



SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING

MINUTES – October 1, 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	Ernie Gomez
Robert Manson	Luis Pedroza	David Sauber	Lexi Burnett	Bill Reardon	Craig Ursuy
			Jesse Torres		
			Tukwot Gollette	Bold = present	
1. WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS				Meeting called to order 1:31 pm Meeting adjourned at 2:58 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 3, 2024			Motion moved to approve minutes by Claire Coyne, 2 nd by Tommy Strong	
4. UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS			ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS	
	Review P&B Committee Goals (Bart Hoffman): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The review is on hold as the committee is awaiting a new form that will be used to assess and review the goals. This delay was noted at the previous meeting, and it's still ongoing. Bart committed to following up on the status of the new form. He will work to find out when it will be made available to the committee. The new form, which the committee is waiting for, is expected to be significantly simpler and easier to use compared to the old form. It has been indicated that this new version will streamline the goal review process. 				

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The simpler design of the new form is anticipated to reduce the need for extensive workgroup meetings, making it easier for committee members to complete the review process without as much time and effort. ● Once the new form is received, the committee will begin the goal review process as planned. ● Bart will notify the group when the form is available. 	
5. SCFF REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● None to report at this time. 	
6. OLD BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Fund 13 Expenditure Plan (Tommy Strong):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Tommy mentioned he met with Mark to go over the plan in detail, highlighting that the committee should feel free to ask questions. He emphasized that his review was intended to facilitate discussion rather than push through decisions without proper scrutiny. ● Key items discussed in the plan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Item 1: President's Cabinet Discretionary Dollars (\$450,000): This fund is earmarked for various discretionary uses across academic affairs, student services, and administrative services. It could be used for additional labor hours (LH) for specific projects like counseling or faculty support. Tommy raised the idea of potentially adding more transparency for large disbursements from this fund. ○ Item 2: Emergency Fund for Santa Ana College (\$4.1 million): This is a reserve specifically for emergencies at Santa Ana College (SAC), not the district or other schools. The fund allows SAC to cover unexpected expenses that may arise. ○ Items 3 & 4: Long-Term Substitute Positions in Geography and Criminal Justice: Bart clarified these are one-time funded positions, covering the need for long-term substitutes in these areas. ○ Item 5: District Safety Overtime (\$50,000): This covers overtime for safety officers working between 2-10 pm, Monday through Thursday, which was identified as the period when most issues occurred. The contract was developed in collaboration with district management. ○ Item 6: District-Wide IT Costs (\$400,000): Post-pandemic, the college has continued contributing to shared district IT costs, which were initially covered by COVID emergency block funds. Tommy suggested that while the committee might approve these expenses for this year, it could reconsider this 	

arrangement in future years, as these IT costs should perhaps be funded by the district itself.

- **Items 7 & 8: Interim Associate Dean Positions:** These are temporary positions, and Tommy noted that if they become longer-term, the committee should plan to fund them from Fund 11 in future years.
- **Item 9: Facilities Modification Requests (FMRs) (\$2.9 million):** This pool of money is allocated for future facilities modifications. Bart clarified that these requests are submitted to the District Operations Facility Planning Department, which oversees the scope, cost, and execution of these projects.
- Tommy pointed out that some funds, like discretionary dollars and emergency funds, do not have specific planned uses yet. The committee could discuss adding thresholds for transparency when large amounts of these funds are disbursed.
 - **Item 10: Omni Content Management System (CMS) (\$90,000):** This funding is allocated for the implementation of the new Omni Content Management System, which will replace the current SharePoint system.
 - The CMS is used for managing the district's websites, ensuring content can be updated and maintained efficiently.
 - Managed at the district level, but the cost is being shared between both colleges.
 - Omni is expected to be adopted across the district over the next few years, replacing SharePoint entirely.
 - The decision to switch to Omni was made by the district, with the expectation that all colleges will follow this implementation standard.
 - The colleges are required to cover part of the expense, which has been communicated to Bart and the team.
 - A concern was raised by Tommy regarding whether the \$90,000 is a one-time implementation cost or part of an ongoing annual fee.
 - Tommy emphasized that if it's an ongoing cost, it should be moved to Fund 11, which covers continuous expenses.
 - Bart and John Steffens provided input, but the nature of the cost (ongoing or one-time) had not been fully clarified at the time of the meeting. The committee agreed to further investigate whether the cost should be marked with an asterisk (denoting ongoing costs) for future budgeting.
 - John Steffens clarified that Omni will fully replace SharePoint, and all future web content management will be done through this new system.
 - Tommy reaffirmed that this cost should be tracked for future use in Fund 11.

- **Item 11: Fence Windscreens (\$100,000):** The funds are dedicated to the upgrade or replacement of fence windscreens.
- This falls under general facility improvements, ensuring the exterior of certain areas, such as sports fields or outdoor facilities, remain in good condition with appropriate visual barriers.
- Although this is a Facility Maintenance and Repair (FMR) request, it differs from typical FMRs.
- Unlike general FMRs that would pull from the \$2.9 million pot set aside for departmental improvements, this project has already been earmarked and funded.
- Tommy pointed out that this \$100,000 is part of specific earmarked funds, meaning it has already been allocated for this purpose and does not come from the flexible pool available for other requests.
- He emphasized the difference between these types of requests and those still pending allocation from the \$2.9 million in the budget. The \$100,000 is already assigned, whereas the \$2.9 million remains flexible for other project requests from faculty and departments.
- The broader \$2.9 million pot is available for other capital improvement projects that are not yet allocated. Departments, deans, and faculty can submit proposals for use of this fund.
- The windscreen project, however, is spoken for, meaning its allocation is already confirmed.

- **Item 15: Furniture and Carpet Replacement (\$200,000):** This allocation is intended as a pool of funds, not fully earmarked for specific departments yet.
- Departments in need of furniture or carpet replacements should make their needs known through program reviews and Resource Allocation Requests (RARs).
- The funds will likely be distributed based on the urgency and importance of requests. If many departments request replacements, the funds may be spread thinly.

- **Item 16: Equipment Repairs (Instructional and Non-Instructional) (\$50,000):** This is described as an emergency fund for equipment repairs, mainly covering issues that require immediate attention (e.g., equipment costing about \$2,000 or less).
- It's similar to a contingency fund but specifically targeted for repairs, such as replacing a projector or other instructional equipment mid-semester.
- The fund also covers non-instructional equipment, addressing a gap where departments like the copy center may need urgent repairs but lack other sources of emergency funding.

- **Item 12: Marketing Expenses (\$650,000):** This amount is part of a \$1 million budget for marketing, with \$650,000 coming from Fund 11 and the remainder from Fund 13.
- The funds support ongoing marketing efforts, which contributed significantly to enrollment growth. These efforts are vital to maintaining the college's prominence and successful programs like adult education.
 1. **Tentative vs. Adopted Budget:**
 - a. The tentative budget is created based on estimates made in the spring semester, and the adopted budget reflects more accurate figures from the summer or after receiving updated information.
 - b. Increases from the tentative to the adopted budget could stem from additional needs that emerged or more precise estimates of project costs.
 - c. Some items, like equipment and furniture replacement, have seen budget increases, possibly reflecting more departments requesting updates.
 2. **Emergency Funds and RARs:**
 - a. Departments should ensure any needs for repairs or replacements are included in their program reviews and RARs to be considered for future budget cycles.
 - b. The distinction between emergency funds for repairs and budget allocations for scheduled replacements is important for departments to understand and plan accordingly.
 3. **Commencement Budget: \$200,000:**
 - a. Post-pandemic, the college has been able to secure significant funds for commencement activities, like hosting ceremonies at venues such as Angel Stadium. This earmark ensures continued support for large-scale events that celebrate students' achievements.
- **Item 14: OCTA Bus Pass Expense for SAC & CEC Students (\$250,000):** Luis Pedroza asked how the transportation cost went from \$0 to \$250,000.
- Tommy explained that costs were previously covered by certain categorical sources, but these funds are no longer available.
- Jim Kennedy clarified that the college's agreement with OCTA expired and resulted in a large, proposed increase in costs.
 1. **Funding for Continuing Education and Credit Students:**
 - a. Continuing education transportation had been covered by categorical sources.

- b. For credit students, transportation costs were funded through the student transportation fee.
- 2. Negotiation with OCTA:
 - a. OCTA initially proposed a large fee increase, but the college was able to negotiate this down to a smaller increase.
 - b. However, the student transportation fee can only be raised by a vote from students, making it difficult to offset increased costs immediately.
- 3. Minor Fee Increase for Students:
 - a. The additional cost per student for transportation was estimated to be about 25-30 cents.
 - b. Even though this is a minor amount, every student has access to the transportation service, increasing overall costs.
- 4. Future Cost Projections:
 - a. Transportation fees are based on ridership, which is calculated a year behind.
 - b. Due to an increase in ridership as more students return to in-person learning, next year's transportation costs are expected to rise significantly.
 - c. The college will have to decide whether to ask students to increase their transportation fees or cover the costs through the college's budget.
- 5. Ongoing Nature of Expense:
 - a. Tommy emphasized that this \$250,000 increase is expected to be an ongoing expense, not a one-time cost.
 - b. The college currently has \$20 million in Fund 13 to manage this, but future surpluses are not guaranteed, meaning long-term planning is necessary to cover these transportation costs.

- **Item 17: Holding Account for Unforeseen Needs and Emergency Services (\$500,000):** Tommy introduced the item as another form of an emergency fund, noting there are pros and cons to having multiple smaller funds versus one large emergency fund.
- Bart clarified the contingency fund (approximately \$4 million) is reserved for dire emergencies when all other resources have been depleted. It is not readily available for general use.
- The holding account for emergencies is more accessible and can be used for unforeseen needs, like equipment failure (e.g., a pipe burst or broken air conditioning unit).

1. Role of the Contingency Fund:

- a. The contingency fund is based on a formula (either 20% of the fund carryover or 1% of the total Fund 11 budget expenses, whichever is greater).
 - b. If unused, the contingency fund rolls over into the following year's ending balance, ensuring a minimum balance of \$4 million going into each new fiscal year.
 - c. Bart emphasized that this amount acts as a safeguard, and the college should maintain this reserve for future years.
- Luis expressed that \$4 million seems like a significant amount, but questioned its adequacy over time, given the ongoing need to replenish it annually.
- Bart agreed that the ending balance could be larger than \$4 million due to unspent funds from various budget lines (e.g., unfilled positions from retirements).
- Tommy raised a potential discussion point for the committee: whether to adjust the formula to be more conservative by increasing the percentage set aside for the contingency fund.
- Bart recommended against increasing the reserve beyond the district's prescribed formula, especially in leaner financial times when every available dollar may be needed to cover operational costs.
- The current structure provides flexibility, but Bart emphasized maintaining a balance between keeping sufficient reserves for emergencies and having funds available for immediate needs during difficult financial years.
- **Item 18: Allocation for Building C:** There was originally a plan to allocate \$50,000 for Building C.
- The allocation has been adjusted to \$0 because the \$50,000 is now included in the total FMR (Facility Maintenance Reserve) amount under Item 9, which totals \$2.9 million.
- **Item 19: Accreditation Costs (\$20,000):** This amount is set aside for program-specific accreditations, such as occupational therapy, nursing, and automotive technology.
- Accreditation cycles can vary (e.g., some are every 3 years rather than annually).
- Tommy raised a concern about why this expense isn't part of a more permanent budget, given the asterisk indicating this is an ongoing cost.
- Bart clarified that while the college as a whole is accredited, individual programs require separate accreditation, which justifies this earmarked funding.
- **Item 20: Support for International Students (\$241,682):** New allocation of revenue from international student apportionment.

- This initiative was started last year, marking the first time the college allocated a portion of the international student revenue for student support services.
- Tommy sees this as a reasonable move since the revenues from international students can be reinvested to provide them with additional support.
- It reflects a new approach to reinvesting revenues generated by specific student populations back into their support services.

- **Item 21: PR and Marketing Budget (\$507,359):** Allocated for college-wide PR and marketing.
- There was a question raised by Craig Ursuy regarding how this \$507,000 marketing budget differs from the \$600,000 marketing budget discussed previously.
- Bart explained that the \$507,000 is for Santa Ana College’s general marketing efforts, while the \$600,000 is specifically targeted for marketing the adult education program.
- Both budgets, despite their different focuses, have been deemed effective in promoting their respective programs.

- **Item 22: Conference Funding (\$50,000):** Allocated for attending conferences without other funding sources (e.g., Strong Workforce or SEAP funds).
- It ensures that important conferences, potentially with professional development or institutional advancement value, can still be attended even if other funding avenues don’t apply.

- **Item 23: Legal Fees (\$25,000):** This fund is designated for unforeseen legal costs, such as reviewing contracts or seeking legal advice.
- There was a question raised by Claire Coyne about whether these fees would go to Ruben Smith (the district’s legal counsel) or external legal firms.
- Bart clarified that while Ruben Smith’s firm often handles legal issues for the college, the district may also engage other legal counsel for specific matters, depending on the need. Costs incurred for these services are billed back to the college.
- Claire further queried whether Ruben Smith is paid on a retainer or per use, and while Dr. Hoffman couldn’t provide a definitive answer, Claire volunteered to look into it.

- **Item 24: Temporary vs. Ongoing Funding for Specific Items (\$314,266):** This allocation covers a variety of expenses that were previously cut from Fund 11 (the college’s primary operating fund) and are now being temporarily funded through one-time sources.

- Tommy highlighted a significant financial concern, noting that using one-time funding sources to cover ongoing expenses is unsustainable in the long term.
- He stressed the importance of either eliminating these ongoing costs or finding permanent funding for them. The need for proactive planning in ensuring that these expenses are transitioned to more stable, recurring budget sources was emphasized.
- If these expenses are not addressed, they could create financial imbalances, as one-time funding is not a reliable source for ongoing needs.

- **Item 25: Contract with Sheriff's Department and Criminal Justice Academy (\$735,280)**: The college has agreements with agencies, particularly the Orange County Sheriff's Department, for providing instructional services at the Criminal Justice Academy.
- The contract involves paying the Sheriff's Department for each student contact hour. Rates mentioned are around \$1.50 to \$2.50 per student contact hour.
 1. **Budget Comparison:**
 - a. Last year, the contract budget was \$622,000.
 - b. This year, \$735,000 has been earmarked for the contract.
 2. **Reason for Budget Increase:**
 - a. Could be due to higher enrollment in Criminal Justice Academy programs.
 - b. Another possibility is an increase in the rate per student contact hour charged by the Sheriff's Department (e.g., a rise from \$1 to \$1.50).

- **Item 26: Fire Technology Department Agreements (\$450,000)**: The Fire Technology Department has similar agreements with approximately 20 fire agencies throughout Orange County.
- These agreements cover continuing education and mandatory training provided at the agencies' own facilities, using non-paid instructors under the college's curriculum.
 1. **Payment Structure:**
 - a. The agencies receive \$3.50 per student contact hour under this agreement.
 2. **Revenue Offset:**
 - a. In the 2023-2024 academic year, the Fire Technology Department generated around 900 full-time student equivalents (FTS).
 - b. The revenue from the state apportionment, based on student enrollment, more than offsets the instructional service agreement costs. This revenue creates a net positive for the college.

- Both items 25 and 26 an asterisk, meaning that ideally, funding should be sourced from Fund 11, the unrestricted general fund, instead of relying on temporary or more restricted sources.
- Fund 11 offers more stable and flexible funding, which is crucial for these ongoing contracts as they are expected to continue long-term.
- **Item 27: Non-instructional Supply Budget (\$50,000)**: A budget of \$50,000 is designated for non-instructional supplies (e.g., office supplies, equipment repair, and other non-classroom-related materials).
- There are more funding sources available for instructional supplies, so this budget ensures non-instructional needs are also covered.
- The budgeted amount will roll over if not fully used during the fiscal year.
- **Item 28: Referees Fees – Kinesiology (\$105,000)**: These fees cover referees for sports and kinesiology events.
- They were historically funded by auxiliary dollars, which have decreased over time. As a result, funding for referee fees has been moved to Fund 13.
- Fund 13 is a restricted fund, often used for specific purposes like grants or specially allocated projects, which may not be a long-term solution. A stable funding source needs to be identified.
- **Item 29: Facility Rental Fees (\$25,000)**: The college used to fund facility rental fees (e.g., for external venues or event spaces) through auxiliary funds, but as those resources have dwindled, these fees have also been shifted to Fund 13.
- Similar to the referee fees, this is not a sustainable funding source, and a more permanent solution is needed.
- **Item 30: Software Costs – Inventive (\$43,010)**: Inventive is a software platform the college currently uses. It's expected to be a recurring expense rather than a one-time purchase.
- Even if the college were to stop using Inventive, it would likely have to replace it with another software that carries similar costs.
- A more secure funding source, such as Fund 11, should be considered to cover this ongoing software expense, as it will likely remain a necessary operational cost.
- **Item 31: Research Department Budget (\$100,000)**: This item pertains to funding specifically for the Santa Ana College (SAC) Research Department, separate from the District Research Office.
- The research department supports institutional data analysis, which is essential for decision-making, program evaluation, and reporting.

- There have been ongoing discussions about difficulties accessing and managing data, and the funding could help address these challenges by supporting staff, tools, or resources needed for data management and research activities.
- The budget may assist in resolving data-related issues that have been a concern in previous committee meetings.
- **Item 32: Distance Education Funding (\$217,000):** \$115,000 operational budget + \$102,000 for a new MOU (Memorandum of Understanding) related to faculty training in distance education.
- Tommy’s emphasis on the need to support a robust distance education system, critical for student success.
- Bart explained that this budget is strictly for the Distance Education Department, which supports the institution's online teaching efforts.
- The new MOU includes costs for training faculty, accounting for their time spent on distance education training.
- **Item 33: Remington Education Center Lease (\$362,000):** Lease agreement for the Remington Education Center on 4th and Grand with the Santa Ana Unified School District.
- A separate lease for parking adjacent to the center is currently extended on a 6-month basis. There are concerns about future challenges if Amazon discontinues the parking arrangement, making the location harder to operate without parking.
- Remington lease expires in 2027, with potential issues arising if the parking lease isn’t renewed.
- **Item 34: Centennial Education Center Lease (\$40,000):** The institution pays \$40,000 for utility and park maintenance at the Centennial Education Center.
- Jim Kennedy noted that this is a significant deal, as it covers the lease at a very low cost.
- Tommy emphasized the importance of ensuring ongoing costs are not sourced from one-time funds, as it should ideally come from more stable, recurring sources.
 1. **District Budgeting Challenges:**
 - a. The district included a 3.5% deficit factor in the budget, impacting the institution's overall budget by over \$4 million. However, for the past five years, this deficit factor has been 0 at year-end.
 - b. Vacant positions are charged upfront, inflating expenses despite millions being held for vacancies.
 - c. While there are district-wide practices that align with standard accounting principles, these can lead to challenges, such as inflated expenses in Fund 11, impacting operational budgeting.

d. Jim Kennedy suggested a full-fledged discussion in a future committee meeting to examine how budget allocations and ongoing vs. one-time fund distinctions impact the institution.

- **Item 35: Tree Trimming and Landscaping (\$200,000):** The maintenance and operations area requires \$200,000 to cover costs for trimming, maintenance, and field repairs.
- Mark Ou pointed out that vendor costs have risen by 10% annually, and the current budget doesn't account for this increase.
- Bart mentioned that, while costs could rise, there are ways to cut expenses by trimming trees internally or delaying non-essential maintenance.

- **Item 36: Preventative Maintenance Fund (\$200,000):** The \$200,000 allocation is for preventative maintenance across college facilities, aiming to address repairs before they become emergencies.
- To avoid tapping into emergency funds for routine repairs (e.g., air conditioner failures or busted pipes) by maintaining a consistent preventative maintenance plan.

- **Item 37: Non-Essential Item Removal (\$0):** The item is no longer needed, so no further discussion was provided.

- **Item 38: Discussion on Adjunct Faculty Costs and Funding Growth (\$4,574,629):**
Bart acknowledged that it is a cost overrun and mentioned that the amount had been significantly higher but was reduced using Fund 11.
- Growth is primarily funded through hiring adjuncts because permanent hiring processes take longer.
- Adjunct funding is essential for institutional growth.
- Jim Kennedy added that the district provides no direct funding for growth.
- The college must cover growth costs upfront, and reimbursement from the district takes up to 18 months.
- The college received \$20 million due to previous years' growth, but the money only started arriving recently.
- Tommy Strong mentioned that the costs associated with the Criminal Justice Academy and Fire Department are tied to revenue generation for the college.

- **Salary Pass-Through for Foundation Reimbursements:** Tommy discussed a \$107,000 salary pass-through, primarily covered by the Santa Ana College Foundation.
- The district covers salaries upfront, and the foundation reimburses them later.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilities Rental Fee Project: Bart explained the increasing fees from renting out college facilities post-pandemic. ○ The institution is becoming increasingly popular for rentals, leading to a growing fund. ○ A workgroup is revising the administrative regulations to allow the college to charge more competitive rates. ○ The funds from rentals go into an account used for maintaining rented facilities. ○ CEC Dollars and Specific Allocations: Tommy briefly mentioned that funds received in certain categories (like CEC) are allocated and must be spent within their designated categories. ○ The small remaining balance for student field trips was also discussed, with funds earmarked for specific departments. ○ Student Field Trips and Vehicle Rentals: Claire Coyne clarified that geology and biology departments often use these funds for field trips. ○ When college vans are unavailable due to other departments (like athletics), the funds help rent vehicles to ensure field courses can proceed. ○ Budget Presentation and Recommendations: Tommy mentioned reorganizing the budget presentation to make it more accessible for non-accountants and accountants alike. ○ John Steffens suggested rearranging data columns to improve readability and better align fiscal year data with corresponding labels. ○ Tommy agreed and is working on updating the draft for clarity. ○ Motion to Approve Fund 13 Expenditure Plan: A motion was made to recommend the Fund 13 expenditure plan for fiscal year 2024-2025 to the College Council. ○ Claire Coyne moved to recommend the budget with added suggestions for revisiting certain line items. ○ Luis Pedroza seconded the motion, and the motion passed without opposition. 	
7. NEW BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Goals Work Group (Bart Hoffman):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Bart Hoffman mentioned that the Goals Work Group will reconvene soon to review tasks on the calendar and update them as needed. ● Once completed, the work group will present recommendations to the committee. 	
8. STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	Mexican Heritage Month (Tukwot Gollette):	

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A budget of \$1,000 was allocated. • Since there is no homecoming this year, \$500 from that budget was used for Mexican Heritage Month events. <p>October Events:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Four events are planned for October, with a \$1,000 budget. • Tukwot emphasized the efficient use of their budget for these events. 	
9. SACTAC	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None to report at this time. 	
10. ACCREDITATION	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None to report at this time. 	
11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<p>Student-Centered Funding Formula (SCFF) Metrics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Martinez will give a presentation in the future. • There are ongoing efforts to resolve data discrepancies before the presentation. <p>Exhibit C in Enrollment Management Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Nery will present Exhibit C to the Enrollment Management Committee and will also present it to this committee for those who do not attend the Enrollment Management Committee. 	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal Resources Committee (rscdd.edu) 	
NEXT MEETING	November 5, 2024	

Submitted by Norma Castillo