

RANCHO SANTIAGO COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT

website: [Fiscal Resources Committee](#)

Agenda for November 20, 2024

1:30 p.m. - 3:00 p.m.

Zoom Meeting

1. Welcome
2. State/District Budget Update – Iris Ingram
 - SSC – CalPERS Employer Contribution Rate Estimates
 - SSC – Revenues Beating Budget Projections
 - SSC – New Poll on Education Bond Released
 - SSC – 2024 General Election Preview
 - SSC – School Facilities Bond Approved by Voters
 - SSC – Republicans Capture Federal Government Trifecta
 - DOF – [Finance Bulletin-October 2024](#)
 - [LAO Fiscal Outlook](#)
3. 2023/24 CCFS-320 Recalculation Recap
4. Faculty Obligation Number (FON)
5. 2024 RSCCD Districtwide Survey Results
6. Standing Report from District Council – Tara Kubicka-Miller
7. Informational Handouts
 - District-wide expenditure report link: <https://intranet.rsccd.edu>
 - Vacant Funded Position List as of November 12, 2024
 - Monthly Cash Flow Summary as of October 31, 2024
 - [SAC Planning and Budget Committee Agendas and Minutes](#)
 - [SCC Budget Committee Agendas and Minutes](#)
8. Approval of FRC Minutes – October 16, 2024
9. Other

Next FRC Committee Meeting: January 15, 2025, 1:30-3:00 pm

The Rancho Santiago Community College District aspires to provide equitable, exemplary educational programs and services in safe, inclusive, and supportive learning environments that empower our diverse students and communities to achieve their personal, professional, and academic goals.



COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE

PUBLIC EDUCATION'S POINT OF REFERENCE FOR MAKING EDUCATED DECISIONS

CalPERS Employer Contribution Rate Estimates

 [BY MICHELLE MCKAY UNDERWOOD](#)

 [BY TEDDI WENTWORTH](#)

Copyright 2024 School Services of California, Inc.

posted October 18, 2024

The most recent California Public Employees' Retirement System (CalPERS) Schools Pool Actuarial Valuation report (report), as of June 30, 2023, was released this fall. Although the actual investment return for fiscal year 2023-24 was not known at the time the report was prepared, updated projections were provided in a circular letter, which estimate future employer contribution rates as follows:

| Fiscal Year | Updated: Estimated School Employer Contribution Rate ¹ | Former: Estimated School Employer Co Rate ² |
|-------------|---|--|
| 2024-25 | 27.05% (Actual) | 27.05% (Actual) |
| 2025-26 | 27.40% | 27.60% |
| 2026-27 | 27.50% | 28.00% |
| 2027-28 | 28.50% | 29.20% |
| 2028-29 | 28.20% | 29.00% |
| 2029-30 | 27.80% | 28.80% |

¹As of August 30, 2024

²Prior to August 30, 2024

Across the projection period, the employer contribution rate has improved marginally compared to the prior estimates. The projection assumes that all actuarial assumptions will be realized and that no further changes to assumptions, contributions, benefits, or funding will occur during the projection period. That makes this the best estimation at this time, but it is still subject to change by the time the 2025-26 rate is adopted by the CalPERS Board this spring.

CalPERS employer contribution rates will be included in the next version of our School Services of California Inc. Financial Projection Dashboard to be prepared with the 2025-26 Governor's Budget proposal in January 2025. The current California State Teachers' Retirement System (CalSTRS) employer contribution rate of 19.10% is expected to remain the same in fiscal year 2025-26. CalSTRS has not released outyear projections.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE

PUBLIC EDUCATION'S POINT OF REFERENCE FOR MAKING EDUCATED DECISIONS

Revenues Beating Budget Projections

 **BY JOHN GRAY**
 **BY PATTI F. HERRERA, EDD**

Copyright 2024 School Services of California, Inc.

posted October 23, 2024

On October 22, 2024, the Department of Finance released its October 2024 [Finance Bulletin](#) with positive news about the economy and state General Fund revenues. Both the U.S. and California economies continued trend-level growth in the second quarter of the year at of 3.0% and 2.8%, respectively. Steady growth suggests that the Federal Reserve's (Fed) management of monetary policy in response to rising costs averted a hard landing for the economy. You will recall that the Fed reduced the federal funds rate by an aggressive 50 basis points earlier this fall, feeling confident that prices and the labor market were reaching a reasonable balance and that the economy was headed in the right direction. Headline inflation, inclusive of food and energy, was just above the Fed's target rate of 2.0%, at 2.4% at the end of September.

Labor and Housing Market

As for the labor market, California's unemployment rate continues to be one of the highest in the nation at 5.3% in September, compared to 4.1% for the nation. Nevertheless, according to the *Finance Bulletin*, the state added 14,700 nonfarm jobs last month primarily in the private education, health services, and government sectors, which combined added 13,400 jobs. Conversely, California's leisure and hospitality and information sectors lost a combined 6,800 jobs last month; these sectors added jobs in September across the nation.

The state's housing market continues to face challenges with single- and multi-family permits down 6.8% from last year. The statewide median price for single-family homes decreased 2.3% from August to September 2024 (to \$868,150) but is still up 2.9% from last year when the median price for a home was \$843,150.

State General Fund Revenues—"Big Three" Taxes

Consistent with larger economic trends, tax revenues from the "Big Three" taxes—personal income, sales and use, and corporation taxes—are exceeding budget projections by \$4.1 billion for the 2024-25 fiscal year. Moreover, revenues for the last three months of 2023-24 are also outpacing budget estimates by \$3.2 billion, according to the *Finance Bulletin*.

| 2024-25 "Big Three" Tax Revenues (in millions) | | | |
|--|------------|----------|------------|
| | Projection | Actual | Difference |
| Personal Income | \$24,198 | \$26,786 | \$2,588 |
| Corporation | \$3,335 | \$4,738 | \$1,403 |

| | | | |
|----------------------|----------|----------|---------|
| Sales and Use | \$8,008 | \$8,076 | \$68 |
| Total | \$35,541 | \$39,600 | \$4,059 |

Proposition 98 Impact

Better-than-expected state General Fund revenues typically accrue benefits for Proposition 98 and education funding. In 2024-25, this is especially true given the lawmakers' decision to suspend (or reduce) the minimum guarantee in 2023-24, which in turn creates an obligation (referred to as the maintenance factor) for the state to restore education funding to what it should have been without suspension. Recall that in June the minimum guarantee for 2023-24 was calculated to be \$106.8 billion, and the state funded \$98.5 billion of this obligation, creating an approximate \$8.4 billion maintenance factor obligation. Also in June, the state made a \$4.1 billion maintenance factor payment toward this debt to K-14 education.

Because state revenues are above the projections assumed in the budget, it could mean that the state would be obligated to spend most of every surplus dollar to fulfill its obligation to K-12 and community college agencies.

We will have a clearer picture of what state General Fund revenue performance means for Proposition 98 when the Legislative Analyst's Office releases its annual *Fiscal Outlook* report in mid-November and again when Governor Gavin Newsom releases his 2025-26 State Budget proposal on January 10, 2025.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE

PUBLIC EDUCATION'S POINT OF REFERENCE FOR MAKING EDUCATED DECISIONS

New Poll on Education Bond Released

 [BY KYLE HYLAND](#)

 [BY DAVE HECKLER](#)

Copyright 2024 School Services of California, Inc.

posted October 25, 2024

On Thursday, October 24, 2024, the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) released its October [survey](#), which included polling data for Proposition 2 (2024), the measure that would issue \$10 billion in bond funding for K-14 facilities.

The poll found that 52% of likely voters said that they would vote yes on the measure, which is a two-percentage point drop from the PPIC's September survey (54% of likely voters said that they would vote yes). There was also a two-percentage point increase in the number of likely voters who said that they will vote no on the measure (44% in the September survey to 46% in the October survey). The poll has a margin of error +/- 3.7%

The survey shows that seven in ten Democratic likely voters support the bond, while only 21% of likely Republican voters say they support the measure. Half of the likely independent voters said they will vote yes.

Support for the education bond was strongest among younger voters, with nearly two-thirds of voters between the ages of 18 and 44 supporting the education bond, while 46% of voters aged 45 and older indicated their support.

It is important to note that support for Proposition 2 is eight points lower than the other statewide bond proposal on the ballot, Proposition 4 (2024). Proposition 4 would authorize the state to issue \$10 billion in bonds to fund various environmental, energy, and water projects. The survey finds that six in ten likely voters support Proposition 4 with strong majorities of likely Democratic voters (81%) and independent voters (58%) saying they will vote yes on the measure. Only 27% of likely Republican voters say they support the measure.

The last time a statewide education facilities bond was placed before voters was the March 3, 2020, primary election ballot. That measure, unfortunately named Proposition 13 (2020), failed passage with 47% voting for the proposition and 53% voting against it.

It is important to note that the month before the March 2020 primary election, PPIC polling showed that 51% of likely voters supported Proposition 13 (2020), just one percentage point lower than the 52% of likely voters indicating their support for Proposition 2.

However, the Proposition 2 conditions are different than Proposition 13. Proposition 2 has a lower price tag than Proposition 13 (\$10 billion versus \$15 billion), does not include the University of California and California State University systems like Proposition 13 did, is on the General Election ballot versus the primary ballot, is not being decided weeks before a global health crisis, and did not draw the unfortunate proposition number of 13.

There is a good chance that this is the final polling data we will have on Proposition 2 prior to the November 5, 2024, General Election.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE

PUBLIC EDUCATION'S POINT OF REFERENCE FOR MAKING EDUCATED DECISIONS

2024 General Election Preview



BY KYLE HYLAND

Copyright 2024 School Services of California, Inc.

posted November 5, 2024

Today, Tuesday, November 5 is the 2024 General Election. While nationally most eyes will be on the presidential and congressional races that will determine which party controls the White House and both houses of Congress, we wanted to preview what other issues California voters will see on their ballots at the polls today.

In addition to selecting 1 U.S. Senate seat and all 52 congressional seats in California, voters will also decide 100 of the 120 seats that comprise the California Legislature. All 80 seats that make up the state Assembly as well as half (20) of the Senate seats will be decided by the voters today. Democrats are looking to retain their supermajority status in both houses. At the end of the recent 2023-24 legislative session, the state Senate consisted of 31 Democrats and 9 Republicans, while the Assembly consisted of 62 Democrats, 17 Republicans, and 1 vacancy. This means that Democrats can afford to lose 4 seats in the Senate and 8 seats in the Assembly and still retain their supermajority status.

Voters will also decide the fate of the following ten ballot propositions, which require a simple majority (50% + 1) to pass:

- Proposition 2: Issues \$10 billion (\$8.5 billion for K-12 education and \$1.5 billion for the California Community Colleges) in bonds to fund the construction and modernization of K-14 public education facilities
- Proposition 3: Repeals Proposition 8 (2008) and declares that a “right to marry is a fundamental right” in California
- Proposition 4: Issues \$10 billion in bonds to fund safe drinking water, drought, flood, and water resilience programs; wildfire and forest resilience programs; coastal resilience programs; and other climate-related infrastructure projects
- Proposition 5: Lowers the vote threshold required to approve local special taxes for housing and infrastructure projects from two-thirds to 55%
- Proposition 6: Repeals language in the California Constitution prohibiting involuntary servitude except to punish crime and replaces it with language prohibiting slavery and involuntary servitude

- Proposition 32: Increases the state minimum wage to \$18.00 per hour (begins January 1, 2025, for employers with 26 or more employees and January 1, 2026, for employers with 25 or fewer employees) and thereafter will adjust annually for inflation
- Proposition 33: Repeals the Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act (1995), thereby allowing cities and counties to limit rent increases, and prohibits the state from limiting how cities and counties expand or maintain rent control
- Proposition 34: Requires certain health care providers to spend 98% of revenues from federal discount prescription drug programs on direct patient care; permanently authorizes the state to negotiate Medi-Cal drug prices on a statewide basis
- Proposition 35: Permanently authorizes a tax on managed care organizations to fund Medi-Cal programs, which is currently set to expire in 2026
- Proposition 36: Revises Proposition 47 (2014) to raise the penalties and sentences for some drug and theft offenses

Arguably, the most consequential ballot measure for K-14 education is Proposition 2. Recent polling from the Public Policy Institute of California (PPIC) finds that 52% of likely voters say they plan on voting for the measure, while 46% say they are planning to vote no. The 52% support figure among likely voters is eight points lower than the 60% of likely voters who said that they plan on voting yes for Proposition 4, the other \$10 billion bond measure on the ballot (see the October 2024 *Community College Update* article “[New Poll on Education Bond Released](#)” for more analysis on this poll).

The other measure that could have an impact on K-14 education is Proposition 32. If approved, Proposition 32 would raise the state minimum wage to \$18.00 per hour, which would likely fuel salary demands at local classified bargaining tables similar to how the recent increase to the fast food minimum wage has led to a demand in salary increases (see the December 2023 *Community College Update* article “[Fast Food Minimum Wage Fuels Local Salary Demands](#)” for an analysis of how Assembly Bill 1228 impacts K-14 education).

The same PPIC poll referenced above found that 44% of likely voters plan on voting yes on Proposition 32, while 54% of likely voters say they are going to vote against it. A poll conducted by the University of California, Berkeley Institute of Governmental Studies in late September found that 46% of likely voters support the measure, 36% are opposed, and 18% are undecided.

Locally, there are 241 general obligation bonds that voters will decide, which in aggregate totals over \$50 billion. Of those 241 local bonds, there are 9 community college district and 24 School Facility Improvement District bonds requiring at least 55% support from the voters (see October 2024 *Community College Update* article “[Voters Will Be Asked to Approve \\$50 Billion in Local School Bonds](#)” for more information). In addition to local bonds, voters will also be asked to decide community college trustee seats, school board races, and various municipal government positions.

It is important to note that none of the statewide offices, including Governor, State Superintendent of Public Instruction, Secretary of State, and Attorney General are on the ballot. This is because California elects its statewide office holders during midterm elections, which will take place in 2026.

It may take weeks before many of these races and measures are called, but we will monitor the information as it comes in and update you in subsequent articles.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE

PUBLIC EDUCATION'S POINT OF REFERENCE FOR MAKING EDUCATED DECISIONS

School Facilities Bond Approved by Voters



BY [KYLE HYLAND](#)

Copyright 2024 School Services of California, Inc.

posted November 7, 2024

Media outlets are projecting that Proposition 2 (2024), the \$10 billion K-14 school facilities bond, has been approved by voters. This news comes four and a half years after voters rejected a \$15 billion school facilities bond on the March 3, 2020, primary election ballot.

With more than half of the votes counted, Proposition 2 is up 57% to 43%. The numbers are currently outpacing the Public Policy Institute of California's (PPIC) final poll on the measure by five percentage points (see "[New Poll on Education Bond Released](#)" in the October 2024 *Community College Update*).

The \$10 billion in bond proceeds will provide a total of \$8.5 billion to K-12 and \$1.5 billion to community colleges. Of the \$1.5 billion provided to community colleges, the proceeds can be used for:

- Construction on existing campuses, including the construction of buildings and the acquisition of related fixtures
- Construction of intersegmental facilities
- Renovation and reconstruction of facilities
- Site acquisition
- The equipping of new, renovated, or reconstructed facilities, which equipment shall have an average useful life of ten years
- The payment of preconstruction costs, including, but not limited to, preliminary plans and working drawings for facilities of the California Community Colleges

"Transparency and accountability provisions" are included in the bond language for any educational institution receiving funds, including a community college district. These provisions include an independent performance audit, a public hearing, and posting information on the district's website.

Proposition 2 will officially take effect the fifth day after the Secretary of State certifies the election results. The Secretary of State has until December 13, 2024, to certify the election results.

We will continue to provide results on the election in subsequent *Community College Update* articles. Stay tuned.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE UPDATE

PUBLIC EDUCATION'S POINT OF REFERENCE FOR MAKING EDUCATED DECISIONS

Republicans Capture Federal Government Trifecta

 [BY KYLE HYLAND](#)

Copyright 2024 School Services of California, Inc.

posted November 13, 2024

Media outlets are now projecting that Republicans have won enough seats to retain the House of Representatives majority. Come January, the GOP will hold a national government trifecta, by which they will control both houses of Congress and the presidency.

The final House breakdown is unknown at this time as there are still several races yet to be called, but it is projected that Republicans have captured at least 218 seats to control the chamber. While the GOP will have control of the House, the Republican majority is expected to be very narrow once the final races are called.

The projected count for the Senate is 53 seats for the Republicans and 47 for the Democrats heading into the 2025-26 congressional session. Republican control of the Senate will allow President-elect Donald Trump to install his cabinet members and other positions requiring Senate confirmation, such as the Secretary of Education, much more seamlessly than if Democrats had retained control of the upper chamber.

While control of Congress will allow Republicans to approve some of Trump's legislative agenda, the narrow majority will make it more difficult for the President-elect to pass significant legislation. This is especially true in the Senate, which requires a 60-vote threshold to break a filibuster and begin debate on a bill. Senate Democrats are expected to use this legislative tool to halt many of Trump's legislative goals.

The narrow majority in the House and the filibuster in the Senate will make it difficult for Trump to follow through on his pledge to close the U.S. Department of Education as closing federal agencies requires congressional approval. We will be writing a subsequent article detailing President-elect Trump's education platform and how feasible those proposals will be in the coming days.

In terms of timing for the Republican trifecta, the House and Senate will swear in the members for the 119th Congress on January 3, 2025, while President-elect Trump will officially be sworn in on January 20, 2025.

**California Community Colleges
Full-Time Faculty Obligation
Fall 2024 Compliance Form**

District

Rancho Santiago

Full-Time Equivalent Faculty (FTEF) Calculation

Full-time equivalent faculty indicates the full-time load factor associated with each assignment. A regular full-time load is considered to be 100% and expressed as 1.0 FTEF. A half-time load is considered 50% and is expressed as 0.5 FTEF.

Full-Time FTEF, calculated per Title 5 section 53309

Regular assignment - full-time faculty credit instruction excluding overload

FTEF
279.82

Include sabbatical, released/reassigned time, paid medical leave, unpaid leave, and late retirement

Classified staff regular assignment - credit instruction

-

Administrative staff regular assignment - credit instruction

-

Noninstructional activities of counselors, librarians, and other faculty

76.18

Total Full-Time FTEF **356.00**

Part-Time FTEF, calculated per Title 5 section 53310

Credit instruction and noninstructional activities

269.96

Exclude any workload attributed to replacing full-time faculty for sabbatical, released/reassigned, paid medical leave, unpaid leave, and for late retirement

-

Total Part-Time FTEF **269.96**

Total FTEF

625.96

Progress Toward Goal of 75% of Classroom Instruction Taught by Full-Time Faculty

57%

Fall 2024 FON Compliance

The Board of Governors, at their November 2023 meeting, fully implemented the FON for Fall 2024.

Full-time faculty obligation

289.40

Over(Under) full-time faculty obligation

66.60

Does the district meet or exceed the Fall 2024 full-time faculty obligation?

In Compliance

Estimated Penalty

If a district has incurred a penalty, the district will receive an invoice for the penalty amount.

Statewide average replacement cost:

\$ 97,855

Estimated penalty is the statewide average replacement cost multiplied by deficiency in meeting the full-time faculty obligation.

\$ -

Please complete and return this form as a PDF by November 1, 2024 to fiscalstandards@cccco.edu


District Executive Officer (CEO, CBO, or CHRO):

I hereby certify that the information above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Printed Name, Title: Marvin Martinez, Chancellor

Date: Oct 7, 2024

Digital Signature:


Marvin Martinez (Oct 7, 2024 15:25 PDT)

District Administrative Contact Information:

Name & Title: Iris I. Ingram, Vice Chancellor, Business Services


Iris Ingram (Oct 7, 2024 14:44 PDT)

Email: ingram_iris@rscdd.edu

Phone: 714-480-7340









Fall 2024 Compliance FON and Report

Final Audit Report

2024-10-07

| | |
|-----------------|--|
| Created: | 2024-10-07 (Pacific Daylight Time) |
| By: | Kennethia Vega (Vega_Kennethia@rscdd.edu) |
| Status: | Signed |
| Transaction ID: | CBJCHBCAABAA80i_2hNxAothY7vfqjNth93doxm6XFN- |

"Fall 2024 Compliance FON and Report" History

-  Document created by Kennethia Vega (Vega_Kennethia@rscdd.edu)
2024-10-07 - 10:10:13 AM PDT- IP address: 204.75.252.3
-  Document emailed to Iris Ingram (Ingram_Iris@rscdd.edu) for signature
2024-10-07 - 10:12:07 AM PDT
-  Email viewed by Iris Ingram (Ingram_Iris@rscdd.edu)
2024-10-07 - 2:44:44 PM PDT- IP address: 104.47.58.254
-  Document e-signed by Iris Ingram (Ingram_Iris@rscdd.edu)
Signature Date: 2024-10-07 - 2:44:54 PM PDT - Time Source: server- IP address: 204.75.252.1
-  Document emailed to Marvin Martinez (Martinez_Marvin@rscdd.edu) for signature
2024-10-07 - 2:44:55 PM PDT
-  Email viewed by Marvin Martinez (Martinez_Marvin@rscdd.edu)
2024-10-07 - 3:24:49 PM PDT- IP address: 104.47.58.254
-  Document e-signed by Marvin Martinez (Martinez_Marvin@rscdd.edu)
Signature Date: 2024-10-07 - 3:25:07 PM PDT - Time Source: server- IP address: 204.75.252.1
-  Agreement completed.
2024-10-07 - 3:25:07 PM PDT



**FULL-TIME FACULTY OBLIGATION
COMPLIANCE REPORT
RANCHO SANTIAGO CCD**

| | Fall 2024 FON | | | Fall 2023 FON | | |
|---|---------------|--------|--------|---------------|--------|--------|
| | DO | SAC | SCC | DO | SAC | SCC |
| Total full-time equivalent faculty (FTEF) attributable to instructional and noninstructional Full-time | | | | | | |
| 1 Faculty based on Title 5 Sections 53302 and 53309 | 279.82 | 190.62 | 89.20 | 290.71 | 202.22 | 88.49 |
| Non-instructional activities of counselors, librarians, and other faculty | 76.18 | 50.38 | 25.80 | 67.29 | 41.78 | 25.51 |
| | 356.00 | 241.00 | 115.00 | 358.00 | 244.00 | 114.00 |
| | | 67.70% | 32.30% | | 68.16% | 31.84% |
| Total FTEF attributable to instructional and noninstructional Part-Time Faculty based on Title 5 Sections | | | | | | |
| 2 53301 and 53310 | 269.96 | 191.62 | 78.34 | 257.10 | 171.61 | 85.49 |
| 3 Total FTEF for Full-Time Faculty and Part-Time Faculty (line 1 + line 2) | 625.96 | 432.62 | 193.34 | 615.10 | 415.61 | 199.49 |
| 4 Percentage of FTEF attributable to Full-Time Faculty (line 1/line 3) | 57% | 56% | 59% | 58% | 59% | 57% |
| 5 Full-Time Faculty Obligation | 289.4 | | | 305.4 | | |
| 6 Difference between Full-time Faculty Obligation and Total Full-Time faculty (line 1 minus line 5) | 66.60 | | | 52.60 | | |
| Average cost of replacement (negative on line 6 x average replacement cost) (penalty) | - | | | - | | |

California Community Colleges

Fall 2024 Compliance FON

| District | Fall 2023 Compliance FON | Fall 2023 Reported FON | Fall 2024 Advance FON | Fall 2024 P2 FON | Fall 2024 Compliance FON |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| Allan Hancock | 129.6 | 162.2 | 122.6 | 131.6 | 122.6 |
| Antelope Valley | 152.4 | 184.0 | 139.4 | 151.4 | 139.4 |
| Barstow | 26.3 | 38.2 | 25.3 | 28.3 | 25.3 |
| Butte | 150.5 | 177.8 | 146.5 | 154.5 | 146.5 |
| Cabrillo | 165.8 | 186.3 | 161.8 | 168.8 | 161.8 |
| Cerritos | 280.0 | 278.0 | 262.0 | 284.0 | 262.0 |
| Chabot-Las Positas | 263.0 | 281.0 | 232.0 | 261.0 | 232.0 |
| Chaffey | 237.6 | 249.8 | 223.6 | 239.6 | 223.6 |
| Citrus | 157.0 | 164.0 | 151.0 | 162.0 | 151.0 |
| Coast | 372.9 | 427.8 | 349.9 | 373.9 | 349.9 |
| Compton | 32.0 | 98.0 | 30.0 | 31.0 | 30.0 |
| Contra Costa | 368.0 | 486.1 | 331.0 | 366.0 | 331.0 |
| Copper Mt. | 7.7 | 31.2 | 5.7 | 8.7 | 5.7 |
| Desert | 124.8 | 145.0 | 117.8 | 129.8 | 117.8 |
| El Camino | 322.0 | 339.9 | 303.0 | 322.0 | 303.0 |
| Feather River | 16.3 | 27.0 | 14.3 | 16.3 | 14.3 |
| Foothill-DeAnza | 340.6 | 404.0 | 314.6 | 333.6 | 314.6 |
| Gavilan | 65.5 | 72.6 | 58.5 | 66.5 | 58.5 |
| Glendale | 201.1 | 221.0 | 182.1 | 197.1 | 182.1 |
| Grossmont-Cuyamaca | 269.5 | 295.0 | 245.5 | 270.5 | 245.5 |
| Hartnell | 107.0 | 117.7 | 107.0 | 114.0 | 107.0 |
| Imperial | 105.1 | 128.9 | 99.1 | 102.1 | 99.1 |
| Kern | 467.8 | 502.0 | 437.8 | 473.8 | 437.8 |
| Lake Tahoe | 18.6 | 35.9 | 18.6 | 18.6 | 18.6 |
| Lassen | 12.0 | 19.0 | 9.0 | 11.0 | 9.0 |
| Long Beach | 331.0 | 348.3 | 315.0 | 341.0 | 315.0 |
| Los Angeles | 1,469.8 | 1,573.1 | 1,337.8 | 1,482.8 | 1,337.8 |
| Los Rios | 798.1 | 894.9 | 750.1 | 841.1 | 750.1 |
| Marin | 48.5 | 145.9 | 45.5 | 50.5 | 45.5 |
| Mendocino-Lake | 41.7 | 57.0 | 35.7 | 38.7 | 35.7 |
| Merced | 170.7 | 184.8 | 167.7 | 186.7 | 167.7 |
| Mira Costa | 147.2 | 202.5 | 133.2 | 144.2 | 133.2 |
| Monterey Peninsula | 104.7 | 118.1 | 96.7 | 100.7 | 96.7 |
| Mt. San Antonio | 419.1 | 449.0 | 397.1 | 423.1 | 397.1 |
| Mt. San Jacinto | 152.6 | 192.1 | 150.6 | 162.6 | 150.6 |
| Napa Valley | 66.4 | 92.9 | 57.4 | 60.4 | 57.4 |
| North Orange County | 495.2 | 534.4 | 467.2 | 501.2 | 467.2 |
| Ohlone | 97.6 | 113.0 | 87.6 | 94.6 | 87.6 |
| Palo Verde | 25.4 | 48.0 | 25.4 | 27.4 | 25.4 |
| Palomar | 271.1 | 295.2 | 239.1 | 256.1 | 239.1 |
| Pasadena Area | 416.4 | 441.0 | 372.4 | 406.4 | 372.4 |
| Peralta | 261.9 | 310.0 | 249.9 | 265.9 | 249.9 |
| Rancho Santiago | 305.4 | 358.0 | 289.4 | 323.4 | 289.4 |
| Redwoods | 57.2 | 76.5 | 51.2 | 57.2 | 51.2 |
| Rio Hondo | 212.8 | 223.0 | 205.8 | 204.8 | 204.8 |
| Riverside | 422.4 | 483.6 | 399.4 | 436.4 | 399.4 |
| San Bernardino | 222.4 | 282.1 | 213.4 | 229.4 | 213.4 |
| San Diego | 489.0 | 573.1 | 460.0 | 485.0 | 460.0 |
| San Francisco | 163.1 | 365.7 | 140.1 | 151.1 | 140.1 |

California Community Colleges

Fall 2024 Compliance FON

| District | Fall 2023 Compliance FON | Fall 2023 Reported FON | Fall 2024 Advance FON | Fall 2024 P2 FON | Fall 2024 Compliance FON |
|------------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|
| San Joaquin Delta | 234.1 | 233.1 | 213.1 | 240.1 | 213.1 |
| San Jose-Evergreen | 170.8 | 236.9 | 148.8 | 166.8 | 148.8 |
| San Luis Obispo | 118.2 | 132.9 | 114.2 | 121.2 | 114.2 |
| San Mateo | 223.7 | 353.8 | 210.7 | 231.7 | 210.7 |
| Santa Barbara | 197.1 | 213.0 | 183.1 | 197.1 | 183.1 |
| Santa Clarita | 211.7 | 234.4 | 189.7 | 206.7 | 189.7 |
| Santa Monica | 245.6 | 351.1 | 224.6 | 235.6 | 224.6 |
| Sequoias | 195.3 | 219.0 | 188.3 | 203.3 | 188.3 |
| Shasta-Tehama-Trinity | 112.3 | 124.0 | 99.3 | 109.3 | 99.3 |
| Sierra | 190.7 | 236.8 | 173.7 | 189.7 | 173.7 |
| Siskiyou | 22.1 | 58.8 | 19.1 | 21.1 | 19.1 |
| Solano | 118.8 | 131.0 | 109.8 | 118.8 | 109.8 |
| Sonoma County | 275.6 | 310.7 | 268.6 | 271.6 | 268.6 |
| South Orange | 371.8 | 409.4 | 349.8 | 377.8 | 349.8 |
| Southwestern | 246.2 | 292.6 | 232.2 | 253.2 | 232.2 |
| State Center | 566.3 | 664.8 | 535.3 | 587.3 | 535.3 |
| Ventura | 401.8 | 438.8 | 370.8 | 402.8 | 370.8 |
| Victor Valley | 125.0 | 116.0 | 122.0 | 140.0 | 122.0 |
| West Hills | 84.6 | 100.0 | 76.6 | 86.6 | 76.6 |
| West Kern | 56.7 | 61.0 | 46.7 | 52.7 | 46.7 |
| West Valley-Mission | 184.1 | 269.3 | 171.1 | 187.1 | 171.1 |
| Yosemite | 275.2 | 309.0 | 262.2 | 285.2 | 262.2 |
| Yuba | 94.1 | 120.6 | 88.1 | 94.1 | 88.1 |
| Statewide Total | 16,304.3 | 19,051.3 | 15,173.3 | 16,466.3 | 15,172.3 |

FON - What Counts?

Title 5, Sections 53308, 53309, 59204

| Type of Faculty | FON (FT Faculty only) | 50% Law (FT and PT Faculty) |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Instructional Faculty | Yes | Yes |
| Non-Instructional Faculty | Yes | No |
| Non-credit Instructional Faculty | No | Yes |
| Non-credit Counselors | Yes | No |
| Tenure Track Grant Funded Faculty | Yes | No |
| Non-tenure track Grant Funded Faculty | No | No |
| FTF Overload | No | Yes |
| Faculty Reassigned Time | Yes | No |
| Sabbatical/Unpaid Leave | Yes | No |
| Late Retirements (within 45 days) | Yes | N/A |
| Funded by Parcel Tax | No | Maybe |



Rancho Santiago Community College District Districtwide Planning Process Survey Results

October 2024

To ensure that the Rancho Santiago Community College District (RSCCD) planning and decision-making process continues to be effective and communicated throughout the district/colleges, members of the RSCCD Governance Committees (n=64) were invited to give opinions on this district-wide planning and resource allocation process, as well as the district operations resource allocation.

The twenty-nine respondents include:

- Representation from all sites, with more than two-thirds from Santa Ana College (SAC), 17% from Santiago Canyon College (SCC), 10% district operations, and 3% unidentified.
- Representation from all employee groups and student leadership: 17% classified, 52% faculty, 21% management, 7% students, and 3% did not indicate their role).
- Representation from all six governance committees: 24% from District Council, 38% from Fiscal Resources, 17% from Human Resources, 28% from Physical Resources, 31% from Planning and Organizational Effectiveness, and 34% from the Technology Advisory Group. Note that representations from governance committees overlaps; therefore, the total percentage exceeds 100%.

Overall, more than half of the respondents are familiar with the RSCCD Planning Design (64%), and nearly half find the district-wide planning process clear and well linked to the colleges' planning processes (48% reported being both clear and linked). Almost two-thirds (64%) believe the five committees collaborate effectively to support the work of District Council, while slightly fewer respondents believe there is integration between college and district planning (48%). There is general agreement among respondents regarding their understanding of the roles and responsibilities of the committees, with agreement ranging from 65% for the Planning and Organizational Effectiveness Committee to 83% for the Fiscal Resource Committee.

About one-third of the respondents stated that the process and prioritization of district-wide resource allocation is clear, that they are satisfied with the request and prioritization process, that there is coordination between district-wide and college-based resource requests, that the resource allocation timeline is clear, and that they are satisfied with the district-wide resource request and prioritization process. Additionally, respondents indicated they were not as knowledgeable about the district operations' resource allocation request process and timeline, nor the coordination between this process and the college's resource requests. It is important to note that 89% of the respondents are from SAC and SCC, suggesting they are likely more familiar with their respective colleges' processes than with those of the district operations.

More than one-thirds of respondents indicated that they bring information and issues from district-wide governance committees back to their respective college committees after every meeting while 46% would bring it to back as needed. Similarly, 71% of the respondents indicated that they bring college information and issues to district-wide governance committee meetings.

Given that representations to the district-wide governance committees changes regularly, it is recommended that new members be thoroughly oriented about the district-wide planning and resource allocation processes, as well as their roles and responsibilities, to ensure effective representation and coordination with colleges' processes and structures. Detailed tables and respondents' comments are provided on the following pages.

| | Count | strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|
| I am familiar with the current RSCCD Planning Design. | 28 | 14% | 50% | 29% | 7% |
| The district-wide planning process is clear. | 29 | 0% | 48% | 31% | 21% |
| The district-wide planning process is linked with the colleges' planning processes. | 29 | 3% | 45% | 45% | 7% |
| I understand the roles and responsibilities of the following RSCCD Governance Committees: | | | | | |
| District Council | 28 | 29% | 50% | 14% | 7% |
| Fiscal Resources | 29 | 31% | 52% | 10% | 7% |
| Human Resources | 28 | 25% | 57% | 18% | 0% |
| Physical Resources | 29 | 24% | 48% | 21% | 7% |
| Planning and Organizational Effectiveness | 29 | 24% | 41% | 28% | 7% |
| Technology Advisory Group | 29 | 28% | 52% | 17% | 3% |

| | Count | strongly agree | agree | disagree | strongly disagree | don't know |
|---|-------|----------------|-------|----------|-------------------|------------|
| The committees collaborate to support the work of District Council. | 28 | 11% | 54% | 14% | 0% | 21% |
| There is integration between college and district planning. | 29 | 7% | 41% | 21% | 14% | 17% |
| Please tell us your level of agreement on the <u>district-wide</u> resource allocation: | | | | | | |
| The process to identify and prioritize district-wide resource requests is clear. | 29 | 3% | 31% | 34% | 28% | 3% |
| I am satisfied with the district-wide resource request and prioritization process. | 29 | 0% | 21% | 41% | 24% | 14% |
| There is coordination between district-wide and college-based resource requests. | 29 | 0% | 31% | 31% | 21% | 17% |
| The district-wide resource allocation timeline is clear. | 29 | 0% | 31% | 38% | 10% | 21% |
| The district-wide resource allocation timeline is satisfactory. | 29 | 0% | 28% | 34% | 17% | 21% |
| Please tell us your level of agreement on the <u>district operations</u> resource allocation: | | | | | | |
| The process to identify and prioritize district operations resource requests is clear. | 28 | 0% | 32% | 39% | 14% | 14% |
| I am satisfied with the district operations resource request and prioritization process. | 28 | 0% | 25% | 39% | 14% | 21% |
| There is coordination between district operations and college-based resource requests. | 28 | 0% | 21% | 39% | 18% | 21% |
| The district operations resource allocation timeline is clear. | 28 | 0% | 39% | 29% | 14% | 18% |
| The district operations resource allocation timeline is satisfactory. | 28 | 0% | 29% | 36% | 11% | 25% |

| As a member of a district-wide governance committee, how often do you take information/concerns back to your college committee that you represent? | | | |
|--|--|--|---|
| Count | I bring information/issues from the district-wide governance committee back to my college committee after every meeting. | I bring information/issues back to my college committee when needed. | I have never shared information/issues from the district-wide governance committee with my college committee. |
| 28 | 32% | 46% | 21% |

| How often do you take an issue/concern from your college committee to the district-wide governance committee that you attend? | | | |
|---|--|--|--|
| Count | I bring college information/issues to district-wide governance committee to every meeting. | I bring college information/issues to district-wide governance committee to some meetings. | I have never brought any information/issues to the district-wide governance committee. |
| 28 | 25% | 46% | 29% |

Changes to the District-wide planning and resource request process you would recommend:

- I see little evidence that needed support is given to campus issues from the district, with or without requests received from the individuals on campus. Critical infrastructure and technology failures go unanswered, and far too many issues exist in which time and research has been applied by campus individuals, with no response from the district. It generally feels like the district is playing a game of "kick the can" when it comes to necessary funding and support.
- It needs to be made clearer that districtwide operations are NOT the same as District Services. We ALL receive districtwide services that are administered through the District Services Office.
- Resources, fundings and FT faculty hirings should be based on the results of the FTE. Thank you.
- Some areas of district wide planning are not as integrated with the colleges planning process as other area; thus, transparency and improvements are needed.
- There should be one process - and one only. It seems that administrators will fund whatever project they wish, regardless of its home through true planning process or not.
- District wide planning should build up from the colleges. Often it appears that the reverse is happening. When input is requested from the colleges, rarely is there sufficient time to engage the campus committees, etc. In some instances, discussions and votes are planned when faculty are off contract which is unacceptable.
- Perhaps have leadership, at every site, share and disseminate information to the workers who are mostly affected by decisions made in a zoom or in-person meeting. Also try to explain the mission, in layman's terms, of each district and local committee. Perhaps this will help with the surveys and swing the answers in a more positive manner.
- "Where is the planning taking place? District Governance Committees are more reporting committees than working committees. Items that come forward for action have already been approved by Chancellor's Cabinet so what's the point of taking action at Committees if it is just a rubber stamp or giving the appearance that constituent groups input matters. Why aren't discussions and recommendations coming from FRC on how many District positions and resource requests can be funded by the District's budget? Again, where is the planning taking place? Ensure timelines for resource requests align with the Colleges timelines, Colleges need to assess and approve their needs before making decisions on District's needs. "
- Rules keep changing and it is hard to know what the heck to do anymore! And takes forever now too.

Changes to the district operations planning and resource request process you would recommend:

- This questionnaire is clearly geared towards the colleges, not district service office functions. Our role is equally important and needs to be elevated. Resource requests should not be subject to the "whim" of the colleges. The allocation process should not be a popularity contest.
- District operations requests should come through the shared governance structures at the campus level prior to being submitted to district committees for approval.
- Explain the role of college governance committees in the district resource allocation process.
- Planning and resource allocation between the district and colleges should clearly outlined in the District Planning Handbook.
- Rules keep changing and it is hard to know what the heck to do anymore! And takes forever now too.

**Vacant Funded Positions for FY2024-25- Projected Annual Salary and Benefits Savings
As of November 12, 2024**

| Fund | Management/ Academic/ Confidential | EMPLOYEE ID# | Title | Site | Effective Date | Annual Salary | Notes | Vacant Account | 2024-25 Estimated Annual Budgeted Sal/Ben | Total Unr. General Fund by Site |
|--------------|--|--------------|---|------|----------------|------------------|--|--|---|------------------------------------|
| 82%-fd 11 | 11 | 1028171 | Instructional Media Producer | SAC | 9/1/2023 | - | Hired CL23-00865 Collado Mendoza, Marcos#2633328 Eff:7/29/24 | 11-0000-679000-11501-2130 | - | |
| 18%-fd 12 | | 1338982 | Adm/Rec Spec Senior | CEC | 8/10/2023 | - | Hired CL23-00747 Cardenas, Maria#1588853 Eff:8/21/24 | 11-0000-620000-18100-2130-82% 12-1102-620000-18100-2130-18% | - | |
| | 11 | 2356350 | Instructional Center Technician | SCC | 8/30/2024 | 49,940 | Reorg1391 | 11-0000-493062-28200-2210 | 91,464 | |
| | 11 | 2326045 | P/T Custodian | SCC | 2/21/2024 | - | Hired CL24-00859 Dominguez, Oswaldo#2740147 Eff:8/12/24 | 11-0000-653000-27200-2310 | - | |
| 60%-fd 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 40%-fd 12 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 11 | 1292404 | Administrative Clerk | OEC | 5/12/2024 | 7,680 | | 11-0000-620000-28100-2130-60%, 12- 1102-620000-28100-2130-23% 12-2462- 620000-28100-2130-17% | 26,434 | |
| | 11 | 1905429 | PT Administrative Clerk | SCC | 12/31/2023 | 27,880 | | 11-0000-601000-25051-2310 | 37,987 | |
| | 11 | 1030388 | International Student Coordinator | SCC | 1/31/2019 | - | | 11-0000-649000-29110-2130 | - | |
| | 11 | 2633936 | Custodian-GY | SCC | 8/12/2024 | 50,964 | | 11-0000-653000-28100-2130 | 91,875 | |
| | 11 | 1027710 | Senior Clerk | SCC | 3/31/2022 | - | | 11-0000-601000-25131-2130 | - | |
| | 11 | 1492326 | Custodian | SCC | 4/4/2023 | 51,287 | | 11-0000-653000-27200-2130 | 95,032 | |
| | 11 | 1239034 | Transfer Center Specialist | SCC | 4/16/2023 | 67,571 | | 11-0000-631000-29305-2130 | 117,232 | |
| | 11 | 1030363 | Executive Secretary | SCC | 3/24/2024 | - | Hired CL24-00876 Ambar - Nakagami#2333446 Eff:7/8/24 | 11-0000-679000-27105-2130 | - | |
| | 11 | 2229878 | P/T Library Technician | SCC | 10/13/2024 | 23,528 | | 11-0000-612000-25430-2310 | 24,540 | |
| | 11 | 2083849 | Custodian | SCC | 5/27/2024 | - | Hired CL24-00933 Godinez, Ismael #26339936 Eff:8/12/24 He si not working GY. | 11-0000-653000-27200-2130 | - | |
| | 11 | 1810444 | P/T Custodian | SCC | 2/21/2024 | - | Hired CL24-00859 Reyes, Sergio#2670695 - Eff:8/12/24 | 11-0000-653000-27200-2310 | - | 1,200,031 |
| | 11 | 1030826 | Auxiliary Services Specialist | SCC | 12/10/2023 | - | Hired CL24-00826 Mark Bui#2792307 - Eff:6/26/24 | 11-0000-696000-24129-2130-9% 11- 0000-699000-24129-2130-91% 12- 11-2250-643000-29335-2130-91% 12- 2250-643000-29335-2130-9% | - | |
| 91%-fd 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9%-fd 12 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1055577 | High School & Community Outreach Specialist | SCC | 6/17/2024 | 82,873 | | | 128,737 | |
| | 11 | 2387469 | Gardener/Utility Worker | SCC | 5/28/2024 | - | Hired CL24-00985 Sanchez Nunez, Hugo #2815472 Eff:8/28/24 | 11-0000-655000-27300-2130 | - | |
| | 11 | 2333446 | Facilities Coordinator | SCC | 7/7/2024 | 82,923 | | 11-0000-683000-27105-2130 | 142,849 | |
| | 11 | 1062155 | P/T Admission & Records Specialist I | SCC | 10/21/2023 | 23,655 | | 11-0000-620000-29110-2310 | 32,230 | |
| | 11 | 1111601 | Career Guidance Coordinator | SCC | 8/9/2024 | 63,427 | | 11-0000-634000-29320-2130 | 100,934 | |
| | 11 | 2443392 | P/T Custodian | SCC | 2/21/2024 | - | Hired CL24-00859 Merino Gonzalez, Jaime#2596109 Eff:8/12/24 | 11-0000-653000-27200-2310 | - | |
| | 11 | 2599392 | P/T Gardener/Utility Worker | SCC | 6/26/2024 | 25,599 | | 11-0000-655000-27300-2310 | 34,879 | |
| | 11 | 1030467 | Lead Custodian | OEC | 10/22/2024 | 51,084 | | 11-0000-655000-28100-2130 | 84,799 | |
| | 11 | 1030029 | Admission Records Specialist III | SCC | 3/1/2020 | 64,745 | | 11-0000-620000-29100-2130 | 113,380 | |
| 90%-fd 11 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10%-fd 31 | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 1028519 | Senior Accountant | SCC | 5/12/2024 | - | Reorg1418 eliminated position | 11-0000-691000-24126-2130-90% 31- 0000-691000-24126-2130-10% | - | |
| | 11 | 1029218 | Custodian | OEC | 9/30/2024 | 50,515 | | 11-0000-653000-28100-2130 | 77,659 | |
| TOTAL | | | | | | 2,618,557 | | | 4,370,759 | 6,105,235 |

Rancho Santiago Community College
FD 11/13 Combined -- Unrestricted General Fund Cash Flow Summary
FY 2024-25, 2023-24, 2022-23
YTD Actuals- October 31, 2024

| | FY 2024/2025 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | July Actual | August Actual | September Actual | October Actual | November Actual | December Actual | January Actual | February Actual | March Actual | April Actual | May Actual | June Actual | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | \$108,927,679 | \$113,008,938 | \$100,939,620 | \$91,692,073 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | \$64,947,066 | Total |
| Total Revenues | 19,472,410 | 7,947,480 | 12,511,262 | (4,714,764) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,216,388 |
| Total Expenditures | 15,391,150 | 20,016,798 | 21,758,809 | 22,030,243 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79,197,000 |
| Change in Fund Balance | 4,081,260 | (12,069,319) | (9,247,547) | (26,745,007) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | (43,980,613) |
| Ending Fund Balance | 113,008,938 | 100,939,620 | 91,692,073 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | 64,947,066 | |
| | FY 2023/2024 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | July Actual | August Actual | September Actual | October Actual | November Actual | December Actual | January Actual | February Actual | March Actual | April Actual | May Actual | June Actual | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | \$69,995,934 | \$71,193,146 | \$61,145,109 | \$63,533,219 | \$60,187,237 | \$59,940,448 | \$71,637,035 | \$71,291,816 | \$63,539,135 | \$77,687,365 | \$84,911,330 | \$75,100,098 | \$75,100,098 | Total |
| Total Revenues | 14,999,379 | 7,247,510 | 21,581,168 | 16,416,147 | 22,719,457 | 32,139,652 | 19,316,041 | 12,651,332 | 35,037,316 | 26,748,556 | 12,047,791 | 64,494,321 | 64,494,321 | 285,398,670 |
| Total Expenditures | 13,802,167 | 17,295,547 | 19,193,058 | 19,762,128 | 22,966,246 | 20,443,065 | 19,661,260 | 20,404,013 | 20,889,085 | 19,524,592 | 21,859,023 | 30,666,740 | 30,666,740 | 246,466,925 |
| Change in Fund Balance | 1,197,212 | (10,048,037) | 2,388,110 | (3,345,982) | (246,789) | 11,696,586 | (345,219) | (7,752,681) | 14,148,231 | 7,223,964 | (9,811,231) | 33,827,581 | 33,827,581 | 38,931,745 |
| Ending Fund Balance | 71,193,146 | 61,145,109 | 63,533,219 | 60,187,237 | 59,940,448 | 71,637,035 | 71,291,816 | 63,539,135 | 77,687,365 | 84,911,330 | 75,100,098 | 108,927,679 | 108,927,679 | |
| | FY 2022/2023 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | July Actual | August Actual | September Actual | October Actual | November Actual | December Actual | January Actual | February Actual | March Actual | April Actual | May Actual | June Actual | | |
| Beginning Fund Balance | \$59,415,833 | \$61,784,640 | \$52,663,482 | \$47,112,071 | \$44,117,698 | \$38,009,050 | \$59,834,822 | \$52,186,865 | \$55,286,293 | \$56,436,784 | \$64,728,465 | \$58,986,931 | \$58,986,931 | Total |
| Total Revenues | 13,207,623 | 6,163,437 | 12,205,656 | 14,492,940 | 14,987,785 | 39,069,575 | 9,590,300 | 22,970,783 | 18,833,781 | 25,599,139 | 12,376,790 | 40,473,184 | 40,473,184 | 229,970,994 |
| Total Expenditures | 10,838,816 | 15,284,595 | 17,757,067 | 17,487,313 | 21,096,433 | 17,243,803 | 17,238,257 | 19,871,355 | 17,683,289 | 17,307,458 | 18,118,324 | 29,464,181 | 29,464,181 | 219,390,893 |
| Change in Fund Balance | 2,368,807 | (9,121,158) | (5,551,411) | (2,994,373) | (6,108,648) | 21,825,772 | (7,647,956) | 3,099,427 | 1,150,491 | 8,291,681 | (5,741,534) | 11,009,003 | 11,009,003 | 10,580,101 |
| Ending Fund Balance | 61,784,640 | 52,663,482 | 47,112,071 | 44,117,698 | 38,009,050 | 59,834,822 | 52,186,865 | 55,286,293 | 56,436,784 | 64,728,465 | 58,986,931 | 69,995,934 | 69,995,934 | |

Fiscal Resources Committee

Via Zoom Video Conference Call

1:31 p.m. – 2:27 p.m.

Meeting Minutes for October 16, 2024

FRC Members Present: Adam O’Connor, Claire Coyne, Sara Gonzalez, Kelvin Leeds (for Grant), Noemi Guzman, Bart Hoffman, Tara Kubicka-Miller, Veronica Munoz, Thao Nguyen (for Perez), Arleen Satele, Tommy Strong, Noah Villa, and Venuri Weeraratne

FRC Members Absent: Iris Ingram, Enrique Perez, and Chrissy Talarico

Alternates/Guests Present: Jennie Beltran, Jason Bui, Shawn Cumming, Alex Davis, Steven Deeley, Gina Huegli, Vaniethia Hubbard, Rasel Menendez, Annebelle Nery, Sarah Santoya, Kennethia Vega, and Barbie Yniguez

1. Welcome: Assistant Vice Chancellor O’Connor called the meeting to order at 1:31 p.m. via zoom upon achieving quorum and in the absence of Ingram. Everyone was welcomed.
2. State/District Budget Update
 - SSC – BOG to Consider 2025-26 System Request
 - SSC – Tepid Support for School Bond in Latest PPIC Poll
 - SSC – Government Shutdown Looming
 - SSC – Governor Acts on Critical Employee Bills
 - SSC – By the Way . . . Proposition 2 Sample Resolution Available
 - SSC – BOG Approves 2025-26 System Request
 - SSC – General Fund Revenues Exceed DOF Projections
 - SSC – CSBA Sues, Citing Proposition 98 Violation
 - SSC – Update on Governor Newsom’s Bill Actions
 - SSC – UCLA Economists- Economy Recovering from Long COVID
 - SSC – Governor Acts on Dual Enrollment Bills
 - SSC – Voters Will be Asked to Approve \$50 Billion in Local School Bonds
 - [DOF – Finance Bulletin-September 2024](#)

O’Connor briefly referenced above articles/updates for further understanding. He said State revenues are looking good at about 7.5% above the forecast. Additionally, there are two articles related to the system request for 2025-26 budget and another article regarding the Board of Governors accepting that request. Two major items of interest include the ask of COLA for all categorical programs however, it didn’t appear to ask for COLA for SCFF. O’Connor clarified with the Chancellor’s Office that they fully intend to ask for COLA for SCFF but thought that was a given. It is hopeful that growth support will become available at just about three quarters of a percent. More will be learned in January 2025 when the Governor releases his budget. Questions were asked and answers provided for clarification of the information received.

3. 2025-26 Draft Budget Calendar – ACTION
The draft budget calendar for 2025-26 was presented at the September 18 FRC meeting for review and sharing with campus constituencies. A motion made by Hoffman to approve the budget calendar for 2025-26 as presented was seconded by Coyne. By roll call vote the motion passed.
4. Salaries & Benefits - % of Total Expenditures (Instructional vs. Non-Instructional by Location)

O'Connor screenshared page 22 of the meeting materials to review salary and benefits as a percentage of total expenses in the district. In the past, 85% was considered high, but that has crept up in more recent years not just for RSCCD but most districts. Education is a "people business" with much of the budget spent on people. In 2022-2023, the district ended with 88.61% and then last year a tick above the 90% range. The 2024-25 budget is set slightly below 90% and it is hopeful the district doesn't trend above 94% when all is said and done for the fiscal year. Discussion ensued and questions asked with answers provided for clarification of the information received. O'Connor agreed to consider adding information to the report to demonstrate some of the reasons for the increase in costs such as additional hires, adding sections to capture FTES/growth, salary, and benefit increases, etc.

5. Economic Development Report – Postponed from September Meeting

O'Connor introduced Dr. Davis who screenshared and provided an extensive review of the Economic Development Report that is also posted on the FRC webpage for further review. She explained the report is version 1.0 and she will solicit feedback from colleagues at the colleges and district office to finalize the report.

This report focuses on how RSCCD and the colleges align career education programs with the local labor market and demand, fostering partnerships with industry leaders to promote equity and access for our students. This is accomplished through a healthy, robust list of partners such as Boeing, Northrop Grumman, and St. Joseph's Hospital which contribute to student training and employment opportunities.

An economic impact study using 2021 data revealed that RSCCD contributed over \$2 billion to the local economy in Orange County which is synonymous to creating and supporting over 20,000 jobs, which is a significant impact. Dr. Davis discussed the 2022-23 District Program Degree, Certificate, Completer, and Transfer Student Outcomes by Sector (page 5 of report) stating almost 1200 degrees were awarded with 3,337 certificates and a combined total of 4,536 awards granted to our students. This includes 3,767 completers and 668 transfers.

Dr. Davis continued with the review and focused on labor market alignment, employer and industry partnerships, regional collaborations and initiatives, and the funding leveraged through the regional collaboratives with 60% retained by RSCCD while 40% is distributed throughout the region through a competitive process. This partnership extends to Orange County Department of Education and K-12 feeder schools in the region as well. She also discussed a future economic impact study.

Sarah Santoya discussed intentional collaborative opportunities by SBDC with a focus on AI and digital marketing which then leads the younger students to programs through SAC and SCC.

Dr. Davis concluded her report by noting the report will be circulated to allow colleagues the opportunity to provide feedback. Questions were asked and answers provided for clarification of the information received. Dr. Davis agreed to provide the detailed economic impact to expand the elements that comprise the analysis and finer details.

6. FRC 2023/24 Goals – ACTION

O'Connor screenshared and reviewed the FRC accomplishments for 2023-24 and the goals for 2024-2025. O'Connor screenshared page 32 of Planning Design Manual in reference to constituent groups and Kubicka-Miller initiated discussion on the responsibilities of representatives to their constituents (who are they) to provide feedback and engagement. Nery indicated SAC plans to add appendix to shared governance handbook to include opportunities for constituents on district governance committees to report at college council. The discussion evolved into the potential imbalance of representatives getting information to constituents, whereby O'Connor noted that as a charge of POE as it relates to the Planning Design Manual, not FRC. A motion by Kubicka-Miller to approve the 2024-2025 goals as presented was seconded by Hoffman. By roll call vote the motion passed.

Hoffman made an inquiry about adding goals to the calendar to which O'Connor clarified the calendar is for budget development. O'Connor suggested Ingram, Kubicka-Miller and he could discuss the matter further to add items to the FRC Planning Calendar on the webpage.

7. Standing Report from District Council – (Kubicka-Miller)
Kubicka-Miller briefly reported on the activities of District Council meeting of October 7, 2024, and shared that approval of AR 2510 Participation on Local Decision Making was split into three ARs (faculty, classified employees, and students). The AR for faculty and students passed while the AR for classified employees was tabled for further clarification. There were several reorganizations approved: one in Fiscal Services, two in District Safety and Security, and seven in Educational Services. Reorganization 1431, from Resource Development, was split into two reorganizations and one will be brought back to a future meeting.
8. Informational Handouts
 - District-wide expenditure report link: <https://intranet.rscsd.edu>
 - Vacant Funded Position List as of October 10, 2024
 - Monthly Cash Flow Summary as of September 30, 2024
 - [SAC Planning and Budget Committee Agendas and Minutes](#)
 - [SCC Budget Committee Agendas and Minutes](#)

General informational handouts, links, and webpages above were referenced for further review.

9. Approval of FRC Minutes – September 18, 2024
A motion by Satele to approve the minutes of the September 18, 2024, meeting as presented was seconded by Kubicka-Miller. By roll call vote the motion passed.
10. Other
There were no further comments, questions, or discussion.

Next FRC Committee Meeting:

The next FRC meeting is November 20, 2024, at 1:30-3:00 p.m. This meeting adjourned at 2:27 p.m. with a motion by Hoffman that was seconded by Coyne.