Minnesota State Meet and Confer

May 5, 2023

Attendance:

**SO**: Andriel Dees, Jackie Bailey, Satasha Green-Stephen, Bill Maki, Chris Dale, Jaime Simonson, Mary Nadeau, Paul McIntyre, Devinder Malholtra, Melissa Fahning, Satasha Green-Stephen, Tarnjeet Kang, Tearrance Robertson, Jacquelyn Bailey, Devinder Malhotra, Priyank Shah, Shannon Bryant

**MAPE**: Nicole Emerson, Barb Gosch, Heidi Vidor, Aaron Pierson, Garrett Steward, Kay Pedretti, Marcia B

1. **Introduction** – Shannon Bryant, Executive Director for Workforce and Economic Development

ShannonCreated a new unit, Shannon comes with great leadership experience and works around building partnerships, higher ed and businesses, and fostering stewardship for the workforce.

Comes from Fort Worth Texas. Comes from one of the top community colleges in the nation. Customized contract training, liaison for college around workforce and econ development, bringing new programs to the area. Let small business development (SBDC) for the company

1. **Equity 2030 Update Minnesota**
	1. VC Dees. Update that is understanding the data and direction with equity scorecard. Walk through the newest key performance indicators. The equity strategy, and get as much input and feedback around the work. Tarrance-- Scorecard the look around key performance indicator 5. Since it’s broader, the dashboard is really what is driving us to think about equity as a whole performance. We have 6 KPIs, and KPI 5 is a discussion today. A scorecard is a tool that encourages us to look at equity from an intersectional lens but diversity and employee retention. Also inquiry into what could be impeding the impact. 1 page handout-- 2nd page is draft. The overall aim for this KPI is to help us all ensure that we have the minimum requirements that is necessary to advance E&I. As we provide the draft elements of KPI 5, we’ll share the progress markers.
	2. Considerations- context of 2-year and 4-year institutions. We realize this won’t happen overnight and are taking a phased approach.. Today is not fixed, we know it has to evolve. Making sure it provides the information they need. Dr. Kang- a brief overview of KPI 5. Focus- strategy, structure, and actions. By engaging, establish a baseline for each institution and then identify gaps and identify areas for growth. Help with resource allocations and hope that it’ll help establish accredit support. This is not intended to measure impact and not meant to duplicate affirmative action plans. Page 2 of hand out-- tentative elements. 2nd doc is a draft marker to see if you are making progress towards having in place. Wanted to provide a sample of progress marker. As we work through this, we continue to engage stakeholders, leadership council, BOT, get the core elements in place, and have to have those key elements lined up in the summer. And allow time for campuses to get these in place. Continue to engage Equity scorecard, this will be restructured… working group stand back up around August. Drive to what does it mean to capture progress. We welcome feedback. Please let us know and welcome the opportunity.
	3. Q how much work is being built into the process so students can have input. Right now they are working with Student or Student Organization. This will be utilized by campuses. We are speaking to the students that are living… Lake Superior College. What is the way students who are dealing with campus stuff, how to communicate if things like this are happening. Can they submit responses? LeadMN isn’t going to know about incidents that are happening on campuses. How can we make sure the stuff that’s happening is coming forward?
	4. Devinder-- this is just some benchmarks for which we can judge. When biased incidents occur, how does this rise up? Andriel and her division have taken an active role, there are bias incidents on all campuses, and when this happens it’s reported up so that we are aware. This creates a response at the campus level as well as patterns emerge, then SO can respond to that as well.
	5. Q- where is the accountability? These little things keep happening that are opposite of equity 2030. What do students do, especially when the president makes that decision? Making sure that we are understanding.
	6. Andreial- there are a few structures that have been effective. The student associates and campus diversity officers see themselves as doing the right thing on their campuses. They meet collectively monthly. She sees them as strong advocates. THey know they are there to be a bridge across the campus and understand the different approaches they will have to deal with. There are greater opportunities to have more advocacy but a broader perspective it’s about education. We should always be thinking about enhancing this, because we always don’t have the right answer for everything. We need to be able to enhance the student voice.
	7. Example from Nicole - in her role, she has been reminded that I’m a college employee first.
	8. Devinder- thanks for sharing. We all struggle with the question that we asked. Who’s agency do I have? (Which side do you speak for?) Often the two are overlapped and sometimes they are distinct. This discussion is also happening in academic and student affairs as well. How do we incorporate the student voice in our operations and …. ?? Is it enough to just talk to student leaders? How else can we listen to the student voices? Many are not in tune within their own student organizations, and those voices are left out. How can we be inclusive? How do we emerge student voice? One thing emerging is the climate assessment survey - there is an employee component and student feedback.
2. Campus Climate Surveys
	1. Some out there this Spring. We are very involved with our members and meet with them over the internet. We know there are issues and have issues at several campuses. How can we find out what’s going on? How can we find out if you are seeing the same thing as we do from our members.. Once we are both seeing the same thing, what is being done about it? We could give a laundry list of issues happening. What are we doing about it? HOw are we moving forward? How do we make it better for students and employees?
	2. Priyank Shah -- (OEI brief overview) brought forward the framework to give them a more overall idea around equity 2030, how people are experiencing the climate. Student experience. That’s the big WHAT. We have been at 17 schools for the first year for campus climate work. Across those schools there is a mix of what they worked on. Every institution will take climate over the next 3 years for students and employees. Of the 17 schools, 10 focused on students and employees. 5 were CC and focused on Employees. 2 focused on employees (GET SPECIFIC LIST). This was bigger than we expected. We aimed to have a more even distribution. Those schools just finished and closed those collection efforts. We need response rates to go up. Looking to the 2nd cohort, we need to firm up with those lists with the presidents, etc and things shift. We have 14 schools slated for next year. Results will be coming back to campuses. We facilitate setting up contracts to address the needs as a system. Campuses will start to get their results back soon…. Campuses work directly with the vendor and the vendor sends back the response….they didn’t want people knowing who they were, and they created aggregate data anonymously. That will be used to populate KPI 6. We did not ask questions about what is your bargaining unit, and that was intentional. What happens next? When results come back to the campus, they have to be shared across their stakeholder group including meet and confer. Engage results and identify areas to address issues and do better. It’s going to take some time. We are trying to be mindful of time. SO wants to help with this work as well. We do want to help support the campuses in this work. Many sides, HR, E&I, we can bring those campuses together, whether an all-call, regional meetings, but engage them in what you are learning from each other, and want to build activation plans. What are you going to do with these results?
	3. Results come back from school…. School comparing needs for itself, if for example school x finds that 60% are saying favorable about dining hall. That’s not a good number. Break it out in color or not color…. It raises a challenge. Our question to the campus is what does it look like to improve this? How do we collect information in response to the scorecards? What are they doing in response? That’s our work ahead. What will they do to respond to their pain points? What does it mean to follow up?
	4. Devinder--- the chancellor calls the president. Assessment as to where the campus itself is, campus climate is an important conversation. Up to this point it was their own pace for how they did the surveys’. Accountability comes in shining the light.
	5. Clarify how much of the results will be shared? Campuses have done this before, on their own. They’ve chosen to only share certain results. Are we shying that all results will be shared? Clarification. Yes and no. In the best interest of transparency, we want results to be shared so we can look at trends. That's what we want and advocate for. We have not been explicit about what we are going to be sharing. The vendors provide different things. Which vendor did the campus choose to go with? Make sure we communicate to our campuses, share as much as you can. No point in hiding any information. Over time it will evolve. We’ve created an expectation and if we see the cata is being truncated…then we have a problem that we need to resolve. System perspective, as much as we can share within the legal data privacy, we should share. It’s in everyone’s interest to know what the campus climate is, and work to get to a better place.
3. Legislative Update
	1. Nothing going on right now. Holding pattern right now. Met on wed this week, they walked through the bills, took testimony and adopted sames and similars. Got fairly far, but not in our area. They got $56mil. A lot of advocacy into the state grant program. Big pieces, funding for us, and funding for U Of M, and senate side, they have a lot of money, $177 for free college proposal. $50mil goes into the tails. Those are the fundamental differences. Lots of conversations happening behind closed doors. Next, what we’ll see in the upcoming weeks is the conference committee, wrapping up bills so they can get passed and get over to the Governor. It’s a lot about the process to get through the process. On a committee, onto the ways and means committee, back to the floor, etc. it takes time. Bonding bill--- lot of work, didn’t pass last year, house passed it, and the Senate did not. Bill was tabled. All cash bill or general obligation bill? The Senate is waiting to find out what’s going on with tax bill. $3mil price tag difference, and is in negotiations. Big pieces left to wrap up.
4. Budget Update
	1. Bill Maki, last updated campus budgets at the board last month. Focusing on the metric of the budgetary gap that institutions have, with revenues and expenses. As we look at that we present to the house, and have a $70 mill gap. Most of institution 15 have less than 5% of structural gap some that are 10-15% gaps. Some are making significant reductions in budgets. Bemidji, St Cloud State, many reductions, campuses are updating budgets, go in May for first reading. Macro level update.
5. Enrollment Update/BESI’s/Layoffs
	1. Bemidji, and St. Cloud has had 4 sign language interpreters laid off, and several MAPE positions not being filled. How is this going to affect the students? What is the response there? How do we approach what’s happening on the campuses? Any more information on BESI’s or anything?
	2. Not aware of any. There are concerns for next FY, depending on enrollment, if that starts to stabilize. That’s the main driver of the situation. We have financial health indicators that we monitor, we have conversations with campuses, to get an understanding of the budget, and when there is one time funding, we raise the flag, the HREF money for example. In the end if the structure is out of balance, some decisions are made all at once. Not aware of any institutions offering BESIs’ Process…has been changed. If they are going to offer BESI’s they have to have the chancellor and Eric Davis and they will have a voice in them going forward. They hadn’t always been consulted. HR or Labor Relations are not always informing MAPE. We are told they are proposals, but layoffs are being sent. They are getting flyers in the mail, but yet not being told what’s going on .
	3. They‘ll have to focus on their own local metrics, and then they get on a watch list. St Cloud there is a lot lost in the communication piece, there were a couple of things, and the proposal has identified the areas, then other folks take what does that do to my job? With this stage, Devinder was to reach out to people and tell them what the implication of that proposal was. We can chat, no formal notices have gone, but the understanding was that there were some implications of the proposal. To reach out and let the people know what the implications were for the different areas. Provide feedback to them, and take them on their work, provide input, and tell them about the proposal.
	4. Chris Dale--- generally speaking when it comes to faculty we have a process that requires us to go talk. We don’t talk about who, we talk about numbers and program areas, and criteria, and kind of dollar numbers we are hoping to save. SO is involved in those budgetary questions. They don’t know how many will respond to BESI - it’s hard to talk about because we don't have all of the financial information.
6. Performance Review
	1. Check in on how the system is facilitating performance reviews at the campus. We’ve requested data, and we have a statute that requires annual reviews to be done, and year after year we see that they’re not doing. How is SO facilitating that they are being done. Is it a real performance review or were the boxes just checked?
	2. Chris Dale - told us that he would talk to the HR community to remind them. He did all those things and was reminded more than once. That said, they don’t live in fear of Chris’ reminders. We have in HR a limited capacity in what they can do.
	3. Eric is going to be meeting and is going to be bringing it up.

NICOLE---- can we add here--- that----if the SO doesn’t have teeth, then WHO DOES!?!?!?!?!!? The campuses point finger at SO. and vice versa.

Davinder – There will always be a structural challenge between SO and campuses.

1. Workday Follow-Up How can we engage with our employees who are not directly in charge of WD, the morale has been down, etc… Thank you Dr Bailey for joining us at our ITS 4 meeting earlier this week and sharing your appreciation of our work.. Thank you very much and please continue. How do we get this out to the campus’ employees? Let’s work on the campuses. Dr Bailey believes they can share this down to the campuses. Will continue to be our advocate.
2. Job Appointments - The more it happens the less buy-in you have of employees. Davinder – bypassing the process should not happen. There were 2 president positions that did not have a search process, however, it was determined by the campuses that they did not want to have a search performed because they were pleased with the interim president's performance.
3. Hiring of Administrators - The more it happens the less buy-in you have of employees concern of the hiring of more administrators instead of the positions that are actually working among the students. The more it happens the less buy-in you have of employees.

**Next Meet and Confer:**