

SAC PLANNING & BUDGET MEETING
MINUTES – April 1, 2025
1:30PM – 3:00PM
Zoom Meeting

Santa Ana College Mission Statement: *Santa Ana College inspires, transforms, and empowers a diverse community of learners.*

MEMBERSHIP

Administrators	Academic Senate		Classified	Student Representatives
Bart Hoffman, Co-chair	Tommy Strong, Co-chair		Mark Ou	Han Nguyen
Jim Kennedy	Claire Coyne	Marty Rudd	Jimmy Nguyen	Kimberly Ramirez
Jeffrey Lamb	John Zarske	Kelly Nguyen	Liliana Oropeza	
Vaniethia Hubbard	Merari Weber	Reza Mirbeik	Jessica Avalos	
Robert Manson	Luis Pedroza	David Sauber		

Bold = Present

1. WELCOME & INTRODUCTIONS		Meeting called to order 1:32 pm Meeting adjourned at 3:02 pm
	Welcome and self-introductions were made.	
2. PUBLIC COMMENTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	Kimberly Ramirez introduced herself formally as a new student rep and Associate Justice for ASG and expressed excitement about contributing to the committee.	
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	Approval of March 4, 2025 Minutes	Moved to approve by: Tommy Strong 2 nd by: Reza Mirbeik Abstentions: Merari Weber & Jessica Avalos
4. UPDATES/REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	SCFF (Student Centered Funding Formula) Metrics Reports Update (Mark Reynoso) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recap provided regarding prior discussion on SCFF metrics and reporting. SCFF data is officially submitted once a year, typically in July or August. 	

- The committee currently reviews SCFF metrics twice a year:
 - September Report: Reflects finalized data from the previous academic year.
 - February Report: Highlights current trends, using Fall term data.
- Committee was asked whether to:
 - Maintain the current biannual review schedule, or
 - Shift to an annual review.
- Key point made that reviewing the data twice a year allows:
 - More timely insights into trends.
 - Opportunities to respond to and strategically plan for changes.
- Consensus leaned toward maintaining twice-a-year reporting for data accuracy and timeliness.

BAM Workgroup Update (Tommy Strong)

- A Budget Allocation Model (BAM) workgroup was formed following discussion at the previous meeting.
- The workgroup met and had productive discussions, which were shared at the March 19th District Fiscal Resources Committee (FRC) meeting.
- Three key proposals were presented:
 - 1. Deficit Factor Language:**
 - Colleges would acknowledge the liability of the deficit factor.
 - Each college would budget their respective share in Fund 11.
 - Colleges would be permitted to spend Fund 11 deficit factor budget up to the equivalent amount held in their Fund 13 contingency account.
 - 2. Capital Outlay Funding:**
 - Proposal to base capital outlay contributions on need, agreed upon by the colleges.
 - Each college would contribute a portion of the revenue.
 - 3. Budget Stabilization Fund:**
 - Historical documents indicated the fund was meant to be temporary (circa 2013).
 - The fund's purpose was originally a stopgap during the transition to the BAM.
 - A request was made for the District to clarify its current purpose and usage of this fund.
- In response, the District requested the formation of a new workgroup including representatives from the District, Santa Ana College, and Santiago Canyon College to further review and discuss these proposals.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis was made on the importance of patience due to the coordination required across multiple entities. • A recommendation was made to formalize the workgroup's proposals into a statement or recommendation to College Council. • Noted that aligning both colleges' positions on these matters could strengthen advocacy for change and promote local control of funds. • Historical context was provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Capital outlay fund originated over a decade ago to address gaps in state funding for building maintenance. ○ Budget stabilization fund was never intended to be permanent but has continued to exist. 	
5. SCFF REPORTS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None at this time. 	
6. UNFINISHED BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None at this time. 	
7. NEW BUSINESS	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<p>Presentation of SAC and CEC Marketing Plan (Ethereal Reyes)</p> <p>Team Introduction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ethereal introduced her team, noting this is their first year fully operational. • Highlighted the addition of a new media specialist, Marcos. • Emphasized the department's shift to doing more creative work in-house (e.g., photography, video production, post-production). <p>Project Overview (Since November Start Date):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 74 design projects and 41 photo requests completed. • Projected annual total: ~366 projects (graphic design alone). • Confident in team's capacity to replace many previously outsourced services. <p>Social Media Highlights:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reached 10,000 followers. • Focus on showcasing people to improve engagement (human interest storytelling). • Goal: Enhance visual storytelling and student connection. <p>Website Update:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New SAC website projected to go live in Winter 2026. <p>Strategic Goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prioritize completion while still maintaining focus on enrollment. 	

- Increase brand awareness and improve brand perception.
- Communicate in ways that support student retention.

Key Target Audiences:

- Local communities (Santa Ana, Garden Grove, Orange).
- High school students.
- Current SAC/CEC students.

Fiscal Breakdown & Budget Request:

- Requested budget: \$670,000 (consistent with previous years).
- Majority focused on digital marketing, while maintaining presence in physical advertising.
- OOH (Out-of-Home) marketing includes banners, billboards, and other physical media.
- Acknowledged the growing dominance of digital media and the need for SAC/CEC to evolve accordingly.

Technology Replacement Plan Update (Ron Gonzalves)

Computer Replacement Plan – FY 25–26

Overall Goal:

- Maintain up-to-date, efficient technology infrastructure for students and staff.
- Align replacements with 5-year life cycle of computers and devices.
- Spread replacement costs annually based on hardware aging trends.

FY 25–26 Computer Totals:

- Total computers scheduled for replacement: 313
- Estimated total cost: \$456,000
- Includes both instructional and non-instructional computers

Breakdown by Type and Area:

- Instructional Desktops
 - Units: 110
 - Estimated Cost: ~\$154,000
 - Locations:
 - Building A
 - Building L (includes 2nd floor classrooms – confirmed)
 - Building T
 - Building Y
 - Used by students in instructional labs and classrooms.
- Instructional Laptops
 - For faculty/staff instructing students; numbers not specified in detail but included in the 313 total.
- Staff (Non-Instructional) Desktops

- Located in administrative and support offices.
- Staff (Non-Instructional) Laptops
 - Used by classified professionals, management, and administrative assistants.
- Lectern Computers
 - FY 25–26: None scheduled for replacement.
 - All lectern computers were fully replaced in FY 24–25.

5-Year Technology Aging Forecast (FY 25–26 through FY 29–30):

- Plan accounts for aging out equipment based on when it was purchased.
- Goal is to maintain a rolling replacement strategy to avoid large, one-time costs.

Spending Peaks:

- FY 27–28 Projected Spike: ~\$1.46 million
 - Reflects replacement of 1,033 computers purchased during COVID (FY 22–23).
 - That year alone significantly outpaces others due to high volume of aging units.

Years with Lower Costs:

- Reflect fewer aging devices in need of replacement.
- Cost is proportional to the number of devices nearing end-of-life.

Classroom Technology Replacement Plan – FY 25–26

- Purpose:
 - Replace aging AV and instructional tech (projectors, speakers, control systems, etc.)
 - Enhance teaching/learning environment with modern tools.

Classroom Tech Equipment Types:

- Audio/Visual systems (projectors, screens, speakers)
- Touch panel control systems
- Microphones
- Integrated tech in teaching lecterns

Planned Classroom Replacements (FY 25–26):

- Total Classrooms Scheduled: 19
- Estimated Cost: \$248,000
- Buildings Involved:
 - Building H
 - Building I
 - Building R
 - Building T

Priority Criteria for Replacement:

- Age of existing equipment

- Frequency of use
- Equipment failure rates
- Feedback from faculty

Plan Logistics:

- Replacements scheduled during:
 - Summer and Winter intersessions when classrooms are not in use
 - Budget planning aligns with Instructional and Administrative Technology priorities

Lifecycle & Replacement Eligibility

- Instructional desktops and laptops purchased with HEERF funds are reaching end-of-life.
- Only devices five years or older (based on purchase date and serial number) will be replaced.
- No need for departments/instructors to submit requests—IT Services will identify qualifying devices automatically.
- Device replacements in the L Building have been rolled out in phases across academic years.

Timeline

- Replacement of L Building instructional technology scheduled for Summer 2026.
- New instructional technology rollout aligns with the district's lifecycle replacement strategy.

Devices & Equipment Covered

- Instructional desktops and laptops (e.g., used in the Math Center and classrooms like L-207).
- Classroom technology such as projectors, document cameras, and touch panels are part of the instructional equipment budget.
- Back-end infrastructure (e.g., server racks, wireless access points, network equipment) is not included and is managed separately by District Operations.

Funding Sources

- Instructional desktops/laptops: Replacements funded by the district under the technology lifecycle plan.
- Classroom technology (projectors, etc.): Funded by the college's instructional equipment budget.
- Infrastructure upgrades: Funded by District Operations.

Inventory & Management

- IT Services uses an inventory system to track device age, serial numbers, and assigned locations.

- This system helps automate identification and scheduling of equipment replacements.

Next Steps

- A follow-up presentation will provide detailed updates on classroom technology upgrades, timelines, and support.

Computer Purchasing & Deployment Timeline

- Purchasing deadline: March 21st
- Process timeline:
 - Purchase Requisitions submitted by deadline
 - Purchasing takes 2–3 weeks to process POs and validate (accounts, locations, etc.)
 - Vendors receive PO → delivery expected in 4–8 weeks
 - Some items may arrive earlier (2–3 weeks), but delivery into late May is common
- Deployment process:
 - Summer is spent imaging/upgrading computers
 - Quantity can range from hundreds to low thousands
 - Often continues into Fall and year-end
 - New purchase cycle begins soon after

Classroom Technology Upgrades

- Scope:
- 30 classrooms to be upgraded next fiscal year
- Upgrades Include:
 - Projectors:
 - Replacing with 6,000 lumen laser projectors
 - Current projectors: 2,500–4,000 lumens, many are outdated/dim
 - Flat Panel Displays: Installed where needed
 - Speakers: New ones throughout
 - Lecterns: Replacing very old units in poor condition
 - Cabling:
 - All-new infrastructure
 - Compatible with modern tech
 - Warranty-backed for 25 years
- Electrical:
 - Increasing capacity where needed
 - Supports newer high-power tech
- High Flex Infrastructure:
 - Pre-installing wiring/cabling for future hyflex conversion
 - Just need to purchase/install hardware later if chosen

	<p>Question on T Building Access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The closure of the T Building impacts the proposed plans for upgrades scheduled for FY 2027-2028. • The T Building may be removed from the plan if it remains unavailable for use. • Modifications to the plan will be presented to relevant committees if changes are needed. <p>Use of Apportionment Revenues for Criminal Justice Academy:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The approval of the Criminal Justice Academy’s educational center status may allow the use of apportionment revenues for updating classroom technology. • Further discussions are needed with relevant department leaders regarding the use of these funds for technology updates. <p>Classroom Technology Updates (Projectors, Screens, and Lecterns)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan includes upgrading projectors, screens, and related classroom technology. • New lecterns (teacher desks) will be installed, featuring electronic lift capabilities for ADA compliance. • The lecterns will house the necessary technology components (projectors, screens, speakers). • Whiteboards will not be part of this upgrade, as they are classified as furniture. Departments may need to handle whiteboard replacements separately. <p>Classroom Furniture Updates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classroom desks and lecterns will be replaced as part of the technology upgrades. • The new lecterns will be designed to accommodate electronic components, ensuring compatibility with the new technology. <p>Assistive Listening System</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The system will be installed in all upgraded classrooms for students with hearing impairments. • Receivers for the system may be provided through administrative offices or included in the new lecterns. <p>Cost and Budget Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The total estimated cost for upgrading 30 classrooms is \$1.1 million. • There are concerns about rising costs for acquiring necessary materials and equipment in the next fiscal year. • A budget for potential cost increases and overheads for new materials is being evaluated. <p>Other Classrooms in Need of Updates</p>	
--	--	--

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Questions raised about classroom furniture and technology in various buildings. • Specific classrooms with outdated furniture and equipment, such as whiteboards, desks and chairs, were highlighted. <p>Motion to Recommend Plans (Tommy Strong)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tommy Strong moved to recommend both the marketing plan and the technology replacement plan to the College Council for further approval. • The motion was seconded by Reza Mirbeik. <p>Voting Process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tommy Strong asked if any members were opposed to recommending the plans to the College Council. No objections were raised. • He then inquired if there were any abstentions. Again, no abstentions were reported. • With no opposition or abstentions, Tommy declared the motion passed. <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plans will be forwarded to the College Council for further approval. 	
8. STUDENT UPDATE	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark Reynoso asked if the student representative, Kimberly Ramirez, had any updates or reports. Kimberly was in attendance but did not reply. It was determined she did not have anything to share. 	
9. SACTAC	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	None to report at this time.	
10. ACCREDITATION	DISCUSSION/COMMENTS	ACTIONS/FOLLOW UPS
	None to report at this time.	
11. FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The committee will review the 2025-2026 meeting calendar on May 6, 2025. 	
GENERAL INFORMATION		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fiscal Resources Committee (rscdd.edu) 	
NEXT MEETING	May 6, 2025	

