

Riverside Community College District
District Strategic Planning Council
Friday, March 13, 2015 - 2:00-3:00
Bradshaw Bldg., Heritage Room, Riverside City College
MINUTES

Committee Webpage: <http://www.rccd.edu/administration/educationalservices/ieffectiveness/Pages/StrategicPlanning.aspx>
Meeting called to order by chair at 2:04

Chair: Michael Reiner

Present: Ruth Adams, Melissa Bader, Aaron Brown, Amy Cardullo, Travis Gibbs, Norm Godin (for Robin Steinback), Beth Gomez (for Paul Parnell), Rick Herman, Richard Keeler, Ruth Leal, Sandra Mayo, Eric Muehlebach, Lee Nelson, Michael Reiner, Leslie Salas, John Tillquist, David Torres

Absent: Tom Allen, Ree Amezcuita, Martha Arellano, Michael Burke, Ed Bush, Peggy Campo, Chris Carlson, Diane Dieckmeyer, Wolde-Ab Isaac, Susan Mills, Paul Parnell, Robin Steinback, Sylvia Thomas

Guest: Henry Bravo

- **Committee Business**

a. Minutes - Approval of minutes for February 20, 2015 /MSC/Adams/Tillquist/2 abstentions

- **Chancellor's Report** – M. Burke—absent

- **Information Items** – M. Reiner

- District Strategic Plan 2017—The current RCCD plan is for 2013-2016. We will begin developing a new plan next year for 2017 and beyond.

4. Presentations – N/A

5. **Items for Action**

Discussion: Reiner asked for Rick Herman's presentation (5.b.) to be removed from the Action Items and moved to the Task Force Report section. Discussion ensued regarding whether or not the Chair has the authority to revise the agenda at the meeting. This is not a Brown Act Committee.

a. **Proposed membership and charge for the subcommittee to review, revise, and potentially reformat DSPC structure and function – M. Reiner**

- A proposal was distributed for the need, charge, and composition of the subcommittee. A concern was raised that the presidents are not members. Reiner discussed the purpose of the subcommittee (i.e., it's a working group that will bring ideas to the DSPC for consideration) and that the VPAs suggested their college presidents need not be involved at this level of detail. The intention was to keep the group relatively small, but ensure that DSPC constituents were represented.
- A question was raised as to why there was no fiscal representative from colleges. Gibbs emphasized that the subcommittee representatives need to communicate with their constituents. Mayo asked if the VPA representative would represent all of the VPAs and his/her specific college. Reiner responded in the affirmative, noting that the structure of the subcommittee is a type of matrix organization.
- A question was asked if this subcommittee was implementing Chancellor Burke's ideas presented in February to DSPC. Reiner responded that was not the intent of the subcommittee. They will look at various models, including the Chancellor's. Options will be discussed and subcommittee members will be asked to act in the best interest of this District body, not advocate for their individual constituents.

- The proposal (see attached) was accepted with the following revisions: (1) 2b. Delete the word “recommendations” and add “bring forward options for revision and reformat of the DSPC’s structure and function”; (2) 2c. Change the year from 2013 to 2015; (3) Add to item #3 under District Composition “CSEA Representative”. Dr. Reiner to send out an email to have eight subcommittee members selected.

Motion: to accept the subcommittee proposal with revisions as noted above.

MSC/Muehlebach/Brown/Unanimous

b. Decentralization of Microcomputer Support—R. Herman

Reiner asked Herman if he wished to pull this action item and move it to Task Force Reports. Herman did not want to pull it so that the committee could take action if needed.

- Herman reviewed the history of decentralization. At the last meeting, 9 were in favor of the recommendation and 3 opposed (all from Riverside). Riverside had made an alternative proposal citing the following reasons: (1) Insufficient time to move forward; (2) allocation of personnel had not been considered; (3) further discussion including the inventory of computers needed to be evaluated by VPs of Business; and (4) the transition plan for July 1st.
- Henry Bravo addressed the DSPC as a guest from RCC and discussed his concerns which included not being aware of relocating individuals to another location, the problem of managing staff distributed throughout campuses, and concern about a deadline of July 1st for implementation without all the details. Bravo also stated that decentralization would have many benefits such as enhancing services and elevating skill sets. It was necessary, though, to know expectations and communicate to administrators. What would the proposed new structure provide to District and to what level?
- Further discussion about logistics, responsibilities, staffing and District/College functions ensued, including what will happen when the District moves downtown.
- Discussion took place on implications of the structural change for budget. Historically, when changes are made budget usually follows personnel. It was felt that this was a flaw in RCC’s alternative proposal as they wanted to retain the traditional BAM split of 54, 23, and 23. However, we can’t split people, so this proposal was not considered valid.
- District contracts for Western Data and computer software licensing will be retained. However, overtime salaries and the 4000s and 5000s will move based on the same personnel split. RCC proposal had nothing allocated to district under the assumption that RCC would service District and Help Desk would become a Riverside position.
- The emerging consensus was that decentralization was fine if it doesn’t create chaos. This sounded like a great idea in terms of potential benefits, but execution may need more planning. Are we in a hurry? If we wait for all details to be worked out, nothing will ever be executed.
- Herman agreed that July 1st is a reasonable timeline for reorganization. Reiner acknowledged the importance of the Academic Senate in this decision and noted that it is the intention of the motion to examine DSPC structure and process.
- There was not a consensus among the colleges to move forward with this recommendation in ITSC, but there was a majority in favor of moving forward as the vote was 2 to 1. (The three RCC reps were not in agreement to move forward).

Motion - to approve the ITSC proposal as submitted and forward as a recommendation to the Chancellor/**MSC/Mayo/Bader (vote: 14 ayes / 0 nays / 2 abstentions)**

Motion Passed

● OPEB Obligation—A. Brown

This is a funding plan in response to the ACCJC recommendation related to the post-employment benefit obligation. It has been vetted through the colleges’ shared governance processes, District Budget Advisory

Council (DBAC) and is presented as a recommendation to DSPC. The plan consists of the following:

- (1) Effective July 1, 2015, establish an irrevocable trust to pay current retiree health costs and to accumulate funds for future costs to offset the OPEB liability;
- (2) Develop a rate to apply to every dollar of payroll, in all Resources that have payroll, to cover the annual current cost (“pay-as-you -go”) plus a minimum of \$250,000 annually to begin providing for future retiree health costs, including application of the rate to grant and categorical programs in accordance with the OMB Circular A-21 and the State Chancellor’s Accounting Advisory-GASB 45 Accounting for Other Post-Employment Benefits;
- (3) Investment earnings over time will contribute to the reduction of the outstanding OPEB liability, so the total amount of funds set-aside by the District and accumulated to pay for future retirees’ health costs will be limited to a maximum of 50% of the outstanding OPEB liability;
- (4) At least annually, transfer all funds provided by the retiree health care rate to the irrevocable trust; a
- (5) Pay all retiree healthcare costs out of the irrevocable trust. (Note Definition - GASB 45: Governmental Accounting Standard Board Statement No. 45 - Accounting and Financial Reporting by Employers for Post- Employment Benefits Other than pensions).

Motion: to approve DBAC’s funding plan with the GASB 45 definition/**MSC/Bader/Mayo/Unanimous**

6. Subcommittee/Task Force Reports - No reports

- a. District Budget Advisory Council – A. Brown
 - i. District Enrollment Management Committee – M. Reiner
 - ii. Information Technology Strategy Council – R. Herman

7. President and Vice Chancellor Reports - No reports

- a. Moreno Valley College, S. Mayo
- b. Norco College, P. Parnell
- c. Riverside City College, W. Isaac
- d. Educational Services, M. Reiner
 - e. Business and Financial Services, A. Brown
 - f. Diversity and Human Resources, S. Thomas
 - g. Facilities Planning – C. Carlson

Adjourn 3:15/MSB/Mayo/ Bader

Next meeting – April 10, 2015, 2:00 – 3:30 pm, Bradshaw Bldg., Heritage Room, RCC