**Minnesota State Meet and Confer**

**March 1, 2024**

Attendance:

**SO**: Andriel Dees, Chris Dale, Jaime Simonson, Melissa Fahning, Chancellor Scott Olson, Ann Maile, Eric Davis, Satasha Green-Stephen, Jacquelyn Bailey, Betsy Thompson, Steven Kelly

**MAPE**: Nicole Emerson, Ben Nwachukwu, Suzie Lundsten, Heidi Vidor, Aaron Pierson, Kay Pedretti, Beth Swanberg

1. Legislative Update MAPE
	1. Melissa Fanning talked about the MMB Update that we have all seen.. Start with that. It is better news - $3.7B surplus for the biennium. Still projecting that spending will exceed revenue through FY 2027. MMB and the governor are still talking about staying the course and staying cautious about spending. What will the structural budget look like in the next biennium? Been seeing for a while now that they weren't sure if they would get a budget target. It will be one time in nature and very small. Good news is that the potential to have a budget target is better, but still unsure. The 2 year budget for the state of MN is … Looking at what it looks like going into the next biennium. We are hopeful there will be a target, but also believe that if there is one it will be one time in nature. $61M is our supplemental budget request and hoping it is in the base, but probably not something they will be able to do. Keep working with the committees, staff, and members to move forward our message. The Governor is focused on infrastructure bill/bonding bill. Discussion of some things in cash as well as in bonding. Both sides seem intent on doing something in bonding. Other things they are discussing are in the area of policy. Will probably pass a large policy bill in Higher Ed and put one time money into Higher Ed. Wrapping up the third week of the session and almost done with all of their presentations. Been in front of the Higher Education committee. Were at a bigger meeting, but there were a lot of questions from the U of MN, so we have to go back on Tuesday to discuss our budget request. The Senate bonding and budget bill was all in one presentation. They have not shifted to bills, policy in nature. Probably not going to hear bonding bills. Asked them for the governor’s $82M in HEAPER and #1 project - St. Paul College. Asked not to speak about our other requests. They all seem to be focused on asset restoration and take care of what we have. They understand we have a backlog. House asked for ALL of our asset preservation lists - $200M. We did present that. Campuses provide their priority rank. They don’t rank college’s against each other. We showed them what that looks like. Showed them what it would look like if all the college received only their #1 ask - $100M. Also showed them if the colleges only got their #1 and #2 priorities. The $82M would only cover about 23 projects. Wanted to show them what will get funded and what won’t get funded. Some of the backlog projects have been paid for with other means - they asked what other funds are available on the campuses to pay for items if they don’t receive the state funds. How are they using their reserves in the scope of HEAPER. Private philanthropy for HEAPR projects. They asked the U of MN that question. Truth is that our donors like giving scholarships for students, secondly donors like to give money for new things - like new facilities. Hard to convince them to give money for things like tarring a roof. Things are going to move fairly quickly. Bills are going to start showing up like crazy. All policy bills are first deadline - March 22, finance bills are second - April 19. A lot of buildings that are named are named in honor of someone who gives for student scholarships, versus naming them for the group who paid for the building, like at the U of MN. No way to know how campuses are funding HEAPR type things on their own campuses.
	2. Let us know if you need us back! Interesting to hear all of the presentations.
2. Workday Update MAPE
	1. Updates:
		1. Dr. Bailey said we are still on track to go live on July 1, 2024.
			1. Integrations - testing is through the whole team. IT is a part of it, not solely tested by IT. Finance, HR, OCM, etc are also included in the testing process.
			2. There are integrations that WorkDay and SO are each responsible for. If there are things that SO wants to change, we work with WorkDay on that. WorkDay is very collaborative. SO can sign off or not sign off on each area.
			3. Any defects that are found are sent back to fix and are retested until satisfactory.
			4. MAPE - Based on feedback from IT and NextGen - they aren’t getting information back to be able to find and fix errors. When WorkDay goes live, we are going to have to call in Team WorkDay to fix them. JB - That is not my experience. Examples would be helpful to be able to go back to my team to address them. MAPE - if our people feel they are not equipped, it is going to cost more money to call someone back to look at it and fix it. JB - We have to sign off on everything. It would be difficult for us to not know about something that is occurring. MAPE - who signs off. JB - it depends on the respective lead - could be HR, IT, Finance, etc. Once we go live, we go into HyperCare - all hands on deck, Team WorkDay is us for 90 days. MnState decides when we go out of HyperCare. There will be lots of teams to go into troubleshooting and fixes. We have some protections to determine how we want to move forward. We have quite a large WorkDay open source materials. When trying to find answers, they can go out to that community. When HR and Finance go live, we still will be working on it.
			5. MAPE - there are rumblings that either HR OR Finance will go live, but not both. JB - July 1 will be Finance, HR going live July 3. We only want to use one area for payroll.
			6. MAPE - we have a lot of people concerned about WorkDay. Already having payroll issues. JB - we are pretty confident. We are actually going to go to a dress rehearsal. Given what we know, we feel confident. Once we see what happens, we will reconcile that. We cannot say that we won’t have lumps and bumps. We have to be clear and say it won’t be 100% error free. ED - we have done two cycles of testing already. Last time it was a 94% exact match. Examples of errors - supervisors fail to approve timesheets, employees are constantly changing their timesheets. There are some things that we don’t understand, but we are working on it. Going into the dress rehearsal with some confidence. As long as we don’t go backwards, we are moving forward. MAPE - what is the threshold - if it’s still 94%, are we delaying going live? JB - It’s not always our fault, it could be a process or procedural piece. We will go live, barring anything that the leadership feels we shouldn’t. MAPE - The SEGIP system is working with WorkDay? Eric-It’s processed at MMB and that won’t change. We just have to make sure the files get over. 6% is an unacceptable variance - that is 900 people and we cannot have that. Our payroll error rate is less than 1% today and we want to keep it that way. Some of the variances were less than a dollar. That could just be a rounding error, going up or down one cent.
			7. MAPE - Reimbursement timelines? Said during communications that they will be delayed. SO - We haven't heard that, we don’t expect that. We will continue to use ISRS to process that, so it should be the same way it happens today. Any expenses that incur after July 3 will be processed through WorkDay. We want as few changes between the ISRS snapshot and WorkDay as possible.
			8. Communication is going out to all campuses to talk about what transactions will be frozen temporarily while things are updated. We are working alongside a steering committee that is helping us understand from a campus prospective what they want information about. It helps to drive what the campuses need to know. There will be a catch-up period, we do not want people to have to work between two systems.
			9. 2029 for students. JB - we haven’t landed on a date. Aaron - my supervisor was told a date. JB - we haven’t decided on a date and have not communicated that. Satasha - we are working on a date, but student is a lot more complex and affects a lot more people. We have been doing a lot of prep work on this. There were a lot of people during student week. We want to be very clear and start communicating and communicating and communicating. The work for students won’t be at the SO, it will be on the campuses.
			10. There is a D2L page for Students. Anyone can join. We understand that there will be uniqueness here.
			11. Nicole - will this replace our communication portals. SGS - we are not there yet. It is considered a companion project. We have to first see if it can integrate with the campus CRMs. Is there a functionality in WorkDay for this? If not, we will narrow down to specifically which ones will work with WorkDay. It is CRM lite - it is not the same as Slate, SalesForce, etc. It all depends on what a campus might need. We are working with every campus on what business process and technology you have now and if they can work with WorkDay. If not, we will have a conversation with like campuses to find a similar situation.
3. Artificial Intelligence Minnesota State
	1. Satasha Green-Stephen Kelly (project manager for WorkDay Student and works on AI)–what does that mean for our system. Where are we at? Update with Stephen–in 2022 i became beta tester and on Nov 2022 chat GPT went live. We have not had a consensus response. On Monday sharing our guidance. IT, HR, equity worked on this document for 10 months. We got feedback. The key developments –do we need Board policies, etc. We will approach this like we have in the past. This document does 3 things - 1) clarify applicability 2) recommendations and best practices and 3) provide foundation to campuses (update code of conduct). Insight we struggled with intellectual property. We do address this in the document (Syllabus, etc.). We also acknowledge there is a procurement hurdle. We had data security concerns. We have enthusiasts and skeptics of AI right now and this document addresses it. Follow up after Monday’s release. , :
		1. Pull together a co-pilot program and form functional groups and figure out how we utilize this technology. Workday is integrating AI right now. This is a living document (update cycle every 3 months at first). We want feedback.
		2. We are behind already, other systems are using it for their benefit and we are talking about limiting it. We were hoping to hear how we were going to use it for enrollment and retention. It can also really help our staff and faculty.
		3. There are appeals coming through about academic dishonesty for using AI.
		4. MAPE will provide feedback once the document is released. Feedback can come through the service desk or direct feedback with Steven Kelly - on Teams and email. He will collect all feedback to add to the living document. There are no new directives for institutions. There are recommendations or things to try.
4. Job Audits/Reclassifications MAPE
	1. We have talked to many of our employees and have realized that there is a backlog of reclassification. We have heard it has been sitting at the SO for 7-9 months after waiting 1-2 years to get it to the system office. We want to know how we can expedite this process and where we are at.
		1. Eric - There are some in the queue that are up to 7-9 months. We do prioritize new positions. As a consequence, the lower priority reclassifications get older and older. We are trying something different. Opposite day - one specific day of the week, we are flipping priority. This will allow us to get some of these older ones out of the queue. The consequence is that the new positions take longer. We don’t have the capacity for the volume of requests. Some other things we are looking at that will take more time - delegating to campuses - that introduces some risk of inequity. It can be very different based on the ideas of the campus and what they want. We are starting that by having a conversation with the campuses - are there people ready to take on some of that for classified work. At the university level, MUSASF is less risky and it can be moved to the campuses, which will remove some of them from the queue. We are well aware of the problems.
		2. Is there a conversation with our HR teams - yes, we are discussing with our campus HR teams. What are their best ideas for how to address this issue? We talked about this with the CHROs. One thing we are seeing is incomplete requests - campuses that don’t provide what is different, the org chart, etc and we have to go back to the campus to get what we need to make it complete. We know the campuses want to see more urgency, but they feel powerless to do something about it. It is true, they are powerless. We want to figure out equity and excellence.
		3. Equity comment from Nicole - we have a group of advisors at a specific institution. They were all put in Academic Professional I. A comparison was done of their job descriptions and they should have been AP2’s. Everything they do is AP2. As a group, HR submits a job reclassification request. They get communication back that this did not change 30-40%, so it is denied. It should have been classed as an AP2 from the beginning. ED - We have never seen a percentage requirement again. It must be part of the framework the classification specialists use. When you create a position and create it as an API, it has certain minimum quals, requirements, etc. However, you meant it to be an AP2. There are things to consider. Why did you do it this way, how did you post it, do we need to repost these positions, etc. Reallocations take time. As opposed to creating a new role where people have to apply. People are often wanting to work around that and we cannot do that. Chris Dale - at some level, we evaluated this differently. Whether someone else declared them differently, it is what our highly trained staff decided. This has been tested and found correct by MMB regularly. MAPE - what about when the two job descriptions are exactly the same as a group that is an AP2. This is not equitable. They do exactly the same thing, but they are classes separately. We have never heard of this percentage requirement before. ED - We disagree on the equitability part. The document is just a framework, nothing more than that. Here are some examples of the kinds of things you would find in that PD. There are variances in what they do, freedom to act (how much autonomy do they have), classification level of the school (budget size, number of students, etc); smaller institutions have lower classification of jobs. There are lots of factors that go into the classifications. These things are very fact specific. Are we doing this work that is correct or are we doing it on a whim? MAPE - when we go to campus meetings, we have to be able to explain these things. It is difficult when we don’t have all of the information. Our job descriptions should be fluid based on the changes on our campuses. We have to be prepared to support our people. They are one of the main reasons students stay.
		4. When colleges submit requests - why are they listing specific things when they submit them when we have highly trained individuals who are supposed to be deciding? You say you aren’t giving the colleges a specific classification they are asking for - then why are they listing that and asking for specific classifications for those positions. Chris said that colleges aren’t asking for a position in a classification, they are asking for a body. That isn’t true. You ask straight up on the form what classification they want this position in. ED - happy to have this conversation. Very protective of this team, because lots of people want them to do specific things. Your point is taken about campuses asking for specific positions. MAPE: We are trying to take care of our people.
5. Performance Review Follow-Up MAPE
	1. We are just looking for an update from our previous conversations. We have come at it before from a contract perspective and a legislative perspective and have gotten nowhere. Our employees are missing historical information on what kind of employee they are because supervisors are not doing their reviews. ED - we are keeping it in front of our HR professionals and re-emphasizing it. Campuses are tracking this locally. Keep talking about it here and locally. These things are done institution by institution, supervisor by supervisor and employee by employee. It is hard for us to give you the answers you are asking for. However, we are re-emphasizing this every time we have the chance. MAPE - not every campus has a meet and confer or the
6. Service Center/Pay Disparities MAPE
	1. We had another meeting before the board of trustees meeting. Working with our partners on campuses and service centers, we are continuously working to improve our processes. Lots of eyes are on this process. Please let us know what issues there are.
7. Tuition Waiver MAPE
	1. Leadership meeting this week. Guidance on how this will guide our work on campuses. We don’t want some campuses to give tons of money and some give nothing. Let’s work on a floor - a shared understanding. Some back and forth, but it was warmly received. For our presidents, they have such varied outlooks. Some are very concerned about discretionary spending when there are layoffs coming. There was broad support. We did walk away with some consensus about not having a universal no, and will set up at least some funding to honor some requests, when there are more requests - set up a process like a lottery, and will give due consideration to all requests. Those are the kinds of conversations that we are having. Confident before fall that we will have some guidance. Definitely steered away from seniority - MAPE: good, unclassified have no seniority. Optimistic that guidance will be in place by this Spring.