MSUAASF State Meet and Confer

February 17, 2017

Meeting began at 10:30 a.m.

Present: Sue Bayerl, Zach Johnson, Barb Oertel, Tracy Rahim, Sarah Granberg-Rademacker, Jean Clarke, Sami Gabriel, Mike Sharp, Jay Lee, Maureen Acosta, Jim Anderson, Rich Wheeler, Jaime Simonsen, Jim Jorstad, Chris Dale, Steve Rosenstone, Mark Carlson, Sue Applequist, Renee Schmidt, Tim Anderson, Trent Janezich.

Legislative and Budget Update-Jamie Simonsen

There have not many changes in the last few weeks since I came to your MSUAASF Board Meeting. Mn State will be testifying before the House and Senate Higher Education committees next week. We will build the case or our legislative ask of 178 million dollars which includes a presentation specifically about ISRS funding necessity. We have presented information on bonding and HEAPR needs already so that we can get this funding and this funding decision will come in at the end of the process. We have had good testimony shared by Laura King already with the Ways and Means committee. We are being very clear with legislators about the impact our campuses make on communities.

President Rahim asked about the possibility of tuition increases? The Chancellor noted that the BOT and presidents will have to find the funding balance if our total legislative request is not met to make sure that our campuses have the funding that they need, and this may include small tuition increases. President Rahim asked about the allocation framework model and new student success metrics? The Chancellor stated that there are two components: one looks at overall student third semester retention which looks at how much better your university is doing than in the past. The second metric looks at successful completion of students of color at campuses. Each university student success matrix will be determined by its historical record of past success in these areas. We want to reward campuses who enact programs and policies that help insure student success. The Chancellor will send President Rahim the new metrics.

FLSA Review Update-Jim Jorstad

This project will take time. Over 1300 positions were identified as needing review. We hope to have this all completed by the end of June 2018. President Rahim noted that we have concerns that there already are 200 positions in the review process and questioned why there is a need at the system office to review work already done at the campus level? Mark Carlson noted that the delegated authority from MMB has required the system office to do a second review of campus HR offices.

President Rahim asked about the appeal process. Mark Carlson noted that he is the appeal process (as Vice Chancellor) since he wants to manage this in house. He appreciates MSUAASF frustration and stated that we are working through these as quickly as possible. What is the

plan for the 200 or so in review? Renee Schmidt stated that most of these are from SCSU. Now with the change in the salary test we are still deciding whether or not to go forward all at once, or send these back to the campus for review later? We will have a decision soon.

Mark Carlson stated that we have hired a recently retired HR official to help in the system office HR area. Sara Granberg- Rademacker asked that communication go out to members who have already been notified and affected by FLSA such as Admissions Counselors and Trio program members. These members need more communication about what is happening. Sue Appleby stated that we are going to be sending out communication soon to affected members.

President Rahim asked that the system office maintain the focus on current PD reviews in the work cue. We have 7 campus PD's waiting for a response from the system office so how is this prioritization going to be determined? Mark Carlson noted that these pending PD reviews will go to the top. We are stretched with only 1.5 FTE in the HR office and this is a balancing act, but filling vacancy PD's will be first reviewed.

ASF Position Allocation Matrix Update-Jim Jorstad and Chris Dale

Management handed out the MSUAASF Range Assignment Process Review document. Key dates are as follows:

٠	Streamlined MSUAASF Range Assignment Tool Finalized	February 28
٠	MOA on labor agreement language changes	March 3
•	HR Training on Science of writing a PD, Art of Writing PD	April 14
•	Online Job Descriptions Made Simple PD Writing Tool	April 14
٠	WebEx training on new MSUAASF process	April 28
•	MSUAASF Online Training Developed	May 31
٠	Art of writing a PD Online Training Developed	June 30

Jim Jorstad noted that we should have a seamless transition to the new model. President Rahim asked what the process for current PD's needing review? Renee Schmidt stated that this timeline for implementation is estimated dates and maybe we need to meet with our combined task force to figure out a plan for these pending PD's.

Currently those PD's in the JDSM system will be reviewed under the new allocation matrix process. Barb Oertel stated that the new matrix tool was easier to use, however, it might be more difficult for new staff members who have not had the training with the new tool.

Human Resources TSM Update-Sue Applequist

Sue Applequist passed out the HR-TSM update. The HRSC managers started in mid-December and the hiring process for staff is underway, 3 full-time positions are being hired at each service center. Phase 1 will see transactions involving IFO and MSCF faculty members pay and benefits.

President Rahim asked about the financial plan for funding the hubs? Sue Applequist noted that the financing for these sites from system colleges and universities funding will not occur

until 2019. We want campus HR offices to be involved in the decision-making process of what functions will occur in the TSM? We want to look at a fee based on headcount model for 2019 financing from the campuses.

System CRM Update-Tim Anderson

The RFP process for the system CRM tool has ended in early February. We did a work group of 30 staff across the system to help us in this process including a few MSUAASF members in this group, and we had a meeting of 75 system CRM staff people to help us determine what are the needs of the system office in regards to an effective CRM to help campuses?

We are scoring the RFP responses, and initial costs, and we will be meeting with vendors through web conferences because we have more than two vendors. We need to get more information since there are disparities these will occur the first week in March. We are welcoming many constituent groups look at these web presentations.

Jim Anderson asked if ASF can be included in the web conference viewing and RFP presentations. Tim Anderson said that he will send that information out. Mike Sharp noted that SCSU is looking at purchasing a new CRM so our campus wants to make sure we do not duplicate efforts and more information sharing is appreciated.

Business and Industry Solutions-Trent Janezich

Trent gave MSUAASF an update on the work of the Business and Industry Solutions CTF taskforce. Their work has to do with how we are interacting with each other in the area of Customized Training. All of the system campus based Customized Training offices have a current deficit model in how they deliver the training. We need to figure out how to reposition ourselves to thrive and grow. How do we attract new revenue?

Trent has workgroups across the state; he serves NE Minnesota higher education to work with campuses in Customized Training. This project is actually five years old and we are trying to bring this new NE Higher Education CT model to the State of Minnesota and he is also working with a group of lead presidents.

There are four workgroups that are currently working on trying to develop new models of how we operate. State Universities only make up 10% of the customized training being conducted so our work groups have a small number of ASF members, of which there is currently 4 ASF staff. The plan is to look at how the NE Higher Education Consortium model can work at a system level? How can we help support each other financially? How can campuses share information to be more successful like through a CRM?

Meeting ended at 12:07 p.m. Respectfully submitted by Jim Anderson