
4. UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS	
	Membership Review (Bart Hoffman) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart asked committee members to review the membership list for accuracy. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bart confirmed Dr. Kristi Blackburn as the representative for Academic Affairs, replacing Dr. Jeff Lamb. ○ Jeff Lamb clarified Dr. Blackburn’s role and mentioned Bill Reardon as a shadow/backup for the committee. • Claire Coyne emailed the most updated list of faculty membership to Norma Castillo. • Bart acknowledged the update and noted that the list would be cleaned up accordingly. 				

- Lexi Burnett mentioned that the student representative listed, Julia Guerrero, should be updated to reflect the current ASG student representatives.
 - Student Representatives: Lexi Burnett, Jesse Torres, and Tukwot Gollette were confirmed as the correct representatives.

Budget Reports (Mark Reynoso)

State Budget Updates:

- Deficit: The state budget reflects lower revenues, resulting in a \$45 billion deficit. The deficit will be managed using reserves and deferral payments.
- Deficit Funding Factor: An 8.74% deficit funding factor was applied to FY 23-24 community college revenues, with payments scheduled for release in 24-25.
- No Major Funding Reductions: No significant reductions noted for community college program services.
- Cost of Living Adjustment: A 1.07% COLA was applied, lower compared to previous years.
- Growth and Revenue Protections: SAC has grown out of "hold harmless" and is one of 17 districts receiving growth dollars. Revenue protections extend into 25-26.

SAC Budget Performance:

- Budget Highlights:
 - Resource Allocations: \$2.6 million funded for 23-24 requests.
 - Technology Upgrades: \$1 million allocated for new technology and computers.
 - Facility Upgrades: Various upgrades underway, totaling approximately \$9 million.
 - Hiring: 19 full-time faculty positions and 29 full-time classified positions are being filled.
- Expenses:
 - Hourly Instructional Expenses: Increased by \$9 million compared to 21-22.
 - Utility Expenses: Increased by \$1.2 million since 21-22.
 - Apportionment Revenue: Increased by 30%, from \$103 million in 22-23 to \$134 million in 23-24.

Future Considerations:

- Fund Monitoring: Close monitoring of hourly instructional expenses and utility expenses.
- Capital Outlay Projects: Funded through a mix of capital outlay funds and general fund dollars.

Fund 13 Plan:

- Unprecedented Budget: Fund 13's budget for 24-25 is \$20 million, significantly higher than in previous years. This budget will be allocated according to the Fund 13 expenditure plan.
- Budget Reallocation History:

- Past financial constraints led to cuts in Fund 11 (general fund) during fiscal years 2020-2021.
- Expenses were temporarily moved to Fund 13 (one-time funds) but are gradually being shifted back to Fund 11 as financial health improves.
- One-Time vs. Ongoing Expenses:
 - Certain expenses, such as long-term substitutes and Interim Associate Deans, are considered one-time costs.
 - There is concern about using one-time funds for ongoing expenses, which is not a sustainable practice.
- Document Review Concerns:
 - Committee members received the budget document only an hour before the meeting, limiting their ability to review it thoroughly.
 - Requests were made to highlight differences between the current document and the previous version (May draft) to facilitate easier review.
- New Items and Multi-Year Implications:
 - New budget items (marked in purple) were discussed, with clarification that some are newly added or have increased funding compared to the previous year.
 - There was a suggestion to include information on whether certain items have multi-year implications, though most current items are one-time expenses.
- Next Steps:
 - The idea was proposed to place the document in a Teams folder to allow committee members more time to review and comment.
 - There was agreement to continue the dialogue and allow more thorough review before forwarding the budget to the college council.
- Time Sensitivity:
 - Dr. Kennedy emphasized the need to review and approve the budget quickly due to the time-sensitive nature of the one-time funds. Delaying could hinder project implementation and hiring processes.
- Review Timeline:
 - Bart Hoffman proposed giving committee members a few days to review the document in Teams and provide comments by Friday, September 6th.
 - An electronic vote was suggested by Dr. Blackburn and agreed upon, to be conducted on Monday, September 9th.
- Document Accessibility:
 - Concerns were raised about the late distribution of the document. Hoffman acknowledged the issue and proposed highlighting new items and any changes from the previous May draft to help with the review.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clarification on Budget Items: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The committee discussed the importance of distinguishing between new items and those previously approved or discussed. ○ Items marked "new" would be highlighted in yellow, and additional annotations would be added to indicate which items were previously approved. ● Suggestions and Adjustments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jeff Lamb brought up a new ongoing expense related to department chair LHE over the summer, which might need to be accounted for in the budget. ○ Mark Reynoso offered to identify and highlight differences between the current budget draft and the May draft. ● Next Steps: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The budget document will be placed in Teams for review, with committee members encouraged to submit comments by the proposed deadline. ○ An electronic vote will take place shortly after the review period to ensure timely progression to College Council. 	
5. SCFF REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	
	<p>Supplemental Allocation Trends (Robert Manson):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Fee Waivers: Numbers are improving post-pandemic but have not yet returned to pre-pandemic levels. ● Pell Grants: Significant growth, with one of the largest years on record, attributed to simplified government verification processes. ● AB 540 Students: Enrollment is growing but still below pre-pandemic levels. Speculation that slower recovery may be due to AB 540 students being ineligible for Pell Grants. ● Overall, steady growth across all three supplemental allocation areas. <p>SAC Production Data of Success Funding (Mark DeAsis):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Presented historical data on degrees completed, CTE units, and transfer-level math and English from 2018 onwards. ● Noted that the current year's numbers are significantly higher than the previous year. ● Clarified that this data is presented in the same way as past years but does not factor into the Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) success metrics. ● Questioned the use of this data in the past since it does not translate directly into a financial figure for the funding model. ● Jeff Lamb acknowledged the college's evolving understanding of the SCFF and expressed interest in identifying more relevant metrics for funding purposes. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggested clearer communication between departments like enrollment management and institutional effectiveness to ensure data alignment. ● Mark DeAsis mentioned working with other stakeholders to link the data to dollar figures for the college. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Shared a report on the California Community College funding, indicating efforts to break down the allocation between SAC and SCC. ● Daniel Martinez inquired if the reported data was duplicated or unduplicated and explained that the SCFF uses unduplicated numbers with specific hierarchies. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Expressed concerns about the limited utility of the current data for funding formula purposes. ○ Highlighted ongoing efforts to understand the discrepancies between colleague data and MIS reporting. ○ Stressed the importance of data integrity and reconciling data at different stages of the reporting process. ● Bart proposed forming a workgroup to analyze the SCFF performance numbers in detail. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Suggested a deeper dive into district-provided metrics to ensure relevance and accuracy. ● Vaniethia Hubbard emphasized the need for the group to understand how data impacts the budget. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She referenced data presented in previous meetings that link numbers to budget outcomes. ● Bart expressed concern about the accuracy of performance numbers and their relevance to the budget. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He reiterated that these numbers should inform decision-making, especially regarding the student-centered funding formula. ● Daniel suggested refining the reporting process by counting students once per year, following the funding formula's hierarchy, which would be an improvement over the current duplicated counts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Bart agreed with Daniel's points and mentioned follow-up actions to ensure more meaningful data related to the budget. 	
6. OLD BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Goals Workgroup Status (Bart Hoffman):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bart explained that there were scheduling challenges in getting the goals work group together due to the end of the school year, but efforts to organize a meeting are ongoing. The group plans to meet soon and continue working on their goals spreadsheet. 	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He asked if anyone had heard that the goals worksheet would be changing, specifically if the number of columns might be reduced to simplify it. • Jeff Lamb responded that he hadn't heard of any changes but noted that the Institutional Effectiveness and Assessment Committee, which originally developed the worksheet, would be the authority on such updates. 	
7. NEW BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Goals Work Group (Bart Hoffman):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart introduced the task of having the Goals Workgroup review the committee calendar to ensure all tasks were addressed throughout the school year. • He emphasized the importance of this task and requested that the Goals Workgroup check for any gaps in the planned activities. • He reiterated that this task was assigned to the Goals Workgroup to ensure no important duties were overlooked. • Bart requested that the Goals Workgroup review the committee calendar and assess the listed tasks to ensure everything was accounted for during the academic year. • Daniel Martinez explained that he and Claire Coyne are chairing IUNA this year. He shared that they developed a goals worksheet in collaboration with Dr. Nery. This worksheet aims to help campus-wide committees align their activities with the college's overarching goals. Martinez indicated that this worksheet would be distributed shortly. • Bart confirmed the importance of this review by the Goals Workgroup, noting that the group would help ensure the committee calendar was comprehensive and that nothing would be left out. <p>RAR Summary Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kristi Blackburn proposed moving the RAR (Resource Allocation Request) summary to October rather than November. • Mark Reynoso explained that the RAR funding approvals typically happen in early October, and moving the summary report to that month might be too soon. He suggested keeping it in November to allow time for approvals to settle before reporting. 	
8. STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lexi Burnett responded that there were no updates at the current meeting but anticipated there would be updates for the next one. 	
9. SACTAC	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	None to report.	
10. ACCREDITATION	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jeff Lamb mentioned that Monica Zarske, the former accreditation coordinator, was no longer receiving reassigned time for the role. Jeff expressed that while Monica might still want to contribute updates, the work had stalled due to structural changes in her role. • He shared that the next major accreditation event is the midterm report, due on March 15, 2026, with the following full report due in fall 2028, and the site visit planned for spring 2029. • He mentioned that a new Vice President from ACCJC, Nickawanna Shaw, has been assigned to assist with accreditation efforts. • Jeff also noted efforts from the ACCJC to develop a digital platform for data submission and annual reporting, which would create a dashboard for colleges. Additionally, revisions are underway for distance education standards, particularly around "regular and substantive interaction" between students and instructors. • There is also a statewide push to infuse equity into the accreditation process, with workgroups from the State Academic Senate and other stakeholders participating in this effort. <p>Future Accreditation Reports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart suggested periodic updates rather than monthly ones, considering Monica's change in responsibilities. He noted that it's important to keep the committee informed about accreditation progress without overburdening individuals who are no longer formally responsible for it. 	
11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<p>Discrepancies between SCFF Metrics & MIS Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bart briefly addressed a future agenda item involving Dr. Martinez's work. Dr. Martinez indicated that while there are known gaps, the data requires further review, and it would take time to gather solid evidence before discussing discrepancies in detail. As a result, the item will remain as a future agenda item until Dr. Martinez is ready to present findings. 	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal Resources Committee (rscdd.edu) 	
NEXT MEETING	October 1, 2024	