Minnesota State Meet and Confer

September 29, 2023

Attendance:

**SO**: Andriel Dees, Chris Dale, Jaime Simonson, Melissa Fahning,Scott Olson, Daniel McCabe, Ann Maile, Eric Davis

**MAPE**: Nicole Emerson, Barb Gosch, Garrett Stewart, Amanda Prince, Ben Nwachukwu

1. **Chancellor Introductions - MN State**
   1. What Scott thinks: the main things we are working on together. All are heavy lifts, 2 are on agenda, top of list is Equity 2030, big board agreement. Bargaining units, presidents, board, student leaders, we all agree it’s the most important thing we’ll ever do and it’s really heard. Student affairs, and on campuses, have a heavy lift regarding this. Externally facing, this is the most important work we’ve ever done in our life. Currently not making the progress that we’d like to make, but it'll be hard. MAPE knows more about NextGen, this is a huge project. IT Still needs to keep going…this is the change part, and getting NextGen done. There may be some places where testing is going as expected and some places where testing isn’t going at all. MAPE people on the front line know the most about the holes.

We also know we have to bolster enrollment and bolster transfers from college to college and university to university and keep higher ed affordable. Students need to see pathways forward. “All roads lead to MAPE”

It is a blessing to hear what’s going on from MAPE. Scott will continue to return to and is so grateful that MAPE is on the front line.

1. **Next Gen update - both**
   1. Nicole spoke at the Board retreat about this. Nicole reported precisely and accurately and trustees were interested in learning more. Barb reports out for SO perspective- Workday Wedenesdays seem to be predominantly HR and Finance issues- attending may not be universally useful- it would be helpful to understand how the different departments and employees are interacting for employees that are outside of HR and Finance- would additional certifications and education be helpful for new roles that may be developed moving forward- don’t feel that there is enough information- cross training and eliminating silos would be helpful- overall organizational concept would also be helpful- MAPE members are eager to understand the plan and to be given the opportunity to prepare for next steps- we hear that there is so much work and we want to be able be a part of it- feels like staff may leave if not included- the institutional knowledge may be lost- retention is reliant on keeping staff informed-
   2. Rhett report out- campus side of the experience- facilities data- timelines could be realistic if we fully understand what the tasks are- seems to be a break from the top down- recommendation to utilize OMB numbers to estimate time required to complete tasks

Breakdown from top down, workgroup and teams, and blocked b/c we don’t know what’s coming, and then rush to get what’s coming. Don't’ have time to do great work, because we’re rushing. It turns into get it done and check it off, instead of making sure we are getting the correct data that we need. We are yearning for this information, we want to know what’s going on. Silos work to an extent, people are excited to do the work, and can help and have information we have people who want to do, and need have proper timing and know what we need to do. The calculation of work isn’t being done, other people have other work to do. Need a certain timeframe or proper estimate to do the work. Do you have the time to do it? If not, what recourses do you need?

Scott- wonder if Deloitt knows how long it takes to do certain tasks? Would one of the group know how long it takes tasks to do? The flow of communication might not be timely.

1. **Equity 2930 - MN State**
   1. Andreiel Dees - equity scorecard. We had a webinar yesterday on the equity scorecard on the issue of access. We’ve been working to move towards all access and not asking for the access. Excited about that expansion for anyone and everyone to see the scorecard for all campuses. Hope is that what this will do will provide a good spark to engage in further conversation in addressing the gaps. This is particular for KPI1. Toolkits that have been updated to support that work and looking forward to engage and build a repository of promising practices. Some work is going well at some campuses, and other campuses don’t know about it. Trying to get practices together in one place and Nationally as well. We are working on that this year.

Accountability measures, what’s the roadmap? Plan is to get that out this year, taking in also a lot of input from campuses and system to find out if this is where we want to go.

Q: Is everything fully developed? A.D. Equity strategies and structure presented last spring to get feedback, does this sit well? Need to get feedback. YES that list is good, now we have 13 instead of 12. The list could get tweaked, but that is our starting point.

Q: The biggest reason to come up with the scorecard is to get an accountability, how does that play out? A: we look at the scorecard and roadmap, it’s a convergence of a few pieces. 1. Data . interest in doing some predictive indicators. Snapshot gives us an opportunity to build. We are working through what that looks like . We also want to make sure we’re paying attention to the substances, and the things that are driving. They should be married together which drives the roadmap.

This is our biggest frustration with MAPE members, that it’s a checkbox, nothing changes, and you’re going to hear the same message when we talk about campus climate. We are hungry for accountability.

Adriel: building the vertical and horizontal lines, here is where are all going… there are some things we can take into account which is why the scorecard is there in the first place.

1. **Budget/Deficit/BESI’s/Enrollment - MAPE**
   1. Chancellor Olson- getting ready to release the 30-day. The biggest effect of enrollment doesn’t happen until later September.
   2. System overall - we are up 1.4% this Fall. Some campuses have seen a substantial jump in new enrolled students. It would take more than one year of a bumper crop to make up for the smaller enrollments . Many campuses had very strong enrollment. University sector is down a little. College sector up 3.1%. Overall up 1.4%. Maybe b/c of tuition freeze and Northstar promise. Enrollment will continue to be challenged. We need to be innovative.

Campuses decide to offer BESI but need permission from SO to offer. Generally speaking , keep in mind it’s a budget management tool, attempt to avoid layoffs. They might first offer a BESI. the way they offer it can vary from campus to campus. Generally speaking it’s a money saving tool, 1 of 3 situations.

1. Not replace the retirement. That could happen for MAPE members. The work that MAPE does is so integral to keeping things running.
2. When a retirement would give substantial over the prior incumbent. E.g. Senior IFO faculty could make $120k. New prof replace in most field makes maybe $55k. Not true of most MAPE members.
3. Some restructuring that needs to go on. Might not be money exercise, might involve MAPE members.

We are still looking at budget issues…looking at ways to cut costs. Common story. Especially with how the legislator did fund us. Big bucket now, but nothing next year, how do we balance that? This is a consistent agenda item for us. Are they looking at layoffs and BESI’s? In regards to the supplemental budget request, a prelim # was offered but someone suggested that we need to ask for more. We’re looking at more than MAPE being affected.

Chancellor- BESI. do we know? Can we report on any campuses that are offering BESI’s? Chris said BESI”s offered from 2 universities. They don’t necessarily mean they’ll go ahead with it. They’re likely to. St. Cloud did them for a few years in a row. St. Cloud, Bemidji, Southeast, BEsi’s were offered this year but were very targeted but was pretty small. They don’t always work. We often don’t hear about classified staff positions, b/c colleges and universities already know how to offer them, we’ll work through with them. We do tend to hear if there are faculty layoffs, rarer occurrence, and timelines are longer. There were faculty layoffs at st. cloud and Bemidji. Less complicated and more common.

MAPE:

1. **FY25 Supplemental Budget Request - MN State**
   1. Scott- budget deficit, yes one time money for FY24 helping a lot of campuses getting through this current FY. This is helping them from this cliff, and many are looking at significant budget deficits in FY 25, barring other possible opportunities. There may be more conversations as the year unfolds. We would like the one time money to be forever money.
   2. Melissa; supplemental budget. Bonding. This is the time of year, we were putting together biannual budget, listening sessions. Supplemental budget is a smaller part of that. There is this give and take. We’ve gotten more money than we’ve ever gotten, much of it is one time in nature. Conversations are happening, campus stabilization piece. We look at student support and workforce development, b/c we did get funding in those areas we want to show how that money was suspended and how our students benefited. $45mil gap in campus stabilization, and we got one time, in the future, we won’t get that. How can we get that as base funding. Other part is $61mil for stabilization funding. When we re-configure what our needs are, we know a lot of what’s happened at the bargaining table, there is an additional need. The focus is campus budgets, and decisions they have to make, and how can we get more funding to help them? Would love to hear more about this.
   3. Received a record investment from the legislature- primary discussion point is about campus stabilization- $61 million for campus stabilization- we are always willing to assist- we understand that the request for all of the money that we need can be difficult- legislators don’t want to tie the hands of the following legislature- the employer would like to hear our thoughts- this is a bonding year- ER efforts will be split- largest request ever made- $541 million request- campus need to be maintained- asset maintenance- legislators are out doing campus visits- there appears to be interest from legislators- we are telling them that they need to fund this- HEAPR is not as glamorous and therefore may be the first to be cut- the priority list is in line with how the SO lobbies the legislators- lawmakers generally follow the list and rarely adjust the list but it happens at time- SO tells the campus to sell the product to the local lawmakers so that they advocate for it in the legislators- there are a lot of campus visits happening now

$1.24b behind in HEAPR. Strategically, we love to see renovations, but new buildings and new designs, it’s hard to see. Shouldn’t we put our focus and effort on that? That’s a great observation. Those conversations have been happening. What should this look like? Melissa can’t answer. It's not something that hasn’t happened and . Also, what sells? What do they fund? What’s the magic number? Lots of different variables. We aren’t wrong. Scott- politicians like ribbon cutting and push the monetary aspect of these as well. Almost hypocritical.

Rhett- is there any data or consideration with other projects? St. Paul College- some deferred maintenance. Could other campuses benefit from this? Scott- yes, some campuses use institutional $ to use.

* 1. **Legislative Update - MAPE**

Policy discussions- House Higher Ed committee hearings- have asked campuses to track the spending so that the SO can report that out in committee meetings

1. **Campus Climate Surveys - MAPE**
   1. We haven’t gotten much information back from Priyank from our request. We understand the SO sets it and campuses selects the vendor who administers it. The date in which it’s due. At some point they share information with the SO. We look at the ones with issues, then from there, what happens?
   2. Andriel- the idea is to make sure we have points of connections. We acknowledge there has been good work, all of schools have had some survey, wither engagement or campus climate, or safety. Idea around it is that we have some points of contact, what are big picture things, that we can report back to the board. Also a feeder, will be built out on equity scorecard, issues around belonging, and safety and how that builds out. Still working through what the process will look like, we haven’t done the full ask. Once we know that we can go out with the formal ask. Might be largely housed between the center and the institutional research , and might not be their place where we house it.

Nicole- fill in. we’ve had these discussions for a while. Accountability measures are put into place for a president or leader if a campus climate shows that it’s not a great climate to work in, whatever issues are there, and issues exposed. We find from MAPE it goes nowhere nothing changes. There is a survey. People do it. There is a report on it, and then nothing. We are like reiterating our previous worries, that we’ve brought up in the past of what happens if a campus shows an issue in climate in whatever way. What happens from there.

Scott- has not been through that part of the cycle in this job. The survey raises questions, something is going on, why is it? Is it senior leadership? Is it the bargaining units or budget or covid, or ? first thing is indicate campus looks different than others. Lead to conversations with campus leadership and ask why it’s coming out this way/ might be the president, what if it’s not? It would be part of a series of things that are connected that interrelated. It might show more of a border analysis, …also are a part of how presidents are evaluated. Not sure what its’ going to look like. He hasn’t gotten results of campus climate surveys yet. Can answer it better yet. Looking for anomalies.

This is usually a standing item. Next Gen , yes there is a lot of conversations happening high level w presidents and their cabinet and that’s where information drops. That doesn’t get to our MAPE members. There is a gap from flow of communication from down up, there is a safety concern, and we want to make sure that’s being understood and looking to the accountability piece how can we make sure it’s being used to inform future decisions.

1. How to evaluate president
2. How is it being shared at the campus level

Here comes Chris Dale and he challenges Nicole about our perspective and that there is a lack of trust in the process- we are requesting that the survey reports be shared with MAPE

1. **Performance Reviews - MAPE**
   1. Just a reminder that they need to be done annually- we have brought this before this team before- it is a legislative and contractual mandate- Chirs has assured us that he has reached out to HR on campus- it continues to be an issue- Eric talked about Kay’s story about another person’s eval in her mailbox- Marcia took three years to get an eval- we doin tele town halls with our membership that has 200 plus attendees- we do surveys with our membership- Chris says that we continue to address it with campus HR-m SO has no obligation to do performance evals- is he asking us to go to the campus specific? - SO doesn’t do evals either- Barb hasn’t had an eval for four years- this is an issue every- who do we hold accountable?- can’t just run a report as it includes people who are on leaves- we have to come up with a way to address this- Eric commits to have a look at this
2. **Position Classification Process - MAPE**
   1. Brought forward these issues with Eric. S Eric discuss-- Eric sent the matrix, there is a statutory authority for unclassified. Administrators, faculty there are the unclassified. They have a matrix they reference and they describes this kind of work, and characteristics of these jobs. We’ve gone back that MAPE requested their use of academic professionals, and our use of academic professionals as a ration hasn't’ changed over that time, slight increase increase of unclassifieds. The data doesn’t alarm Eric. MAPE has had testimonials that it’s their aim to not use and fill jobs as unclassified. Would not corporate that role and campuses can not independently do this on their own. They have to use the SO. Memo from 1995. IT makes up most of our members. Data would be different. We’ve asked directly for a decision making matrix, how does this decided and what is needed and we don’t get it. We get the memo. That’s more than we’ve gotten in the 10 years then we’ve been on the team. Chris said we’ve sent it before, Nicole said she respectfully disagrees. Hopefully we find it helpful. Let me know if you have questions. Contest the idea if there is a position with classification title, that is obligated to use classified or not, he is not. But for spitballing if MAPE . there should be some justification if there are some jobs that are unclassified. Sometimes the positions might be blended. Sometimes it might get pulled out. What is the purpose of the position, what is the majority of the work? That is what will drive.

Eric says average is 68 days of occupied job. Eric can’t reconcile, but our team can help. The denial happens fast, but the appeal process. Some of these takes YEARS which is unacceptable. Eric sent Nicole the list of the information that the SO requires.

1. **Minnesota Statute § 179A.07 - MAPE**
   1. They’ve informed campuses to tell them they need to allow time. Chris Dale’s position is that Employees are not required to meet with the exclusive reps. No we don’t force them. That’s a choice we also don’t stop paying them.
2. **Board Policy 4.4, Weather/Short Term Emergency Closings - MN State**
   1. Time for refresh. Raise awareness to proposal and housekeeping. Want to clarify that when a president closes a university due to weather, the employees who are teleworking are expected to keep working. Invite MAPE members. Continuity of operations, providing more access to . Goal is to have policy updated . Gary huter publishes policy. SO excluded wouldn’t get time off with pay. That’s reserved for commissioner to MMB. will have to authorize us leave without pay.

**Next Meet and Confer:**

December 15, 2023