



State Capitol – 600 E Boulevard Ave – Dept. 215
Bismarck ND 58505-0230
Phone: 701.328.2960 Fax: 701.328.2961
E-mail: ndus.office@ndus.edu Web: ndus.edu

North Dakota State Board of Higher Education

March 6, 2023, Efficiency and Opportunity Committee Ad Hoc Meeting Minutes

The State Board of Higher Education Efficiency and Opportunity Ad Hoc Committee met Monday, March 6 at 1:00 p.m. CT.

Committee Chair Hacker called the meeting to order at 1 p.m. CT.

SBHE Ad Hoc Committee members participating:

Mr. Nick Hacker (Chair)
Dr. John Warford
Mr. Kevin Black

Institution Representatives Present:

President Van Horn, MaSU
Mr. Brent Winiger, MiSU
Dean Carmen Simone, DCB
President Doug Darling, LRSC
Dr. John Carroll, BSC
Mr. Bruce Bollinger, NDSU
President Andy Armacost and Ms. Karla Stewart, UND
President LaFave, VCSU
Dr. John Miller, DSU
President Bernell Hirning, WSC
Mr. Darin King, CTS
Mr. Corey Quirk, CTS

NDUS Staff Participating:

Chancellor Mark Hagerott
Ms. Lisa Johnson
Mr. Darin King, CTS
Ms. Terry Meyer
Mr. Jerry Rostad
Mr. David Krebsbach
Ms. Jaimie Wilke
Ms. Billie Jo Lorius
Ms. Dina Cashman
Mr. Chris Pieske

Others Participating:

Ms. Meredith Larson, Assistant AG

1. **Agenda**
2. **Meeting Minutes**

Warford moved, Black seconded, to approve the agenda and February 6, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

Warford, Black, and Hacked voted yes. Motion passed.

3. **Feedback from inputs and Format Heard at the February 6 meeting**
 - a. [Scatter gram of first round of campus priorities/survey inputs](#)
 - b. [Categories of Campus Inputs](#)

Chair Hacker stated the committee will have a systemic process to review items and start working through open-ended issues that are ready to be resolved and identify others that need further discussion. Mr. Rostad provided a scattergram that indicates inputs cumulatively with the following quadrants for the committee to consider:

Importance based on inputs,
Impactful based on inputs,
Most expensive to accomplish,
least expensive to accomplish,
Greater workload to complete,
Lesser workload to complete.

He noted that cost and time allocations listed above have not been determined and/or could be difficult to gauge. Mr. Rostad also created a comprehensive table that sorts items by department/categories, such as, audit and compliance, CTS, HRC, budget and finance, academic affairs, and procurement. Chair Hacker stated the committee will begin reviewing the inputs that were provided and vet through them, keeping in mind that additional items may evolve throughout the process.

The committee reviewed each and acted on priorities one, two, and three:

Priority 1:

INPUT 1.1
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
All audit activities from the system office to be scheduled at least 1 year prior to the beginning date of the audit, in order to give all individual campuses time to assign appropriate staff resources to the audit project.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Prior scheduling of audit activities would allow campuses to more efficiently allocate the time and effort of those staff members who will provide information for or directly participate in audit activities from the NDUS.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
This would be a change in procedure and would also result in audit personnel exercising advance planning along with individual campuses. Scheduling audit activities on an annual basis better aligns with the biannual budget cycle.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?

No. Audit activities appear to be generated on an ad hoc basis and scheduled at the discretion of the audit personnel of the NDUS, or in response to requests from the SBHE itself or from legislative groups. Annual scheduling of audit activities would also allow the SBHE to make adjustments to its strategic plan that is typically amended each year at the June meeting.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
The change in scheduling an "audit calendar" for lack of a better descriptor, would need to be approved by the SBHE and then made a directed action to the audit group and to NDUS campuses.
Who would need to be involved?
SBHE, audit subcommittee, NDUS auditors, CFO working group, and campus presidents (or designated representatives).
What would be the estimated transition costs?
No fiscal impact
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
The idea of an annual audit calendar could be approved as soon as the June 2023 organizational meeting of the SBHE, with vetting of the idea taking place in the winter and spring of 2023.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
The administrators and staff of the NDUS colleges and universities will be the primary beneficiary of an audit calendar, as it falls to those groups to prepare information for and respond to audit inquiries.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
There is really no negative impact to such a process, and legislative requests and emerging situations that require audit activities could still be honored with an audit calendar.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Prescheduling audit activities with appropriate lead time will allow NDUS institutions to better plan for audits, resulting in a savings of staff time. Also, prescheduling of audit activities might allow the audit division of the NDUS to trim their staffing and be more purposeful about how they approach general audit activities.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Implementing an audit calendar with a focus on annual planning is of primary interest to our institution.

INPUT 1.3
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
All employees are required to complete the state Fraud, Theft, Waste, and Code of Conduct Training. Though I understand the importance of this training, some may be required to take this training more than one time in a given year because of when they start. I believe this is partially a campus issue, but not certain who sets the timeline parameters for completion.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Duplication is simply wasteful time for the employees and campus. If there are no changes to the training, could we simply review and check as completed on subsequent years with maybe full testing every 3-5 years?

Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
I do not believe this is Century Code directed.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Campuses must reach 100% completion to stay in compliance.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Set standard dates for campuses to complete the training and include in any onboarding during the year. When completed, not require full testing for a period of time for compliance.
Who would need to be involved?
Human Resources Offices from each campus and NDUS HR Office. This recommendation may apply to many of the mandatory trainings that are required within the system as well.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
None Known
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Start this process in next year cycle for trainings. It shouldn't require significant resources (if any) to utilize. It also should not require major changes to content to implement.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Faculty, staff, and institutions are the most benefitted by saving time and duplication.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Not sure there are implications assuming all employees are required to take the trainings and affirm they understand the content.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
None significantly known
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

INPUT 1.4
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
Hiring Process
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
There is not a clear and consistent path to onboarding a new employee. The contacting of applicants is unclear and inconsistent.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Change to current practice
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
no

What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Form a task force, discuss issues and how to better the process, trail period, implementation.
Who would need to be involved?
HR Executive Director, HR Manager and a select team of outside HR employees to share feedback.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
no
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
TBD by campus - would depend on how quickly meetings could be set and procedures reviewed.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
students, staff, faculty
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
NA
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
none
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

INPUT 1.5
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
The Course Fee elimination policy results in inefficiencies and is cumbersome to administer, and the elimination should be revisited. Extra work is required to set up new appropriated departmental former "course fee" funds with necessary different carryover rules from other funds. The budgets for the additional funds then must be adjusted separately every year to account for course enrollment and the carryover. The former practice of using Local fund course fees met a specific need much more efficiently. The campus had no complaints about the former local course fees from students since the students could see the extra supplies and expenses that their fees were going to. Course fees are common practice across the higher education industry for courses that have higher expenses.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Simplified administration of departmental budgets. More accurate allocations of resources. Fairer distribution of budgets between academic departments.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Change in Board policy to again allow course fees.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
No.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
The Board would need to reverse its guidance.

Who would need to be involved?
The SBHE.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Zero.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Immediately.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Campus departments and administrators.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Insignificant negative impacts.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Zero.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
TBD - Lease reporting reductions TBD - Modification to Anti-gifting NDCC to allow student clubs accounts -or- allow students to use funds on university general ledger for fund-raising/donation and altruistic purposes that is prohibited under new legal interpretations. 75 - Background Checks modifications 149 - Online security Requests 109, 155, 147, 161, 169, etc. - Centralized I.T. Services don't work well for all the reasons already stated in those submissions. Other states have better overall systems in a decentralized environment. Good data structures were not always developed correctly during the initial Peoplesoft implementation and persist to this day. Common Vanilla systems don't serve the institutions and management well and have resulted in many of inefficient shadow databases that require substantial effort to keep in sync. 170 - SAAG reporting issues

Input 1.6
Who does this efficiency impact?
System Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
Changes in State Board of Higher Education member selection when an incumbent is running for their second term.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
More timely action, save time on selection, and keep institutional knowledge on the Board.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Change of constitution and current practice.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Article VIII of the North Dakota Constitution
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?

Requires a constitutional amendment which can be accomplished by a public petition certified through the SOS office, or a concurrent resolution brought forward by the legislature during the Legislative session. After one of those two is complete it would go on the next ballot for a public vote.
Who would need to be involved?
Legislature, citizens
What would be the estimated transition costs?
None
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
More than one year for voting process to take place.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Government committees for selection, governor's office, Board. Reduce time and effort for NDUS and Governor's Office to reappoint an incumbent board member.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
None
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
None
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
10

INPUT 1.7
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
We need a change allowing graduating dual credit seniors to register for degree-seeking courses without completing another application.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Improved efficiency in student recruitment and registration.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
policy or procedure
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
admission policy 411
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Changes to IT systems and policy and procedure
Who would need to be involved?
CTS, NDUS, SBHE
What would be the estimated transition costs?

No additional budget
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
6 to 12 months
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
This is a student success initiative to make it easy for them to enroll after graduation. Currently making them reapply to a school they're already attending doesn't make sense.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Nobody would be negatively impacted
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Improved in-state enrollment of North Dakotans.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Yes

INPUT 1.8
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
Create a uniform goals submission process that works best with both campus and system workflow and doesn't create additional workload for campuses. SPOL is not intuitive to use and very cumbersome. It wastes several hours of time for multiple staff when submitting goals and the again when reporting on them.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Create a more timely process for goals to eliminate unnecessary workload for campuses.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Current practice
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
no
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
System goals would be available prior to institutional goal creation.
Who would need to be involved?
NDUS staff
What would be the estimated transition costs?
none
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
immediately
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?

Institutions and therefore ND Taxpayers. The benefit would be eliminating the double effort of preparing goals and changing them when the NDUS goals are sent out.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
N/A
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
More efficient
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Procurement Item #106 – Agree with raising the thresholds for procurement. Procurement Item #168 – It would be nice to have more guidance on what is included in a package purchase. Especially when it comes to purchasing things like laptops regularly. They aren't always a group purchase, so it is difficult if procurement rules put them all together. We sometimes purchase them as we need them. Procurement Item #131 – Agree with only posting bid openings on the website to save on advertising. AG – Referred Item #170 – Agree with minimizing these monthly SAAG reports.

Priority 2:

INPUT 2.1
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
The creation of a robust Financial Dashboard for each institution is a necessity. Currently, financial information is only available through running multiple reports and queries and combining the information, in order to just create a Financial report. A Financial Dashboard similar to the one the NDUS Office currently has, would be a good starting point.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Institutions and each department/division would be able to have all of their financial information at their fingertips. This would allow them to make informed decisions, using accurate and current data.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
None
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
None
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
The creation of a financial dashboard for each of the institutions by NDUS/CTS.
Who would need to be involved?
Campus Finance Personnel, NDUS and CTS
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Any labor cost to create the dashboard would be minimal compared to the amount of time it would save the institutions.

What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
FY2024
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
All institutions and their employees who have financial responsibility for any aspect of the operation.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
N/A
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Any labor cost to create the dashboard would be minimal compared to the amount of time it would save the institutions.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Items 3, 4, 6, 97, 109, 110, 118, 139, 140, 145, 155, 160, 161, 169

INPUT 2.2
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
Performance Appraisal Process - Handled by too many people/too many signatures required. Can seem redundant when job duties do not change from year to year. Supervisor should connect with employees throughout the year so there is no misrepresentation of how well a job is being completed.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Time saved for all
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
change to procedure and current practice
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
yes - SBHE 604.3, 605.1, & NDUS 17
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Form a committee, discussion, trial implementation period, then implement. (With the upcoming electronic performance appraisal, the timeliness and multiple people having to sign off may change)
Who would need to be involved?
HR Executive Director and a committee of various people.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
nothing
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Depends on each institution and the process they follow
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?

staff & faculty
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
no one
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
no
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

INPUT 2.3
Who does this efficiency impact?
System Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
Leverage the purchasing power of strategic partners for program equipment.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Lowered costs for needed programmatic equipment.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Century code and procedures.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Purchasing laws that require a specific procedure.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Change to century code
Who would need to be involved?
legislature and SBHE
What would be the estimated transition costs?
unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Biennial legislative cycle
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Tax payers
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
nobody
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Cost savings to state.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Yes.

Priority 3:

INPUT 3.1
Who does this efficiency impact?
System Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
PeopleSoft information system challenges for Financial Aid compliance and functionality: <ul style="list-style-type: none">o Although there are routine upgrades for the PeopleSoft information systems, there are also gaps in the software that do not get addressed and do not adhere to financial aid regulations. An example is that Financial Aid Offices are required to ensure that the classes a student has signed up for count toward their degree programs. Only courses that count toward the degree program are eligible for financial aid. Currently, PeopleSoft does not offer this functionality, and a third-party vendor would have to be used, adding additional costs to each institution. It is not easy to meet financial aid regulations when every institution must agree to the price. As Financial Aid Directors, we should not have to lobby our institutions for payment to meet the financial aid regulations. The expectation for the PeopleSoft information system is that it should meet the regulations.o Another example of this type of issue is workarounds. As an example of this is the new Isakson and Roe requirements. One of the options institutions have been given is to place non-financial aid item types on the award screen. This option is a workaround solution, and I would not recommend placing non-financial aid item types on the award screen.o One of the challenges with sharing the PeopleSoft information system is that we have two large campuses trying to share the information system with much smaller campuses. While the smaller campuses may be okay with using manual steps to update financial aid for their students, this is not always feasible for the larger institutions.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
-We would be in compliance with federal regulations. -We would be more efficient in campus offices causing less staff overtime and burn out. -We would provide better customer service to students.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Change to CTS practice by customizing PeopleSoft to meet the needs of the two largest campuses.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Compliance with federal financial aid policies
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Not sure
Who would need to be involved?
CTS, University System, campuses
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Not sure
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Not sure

Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
-Students get better service -Campus retain employees -Campuses work more efficiently
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
No one
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Savings in building manual systems and work arounds. Risk to not making the change lacking of compliance with federal financial aid policy leading to potential loss of federal funding.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Items 3, 4, 6, 97, 109, 110, 118, 139, 140, 145, 155, 160, 161, 169

INPUT 3.2
Who does this efficiency impact?
System Level
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
Purchasing Card Process - the need to have a physical copy versus keeping everything electronic
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
removal of duplication and excess paper printing
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
change in current practice
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
JP Morgan card procedures
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Simple conversation with the Procurement Card Administrator. Email Pcard statement and receipts instead of printing off everything and sending through campus mail for processing
Who would need to be involved?
Procurement Card Administrator
What would be the estimated transition costs?
No negative transition cost - would save money on printed paper across campus
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
TBD by campus
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
staff & faculty

Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
NA
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Cost savings
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

Input 3.4 (formerly X.9)
Who does this efficiency impact?
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
In 1995 House Bill No. 1493 amended NDCC Sections 24-02003.3 and 24-02-03.4 to remove the exceptions for the Board of Higher Education and institutions under its jurisdiction from the requirements of participating in the central management system for motor vehicles. Restore the exception for the Board of Higher Education and institutions under is jurisdiction, so that UND can manage its own fleet.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Reduce the overall cost, provide requested services by students that State Fleet cannot provide, remove duplication of business operation functions and generate new annual lease revenue for UND.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
It is my understanding that a UND exception can be granted by the Governor's appointee who oversees the DOT and Fleet Services.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Yes, see above.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Century Code change or an exception granted to NDUS or UND from the Governor's appointee who oversees the DOT and Fleet Services.
Who would need to be involved?
Governor and Secretary over DOT and State Fleet Services.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
\$200K-\$400K in annual costs savings/new revenue for UND.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Probably best for UND and State Fleet Services to transition from State Fleet vehicles over three years.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
The cost savings and improved services would benefit students, staff, faculty and ND taxpayers.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?

No one would be negatively impacted.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
\$200K-\$400K in annual cost savings and new revenue for UND.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

Priority 4:

Input 4.4 (formerly X.6)
Who does this efficiency impact?
Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:
While acknowledging the substantial differences of the constituent organizations within the NDUS, significant efficiencies could be achieved by centralizing various procedural requirements that now fall to individual campuses and schools/colleges for that matter. Many of these are in the HR realm, but not all. An obvious one that falls within the HR realm might be a common faculty leave policy for 9–12-month appointees. Similarly, common policies regarding issues like student mistreatment might be promulgated.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Dramatic reduction of duplication of effort required by each unit developing and promulgating its own policies and procedures.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Change in policy/procedure development process.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
No
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
SBHE, NDUS, and campus policy changes
Who would need to be involved?
SBHE, NDUS Office, and all campuses
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Reduction of faculty and staff duplication of efforts.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
None.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

Chair Hacker recommended that once items are referred to another SBHE committee, that committee will review and decide/recommendation to the full Board; members Warford and Black agreed.

Committee members had a thorough discussion on information technology services, consolidation of services, and the complexities of IT, such as cybersecurity. The committee agreed that several items on the scattergram will be moved into the CTS component, and it will require a large workload, a wide network of input and collaboration, and could potentially be the most expensive to complete. They also discussed the possible need to form another SBHE committee to address it or adding a CTS grouping within the document that covers items related to PeopleSoft, Blackboard, consolidation, etc. Mr. King, Vice Chancellor of Core Technology Services (CTS) requested an opportunity to address some on the inputs for accuracy, prior to any decisions on next steps, The committee agreed; Chair Hacker stated that the committee will have to keep chapter 15-10 Dash 44.1, which requires a consolidated system, and current SBHE policies, as discussions occur. Ms. Meredith Larson, legal counsel offered to research further and provide an opinion; committee members agreed, along with having this topic as a priority for the Board during their invasion 2030 retreat.

Mr. Chris Pieske provided follow-up on the training/compliance item; he stated that he connected with campus representatives regarding fraud, theft, and wasted abuse training. He took additional time researching time spent on training in general by consulting with campus HR directors and Title 9 coordinators. He is still waiting to verify some information and will update the committee at their next meeting. The committee members discussed and inquired what types of training are mandatory, if they are systemwide, and how often. Mr. Pieske explained that there are several training courses that various campuses require, but that's in the control of each campus; some require quite a few, and others require very little. The timing and reoccurrence of training is difficult to identify due to multiple factors such as if it is new employee training, mandatory training, one-time training vs. annual training, and trainings that are required by different departments of different employees and their roles and responsibilities. The committee discussed various options such as testing out and possible liabilities; Mr. Pieske will continue to gather input and the committee will revisit.

Vice Chancellor Johnson addressed the dual credit component; she met with campus admission groups and they expressed they are comfortable with the process they have in place. The group noted that a student can seamlessly move from dual credit to a first-year freshman status. Ms. Johnson stated the current systems are getting better with the new iterations of our CRM. It carries the data from institution to institution, whereas in the past you had to repopulate simple data. The committee agreed that if the campuses agree, then there is no need for additional work.

Vice Chancellor Rostad addressed the SPOL component; it is an evaluation tool used to provide inputs for the campus presidents. He explained that in late summer, the presidents input their goals for the year and in the spring, they submit their progress toward those goals. The tool is a mechanism for consistency in how presidents are evaluated. He indicated there has been more advancement and streamlining in similar software and the Board may want to consider researching alternative solution(s) that they deem more fitting. After discussion the committee agreed the Chancellor will work with the campus presidents and make a recommendation on whether they found alternative software or to maintain SPOL.

Vice Chancellor King addressed the dashboard component, specifically to the institution's financial condition. He explained that over two years ago CTS started to try to do a proof of concept, and about a year and a half ago CTS developed a dashboard approach. Since then, CTS has had a team working on trying to build the correct data model that would be satisfactory for campuses to use. Currently, the data model is in its final testing stage;

he noted it is not the dashboards yet, but CTS is working with the campus controller groups to identify what would be some of the standard dashboards that all 11 campuses could agree on. He indicated they are close to the next step which would be hiring some external development support to build and implement. CTS does not have the bandwidth internally to complete in a timely manner. There is a need to have a signed contract in place and then develop what campuses can choose to use or engage to customize through a vendor. The next phase will be to get the controllers to agree on the path forward to start the development of some standard dashboards. The first set of dashboards would be financial and to build from it, the student data model is also underway, it's unfortunate we don't have a single data warehouse source that contains all the sets of data, such as the HR component. There should be a multi-tiered approach after the controllers complete their portion, it would then be run up the chain. Mr. King will provide the committee with an update at a future meeting.

Chancellor Hagerott provided information on the performance appraisal process; it's a collegial agreement by the system to have standard format, to help the board members have a commonality. Ms. Grinde further explained the 600 policies related to faculty and HR policies related to performance development. Every new employee is reviewed during the probationary 6-month period and annually thereafter. Ms. Grinde provided Mr. Rostad with her prework that included a reference to the century code in relation to compensation increases and performance evals performed annually. PeopleSoft launched a module called EPerformance and a few campuses, along with CTS are currently piloting it; it does have a consistent way of tracking goals and information and several other capabilities, such as, having checkpoints/quarterly process development status. Committee members discussed opportunities for employees to be evaluated outside a single supervisor, the use of culture climate surveys, and/or employee access to coaching throughout the year. Campus surveys are under the purview of the institutions to conduct. Committee members would like to see some mild amendments to policy 604.3, 605.1, and HR 17. Ms. Grinde will bring it to HRC (council) to review and make a recommendation.

Ms. Karla Stewart explained that UND purchased an HR software that includes succession planning, components that are not currently available in the PeopleSoft system. Mr. King stated that there is more information to provide the committee on behalf of CTS. The committee stated that this component should be with IT services-consolidation component.

The committee requested pcards, insurance agreements, and financial aid move to a future meeting; there was not enough information to discuss. Ms. Larson, legal counsel, will look into the insurance agreement portion and report back. Mr. Bollinger will provide more information on pcards. Mr. Rostad will have the Financial Aid Directors revisit and return if necessary.

Ms. Stewart explained the State Fleet vehicle component, indicating there are restrictions on utilizing a private vendor vs. DOT (state fleet) for vehicle travel. She explained that the State Fleet Dept. has an abundance of rules and regulations that restrict the needs of campus representative that are required to travel. After a short discussion, Ms. Stewart volunteered to research and provide further information such as if there is a legislative requirement.

Recruiting system(s) will move to CTS component.

Chair Hacker stated the next meeting will begin with section 4.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m. CT.

Approved April 3, 2023.