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

April 3, 2023, Efficiency and Opportunity Committee Ad Hoc Meeting Minutes

The State Board of Higher Education Efficiency and Opportunity Ad Hoc Committee met Monday, April 3rd at 1:00 p.m. CT, via Teams.

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
Ms. Karla Stewart and Mr. Mike Pieper, 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**

and

2. **Meeting Minutes**
   Warford moved, Black seconded, to approve the agenda and March 6, 2023, Meeting Minutes.

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

Mr. Rostad explained that one of the documents included in the materials are items that have been previously reviewed and acted on and the other is for today's discussion and/or action (beginning with input four). There were a couple of items the committee may want to circle back and provide further guidance.

3. **Continue Review of Survey Responses**
   a. Campus Priorities – Action items
   b. Categories of Campus Inputs (with scattergram)
   c. Campus Priorities – Items reviewed and acted on
   d. Response to Governor's Red Tape Reduction

Follow-up items from previous committee meeting(s) (A – D):

A. State Fleet/UND request to operate vehicle usage outside of ND State Fleet with from March meeting
   - UND representatives explained cost savings, better service, safer vehicles for employees, and having the ability to offer some services to students
   - What the cost savings would be from a system perspective (not just UND)
   - Requires a state law change
   - Requesting an exemption from the Governor's office – not until further discussion by the SBHE
   - Other Institutions need the opportunity to provide input - unintended consequences, some institutions could suffer negative impacts based on their demographics, usage amount, lack of other service options
   - Request Mike Pieper work with Vice Chancellor Krebsbach to formulate questions for the State Fleet department
   - Krebsbach to bring to Administrative Affairs Council
   - Krebsbach to inform BFC Chair Mihalick that this committee requested BFC review and discuss, following Admin Council discussion

B. Shared Liability Insurance
   - Legal Counsel confirmed that OMB has shared liability insurance for the system

C. IT/Peoplesoft/etc. - Discuss further at May Meeting Ad Hoc meeting and possibly the Board's retreat (May 22nd):
   - The SBHE is a Policy Governance Board - Centralized Services for IT Infrastructure
   - Change needed in state law to decentralize and/or allow more flexibility and more autonomy in specific area
     - CTS will need additional dedicated resources to administer and provide oversight if there is a change
   - Pathway to begin vetting and having early indicators of potential solutions to the various components
   - A possible sub-committee, CIO Council, or all NDUS councils to have representation from all institutions
     - Broader discussion is needed because it is not only IT infrastructure, but it could also have an impact on areas such as financial and/or academic/etc.
     - Cost, efficiency, and duplication are all significant factors to be considered
     - Avoid creating additional red tape
   - Policy 1200 language, and possibly working from it as a starting point

        - language is currently written as top down and could be more consultative
    - The Chancellor has procedures for requesting waivers from mandated services
        - There is currently a process for institutions to request a waiver: 1- initiating a request 2- processing the request 3- guidelines to complete the request
        - Time required for CTS to integrate requests
        - May require additional time to work with different vendors on specific requests

D. Curriculum Management System
    - Emerging of digital educational records
    - NDUS campuses currently utilized multiple vendors to manage courses that comprise the curriculum
    - Common curriculum management software could carve the path forward to participating in credential engine
        - Systemwide approach
        - Components of credential engine
    - Vice Chancellor Johnson will bring to AAC/SAC Councils and move forward to SBHE ASAC with recommendations, at the request of ASAC Chair Warford, other committee members agreed

E. Shared supplier database portal
    - All campuses use the same supplier database portal - caused duplication
    - The ability for the supplier to update records
    - Controllers/financial user group to discuss and make recommendations to improve the process
    - Locking key on payment methods
    - Mr. Krebsbach will follow-up at the council level and forward recommendations to BFC

There was an item submitted regarding advertising for procurement issues/posting online; but the submitter was unidentified, and the committee had little information. Mr. Pieper indicated that it may have been the result of an audit findings/recommendations. The committee discussed current legislation that has passed that would result in SBHE Policy and Procedure changes. They requested that Mr. Krebsbach work with legal counsel to follow up and bring it back to the committee.

F. Increase Dollar Threshold for Campus Projects and Improvements/Legislative Approval
    - Current threshold
    - Legislative approval requirements/process
    - SBHE Policy – ND Century Code

G. Title IX
    - Training
        - System office provided statewide training instead of requiring individual campuses to coordinate/resource out - efficient and resourceful as possible
    - Funding Options/Lack of Resources
    - Shared Services – MOU
    - Unknown submitter – committee request submitter to contact Mr. Johnson with a recommendation and/or solution
    - Ms. Johnson to circle back to councils for a recommendation regarding a proposed funding model, and forward to SBHE ASAC
    - Prepare for next legislative session to formally seek funds in the NDUS budget

The committee noted that anonymous submissions cause difficulty for them committee to operate and move items forward; they requested that submitters identify themselves and join the meeting(s) to provide additional feedback and/or answer questions the members may have.
See additional notes for all items in the table below/reviewed and acted on (updated March 27th):

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 of 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.

Combined Priorities: 1.2/1.9/2.4/4.1

INPUT 1.2
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:
Consolidation Policy is HIGHY inefficient NDUS Policy 1200.1 and associated procedures requiring "consolidation" of IT services has created significant barriers to institutions fulfilling their mission. The operational impact of this policy is for all 11 institutions to operate their IT solutions as if they are all a single institution, when in fact, they are not. Resulting IT systems do a poor job of meeting the needs of the diverse institutions in ND. This disproportionally hampers ND's two research universities from innovating technologically. Additionally, significant bureaucracy arises around all services in an effort to manage 11 institutions using solutions designed for a single institution.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
(a) More timely action - bureaucracy slows all changes and improvements to IT systems. (b) Reduced cost - total cost of ownership is higher when solutions do not fully meet needs. Campuses end up having to do manual work that offset any cost savings seen by using single institution solutions for all 11 campuses. (c) Improved regional/national partnerships – The research universities in particular are limited in their ability to partner with other research universities due to the inability to control or even influence core direction of NDUS-CTS (e.g., there is still no NDUS participation in the InCommon federation). (d) Improved quality of service - poor fit of existing IT services result in sub-par service to faculty and student as well as limit a unified presentation of IT services across the board due to difficulty integrating services (e.g., authentication credentials and data integrations).
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)?
All should be changed. NDCC 54-59-22 (affecting state government) inspired NDCC 15-10-44.1, which imposes similar restrictions on higher education. As a result the SBHE created policy 1200.1. This policy was created to operate IT in higher education in the same fashion as state government. There was not an analysis of how this would work. It is probably unique in the nation and has proven ineffective and a hindrance to institutional effectiveness.
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?
(a) Eliminate or at least revise policy 1200.1 and related procedures. (b) Work with the legislature to eliminate or revise NDCC 15-10-44.1. (c) Engage directly with the institutions to understand how all of this actually works and get accurate perspectives on how other states are handling similar situations.
Who would need to be involved?
SBHE members and campus leadership

What would be the estimated transition costs?
No extra expenditures required
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
6-12 months
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
All of the above would positively benefit from this change from both improved cost and improved institutional effectiveness.
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?
Cost savings.
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 1.9 (formerly X.1)
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:
The efficiencies/opportunity within the NDUS that SBHE can address refers to CC 15-10-44.1, SBHE Policy 1200, SBHE Procedure 1200.1 Consolidated IT Services, and SBHE Procedure 1201.1 IT Planning and Reporting. • SBHE Procedure 1200 Consolidated IT Services and CC 15-10-44.1 requires the services defined in CC and procedure to be acquired through CTS or submit a request for a waiver. The procedure has been in place for many years. However, UND is the only institution abiding by the policy and procedure other than the requirement for email services. UND is the only institution with a Service Level Agreement with CTS to provide file server administration, database administration, research computing, storage, and application server. Impact: UND's SLA with CTS is over $2.2M annually. While the level of services has been defined in the SLA, there is no accountability for not meeting the expectations. UND does not receive reports on how the expectations were met or the financial implications for not meeting the expectations. Having to rely on CTS for our core services has impacted our ability to be agile and adapt to changing needs of our students, faculty, and staff. • CTS interprets CC as institutions must use the PeopleSoft environment regardless of its ability to serve the needs of our students. Impact: - PeopleSoft is a legacy system that no longer supports the needs of current and future students in this digital age. - Consolidation addresses only the needs of the least common denominator, leaving institutions to find other ways to fill the gaps. This has led to institutions having to add more staff and/or procure other solutions supporting the consolidated solution. - Customizing legacy systems to attempt to meet student needs is cost prohibitive. The user experience is dismal. Return on investment (ROI) is non-existent. - Consolidation has led to poor data accessibility and integration. Integrating data for a cross-campus view of the total student experience is impossible. - Cost of ownership has escalated due to the effort needed to maintain and manage the system that cannot address the needs of the students and constituents. Innovation is stagnated as institutions are unable to implement solutions that are cutting edge and more useful for the mission of the institutions – educating our students • The policy and procedures are not applied uniformly across the institutions Example: Recently, NDSU was given a waiver to use a different solution for ePerformance while UND's request has been denied. Again, there is no rhyme or reason for allowing one institution to proceed and another to be denied. UND has a robust talent management

solution that can streamline recruitment, onboarding, performance management, and succession planning. However, CTS continues to put roadblocks for UND to use a much-needed system in a very tight workforce market to create efficiencies and provide a high-class service.
• Procedure 1201.1 requires institutions to submit a 1201.1 request when purchasing software greater than $10K.
Impact: An excerpt from the 1201.1 procedure "For purchases where campus policy or procedure requires institutional CIO approval…" All software procured at UND requires CIO or designee approval to validate data security and accessibility requirements. As per the procedure, UND must submit a 1201.1 while most other institutions do not as their software procurement does not go through central IT. As CTS 1201.1 dashboard indicates, nearly 67% of the 1201.1 requests have been submitted by UND.

• Procedure 1201.1 requires institutions to request a waiver for cloud-hosted software solutions over $25K.
Impact: With more software built for the cloud, the $25K threshold is no longer valid. UND has a cloud-first strategy, and over 95% of the software we procure is in the cloud. The strategy takes advantage of the best-in-class software and reduces maintenance and administrative costs. We must adapt to changing environments to compete in the higher education market.

What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?

How the policies, procedures, and CC is interpreted has stagnated institutions from moving forward in this digital age. The institutions are unable to provide a service that they are capable of providing due to the restrictions. Due to demographical changes and the explosion of the need for hybrid teaching, learning, and remote work, the functionality needs of our constituents have changed. The policy restricts the institutions from being innovative to take advantage of newer applications that can be used to create a competitive advantage in the higher education market. The current procedures and policies do not allow institutions or NDUS to provide efficient, cost-effective, and high-quality services.The following are key areas how the "red-tape" has negatively impacted the institutions:• Poor data accessibility:o When peripheral systems that use newer technologies are introduced, developers must invest time and dollars to facilitate data integration. As the age gap between the myriad campus systems continues to grow, so too do the cost and complexity of integration and data access across the portfolio.o Examples: We have PeopleSoft (implemented over 15 years ago) that does not address our demographic of students and employees in this digital age. Customizing legacy systems require considerable effort to build and maintain. The user experience is dismal. ROI is non-existent.o It is impossible to integrate data for a cross-campus view of the total student experience.• Escalating cost of ownership:o As systems age, the skills to maintain them grow harder to access as technology professionals retire and the demand for new skills grows. At the same time, long-standing contracts have a growing price tag that seems increasingly disproportionate to the price of newer, more interoperable systems.o Example: Because legacy systems such as PeopleSoft require a considerable amount of effort for minimal ROI, staff have few resources to dedicate to new, innovative projects. Missed opportunities.• Flatlining product innovation:o Even as contract terms increase, vendors with a broad user base and high levels of lock-in devote fewer and fewer resources to product development and innovation. As vendors reallocate their investments into newer offerings (and acquisitions), users of older products miss out on the latest updates and features.o Example: There is no ROI for vendors to keep maintaining legacy systems when there are other products in the market that provides better functionality with the current user needs in mind. Existing tech stagnates, and user dissatisfaction grows. o PeopleSoft will discontinue supporting on-prem legacy systems in 2030 (planned at this time)… just around the corner.

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 Century Code CC 15-10-44.1, SBHE Policy 1200, and SBHE Procedure 1200.1 and 1201.1 or how it is being interpreted.

Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?

CC 15-10-44.1, SBHE Policy 1200, and SBHE Procedure 1200.1 and 1201.1

What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Option 1: Addressing the consolidation clause will allow the institutions to provide quality service to students that meet and/or exceed their expectations. ND higher education institutions will have a competitive advantage over other institutions across the country. Our employees and students will have a much better user experience increasing the sense of belonging and contributing to retention and recruitment.The application layer, software that students interact with, is critical to providing an engaging and adaptive user experience for our students and our faculty and staff. We can have the best infrastructure in place; however, if we do not have applications/software that provide the best user experience, we will not be able to attract, recruit, and retain the best of the best. CTS has legacy systems that provide critical functions such as recruitment, student success, course registrations, etc. The user experience matters! The systems CTS currently has and forces the institutions to use do not address the needs of our current students or employees.To alleviate the "red tape," let the institutions be responsible for selecting and managing the software that serves the students and constituents. Institutions can provide data feeds to NDUS for reporting purposes and/or other needs. Data Governance can be established to ensure data quality. We understand that smaller institutions may not have the necessary resources to support IT services. This is where CTS can provide the greatest value by helping institutions with limited resources.Option 2: Two larger institutions (NDSU and UND) support the smaller institutions, similar to how other university systems manage their IT service needs (examples: University of Minnesota System, University of Wisconsin System). We are already providing shared services to smaller institutions such as telephony.Option 3: A study could be conducted by a third-party entity to look at possible options for providing IT services to/by institutions to maximize resources and the level of services provided to our students. Who would need to be involved?The institutional CIOs, CTS CIO, and governance from PresidentsWhat would be the estimated transition costs?Option 1: Minimal if addressed properly.Option 2. Will need to do a studyOption 3. Will need to do a study
Who would need to be involved?
What would be the estimated transition costs?
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
A study could be completed in a year.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Students! Addressing the consolidation clause will allow the institutions to provide quality service to students that meet and/or exceed their expectations. ND higher education institutions will have a competitive advantage over other institutions across the country. Our employees and students will have a much better user experience increasing the sense of belonging and contributing to retention and recruitment. The NDUS system will be good stewards of the funding we receive from the state and be accountable. We will be able to attract more students to our institutions and keep them upon graduation.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Addressing how IT services are provided will be a win-win for all entities and our stakeholders.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
A university system with the student front and center in how the services are provided will benefit from increased enrollment, retention, and graduation.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Input 2.4 (formerly X.8)
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:
We have stepped away from Recruiting Solutions after working with a consultant (procured by CTS/Darin King) who drew the conclusion that the system was not meeting the needs of UND. The piece that remains an issue is the inability to integrate with the current HCM/HRIS system based on CTS not allowing it. This will require at least one staff to manually enter all information gathered within PageUp into HCM. While is an inefficiency, this is still better than all the redundancies and extra steps found in Recruiting Solutions. While UND was approved by CTS to move away from Recruiting Solutions, we were not able to utilize the full suite of software we requested to us and that we had procured from PageUP. In our initial acquisition of the PageUp suite of talent management software, we also had performance management software that would integrate with Recruiting Solutions in addition to succession planning software. CTS would not allow UND to move forward with the performance management software. Rather CTS purchased the ePerformance module, without any input from the customers who would use the software and like Recruiting Solutions, this software does not meet the needs of UND. There are additional modules within HCM/HRIS that are not meeting the needs of the campus or are not fully integrated with approved systems, TLAB is one of them. This currently is a campus level impact but NDSU, who also worked with the same consultant, was given the same arrangement. This is among many technology/HRIS inefficiencies that continue to keep HR items more transactional and inefficient not only for HR staff but the campus community as a whole. The root of this is an antiquated PeopleSoft which includes HCM, FIN, and Campus Solutions in addition to the lack for collaboration with CTS when considering new modules or processes.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
As we are already seeing less duplication or inefficiency with recruiting processes, less “clicks” to get steps done in the system, etc. we realize many less steps/less cumbersome process for our community. This would carry through with better technology. Much better use of time.
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 to current practice to require all institutions to follow the same path with regard to technology in most cases.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Again, maybe a goal or process as stated above.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Procurement of new technology or allowed to use the full technology UND has chosen to use based on our unique needs.
Who would need to be involved?
UND HR, UND Procurement, UIT, CTS, external partners representing the software entities purchased. It would depend on the level. If only for the remainder of the PageUp modules, only UND individuals for the most part. If integration with current HRIS/HCM in PeopleSoft, CTS would need to be a collaborator.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
It would depend on the level of change. If HR is allowed to continue use of all PageUp modules, perhaps another $30,000.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Again, would depend on the level of change. For PageUp, 8 weeks for building and implementation of the new module CTS currently does not allow UND to use.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
This would have a positive impact on all faculty, staff, students, prospective students, and prospective employees, as well as legislatures and ND taxpayers who may be looking for information via FOIA request of data that is not always good data due to limitations or structure of the enterprise systems.

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?
Could potentially be both. Savings in that our service level agreements with CTS may be reduced-so a savings but also an expense. Ultimately, the savings for time spent by all groups using systems that are antiquated, not efficient or nonexistent would be a positive.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

INPUT 4.1
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:
Recruiting Solutions - PeopleSoft module to recruit and hire employees is a very inefficient, cumbersome, and frustrating system for employees, potential candidates and new hires. We moved to this archaic system 2 years ago, by request of CTS. It has slowed the hire process and offers no flexibility for a large university such as NDSU. The support for our system is CTS, which also causes delays when the system is not working correctly. The CTS ticket system is inefficient - lots of back and forth to explain issues and assist our customers. The CTS customer service is untimely and lacks solutions for our needs. CTS hired an outside HR consultant to provide a "PeopleSoft Recruiting Solutions Software Study and Analysis" in July of 2022. Research Findings - Main issues: • The effectiveness and efficiency of the system for human resources and hiring managers. - Feedback obtained in discovery interviews, demonstrations, and listening sessions. • The effectiveness and efficiency of the system for employment candidates. - Feedback obtained in discovery interviews, demonstrations, listening sessions, and randomized applicant surveys. • The security capabilities of the system. - Feedback obtained in discovery interviews, demonstrations, and listening sessions. • The reporting capabilities of the system. - Feedback obtained in discovery interviews, demonstrations, and listening sessions. • The complaints about troubleshooting, problems and inefficiency after using the system for more than a year in most cases, is cause for concern - this is beyond a few users, this was the experience of every single user who participated in the study. Briefly, the final report and recommendations are: • Based on the information gathered in this study in respect to not only the functionality of the software as explained by both CTS and Human Resources, hiring managers, various end users, and candidates, it is recommended that the path forward is clearly one that should involve moving into a new application tracking system/recruiting software that better fits the unique needs to UND and NDSU. • As noted in this report, the day to day rhythm of all recruiting practices has deeply affected efficiencies, candidate experience, employee morale, and many other factors. While there are certainly processes that can be streamlined through the recruiting and hiring process outside of the use of software, those will be difficult to address while those inefficiencies exist within practices.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
A more modern and efficient system is needed to meet the demands of hiring University faculty and new employees in an efficient manner - that creates a welcoming and seamless process for onboarding (instead of frustrations) for new employees and campus users.

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 - Recruiting Solutions
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Policy/procedure that all NDUS campuses need to use PeopleSoft
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Would possibly need to submit an RFP for a new applicant tracking system - or join efforts with UND on the applicant tracking system their campus is moving forward on.
Who would need to be involved?
NDSU HR, Payroll and Budget employees. Possibly other campuses.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unsure of the financial impact and what NDSU is currently charged for CTS service to support Recruiting Solutions. The trade-off would be well worth the change.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
One year
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Everyone - student employee, staff, faculty, and potential applicant of NDSU, and taxpayers. Decrease inefficiencies, more seamless hire and onboarding process for candidates, staff time for recruit, hire and onboard, and less frustrations and troubleshooting for the users.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Adjustment period for campus users to learn and train in a new system.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
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 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 Freud, 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 reductionsTBD - 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 modifications149 - Online security Requests109, 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?
immediatelye
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: 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 3.3
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:
We should have shared liability insurance.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Cost savings for each institution and removal of duplicate efforts
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 and procedure change
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
unknown
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Change in procurement procedures for liability insurance
Who would need to be involved?
AG's office, OMB, NDUS, and individual campuses
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
one year
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Taxpayers through costs savings
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?
Unknown
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Yes

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 4.2
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:
State Fleet car reservation process - process varies from institution to institution
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
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?
no
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Meeting of each institution's employee in charge of Fleet Reservations

Who would need to be involved?
Each institution's employee in charge of Fleet Reservations
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
TBD based on each institution
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?
unknown
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
unknown
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

INPUT 4.3
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:
A curriculum management system. The NDUS campuses use as many as three or more vendors to manage the thousands of courses that comprise the curriculum of the state's public post-secondary institutions. With the emergence of digital educational records, it has become increasingly apparent that a coordinated effort is the most cost effective and most inclusive means of aiding ALL the students of the NDUS to present ALL of their accumulated learning through a variety of ways by using the advanced educational technology available to us. At one point in what had become repeated, unproductive meetings it was suggested that if the Board valued this service for students, it would direct campuses to collaborate, select a curriculum management system, and pay for it.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
While investigating how campuses will enable students to upload non-degree coursework, certificates, digital badges, and other verifiable forms of course competency, it quickly ground to a halt as the project was unable to support curriculum management systems that didn't contain some of the foundational IT requirements or formatting to advance as a system. he developers desperately tried to accommodate the variety curriculum management platforms, including at least one institution whose academic catalog was one large PDF document.
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?
No.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Procure a curriculum management system that is the same for all campuses.

Who would need to be involved?
Procurement, academic and student affairs on campuses and at system.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
$500,000 - 900,000 estimated for systemwide software. Cost savings to individual campuses who wouldn't have to pay for their own software.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
9-12 months, taking into consideration procurement procedures
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
students, employers
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?
Both. It would be an additional cost to system, but campuses would have a curriculum management system that would translate between institutions. It would be a "digital wallet" for students to share their certificates and course work with whomever they wanted. Employers would be able to readily assess competencies based on coursework/curriculum. Some campuses already use the curriculum software, others just have a pdf. This would bring equality to campuses and usability to students, and application to employers. Approval of programs could also be managed through systemwide curriculum management software.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
number 10

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.

Priority 5:

INPUT 5.1
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:
The supplier portal for adding/updating suppliers was changed so that campuses can no longer add/make updates to suppliers in the system without CTS approval. The process became inefficient as campuses are still responsible for the supplier information in the system, but we do not have final approval, so we spend more time double-checking what was entered and submitting multiple tickets to ensure the information is accurate. It would be more efficient to allow campuses more control over the supplier data. We will be starting a workgroup with CTS in mid-January to address the issues.
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 of efforts, more timely set up of suppliers for paying invoices
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?
There is no formal policy/procedure/agreement with CTS related to the Supplier portal yet.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
CTS would need to update the Supplier portal to allow campuses more access, training/procedure documents would need to be created and campus staff would need training for campuses to ensure consistency in adding/updating supplier information.
Who would need to be involved?
CTS, campus staff familiar with Supplier portal

What would be the estimated transition costs?
$0
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
6 months
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Staff, suppliers - More efficient process for staff and suppliers could get paid quicker
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.
Items 3, 4, 6, 97, 109, 110, 118, 139, 140, 145, 155, 160, 161, 169

Input 5.2 (formerly Input X.3)
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:
#131: NDCC 48-01.2-05: Contents of advertisement This code is all about posting newspaper ads about upcoming construction projects and public bid openings. This should be changed to allow online public notice postings and openings. COMMENTS: Sherry Neas from state procurement is working on changing this language, but not sure if she was specifically addressing on-line instead of paper. I suspect she is now. Sherry's team to provide some data to help inform a determination on this at a future PAC meeting.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
One central place for public notices.
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 century code
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
NDCC 48-01.2-05: Contents of advertisement
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Change in century code
Who would need to be involved?
OMB, Legislature
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Unknown

Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Suppliers have a web page to view instead of waiting for a newspaper ad. Most up-to-date info on webpage. Larger pool of bidders.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
Local Newspapers
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Cost savings to agency not having to pay to post advertisements in newspapers
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

Priority 6:

INPUT 6.1
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:
Increase legislative approval threshold for buildings and campus improvements finances by donations, gifts, grants, and bequests from $700,000 to $2,000,000. The current threshold means nearly all projects financed this way need legislative approval. In turn, the NDUS policy manual references this section of the Century Code and will update the thresholds for SBHE approval. (NDCC 15-10-12.1) Increase threshold for hiring an architect or engineering firm from $35,000 for a single project to $100,000 and increase the threshold for fees over the twelve-month period preceding negotiation from $70,000 to to $200,000. With the current thresholds, only very small projects are eligible to directly hire these services. Construction costs have gone up drastically so it's time to increase the thresholds. (NDCC 54-44.7-04)
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
A lot of work goes into preparing documents for legislative and SBHE approval. Costs have gone up rapidly in the past year, so the current thresholds mean nearly all projects need approval. The same reasoning goes for increasing the threshold to hire and architect or engineer. It takes significant time and effort to put together an RFQ, review proposals, and interview firms. This makes sense on larger projects, but on small projects there are times a direct negotiation would be more appropriate.
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 NDCC
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Yes, NDCC sections listed in section #3
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Change to the NDCC
Who would need to be involved?
NDUS and the Legislature

What would be the estimated transition costs?
None
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
As soon as the NDCC is updated
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Campus - more efficient use of time
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?
Time savings
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 6.2
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:
Authorization forms with multiple signature needs
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
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?
no
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Form campus committee, discussion on all forms and who truly needs to sign off on them.
Who would need to be involved?
President staff and Human Resources Executive Director
What would be the estimated transition costs?
None
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
TBD - would vary by campus and current practices
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?
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.

Input 6.3 (formerly X.12)
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:
SBHE should consider working with NDUS to help each institution with Title IX and Discrimination/Harassment oversight. This could be accomplished by creating a position on the same level as a Title IX Coordinator who could identify gaps in training, gaps in processes, and/or assistance with resolving matters that fall under Title IX (sexual misconduct) and Title VII (discrimination and harassment complaints).
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
The SBHE and NDUS would likely see an improvement in the cost of resolving complaints that fall under these categories by having an external person who can assist in times where there is a conflict in the institution. This would save the institution from having to hire lawyers or law firms to handle complaints due to conflicts of interests. This position could provide guidance and assure each institution is operating their grievance processes in compliance with Title IX and other applicable laws by internally reviewing each institutions policies, procedures, and overall approach to addressing reports of sexual misconduct and reports of discrimination/harassment. This would help institutions by identifies areas where there could be more efficient responses/ways to handle complaints.
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 current practice as each institution now has Title IX coordinators who, oftentimes, are wearing other compliance related hats and are not strictly working with Title IX on a day to day basis. This change in practice could help those institutions that may not handle complaints often to have a resource for assistance in addressing complaints of Title IX related misconduct or discrimination/harassment. Which, in turn, would at least lessen the likelihood of liability for that institution should there be any misstep in process that would conflict with Title IX or other applicable laws.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Title IX and Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 would be the federal law related to this position. SBHE policies and NDCC would also be related to this regulation as it relates to Title IX and civil rights complaints (like NDDOL).
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Funding would need to be secured either at the NDUS level or SBHE level. A determination would need to be made as it relates to who this position would report to. It may make sense for the position to fall under NDUS and be fully supported through the NDUS budget.
Who would need to be involved?
NDUS staff, SBHE, University Presidents, etc.

What would be the estimated transition costs?
$100-$120,000 salary for the position would likely be the appropriate estimated cost. Cost for recruiting, creating the position, are unknown.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Everyday there are complaints being filed at each institution under NDUS. The quicker a position like this could be created the sooner the position could be of assistance to our institutions.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
It is obvious having an oversight position to assist the institutions would create more efficient practices for each institution, but the big positive impact for the ND Citizens and ND taxpayers would be the cost savings this would have for each institution. Any litigation that is spurred from a mishandling of Title IX or other civil rights matters is costly and farming out the work to outside counsel or law farms is also costly. Why not have a position that would be the go-between for the institutions before the matters are farmed out to other entities?
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
I do not see a negative impact.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Additional expense of having a FTE in Bismarck. I think the cost/benefit analysis in this would show that having a FTE would be much better than dropping the ball at an institution in relation to handling these matters and opening up the state to litigation.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

Priority 7:

INPUT 7.1
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:
When the ND Legislature appropriates money for a campus capital project, campuses are required to request SBHE approval to proceed. The SBHE has already approved the project to be in the Campus Master Plan, so putting together documentation for further approval seems like an unnecessary step.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
The SBHE reviews and approves projects prior to them being submitted to the Legislature. The time and effort to go back for approval after the State funds the project doubles the work.
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 policy/procedure
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?
Change the NDUS policy/procedure for Capital Projects

Who would need to be involved?
NDUS and SBHE
What would be the estimated transition costs?
None
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
As soon as the policy is updated
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Campus - capital projects would be submitted and approved by the SBHE one time.
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 - projects would still be reviewed and approved by the SBHE
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Time savings
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 7.2 (formerly X.7)
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:
Return the control of the university's Office of General Counsel to the university.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Since the operation of the Office is not under the control of the university but rather the Office of the Attorney General, the university and its constituent units do not have direct control over the operation of the Office, and especially over the timeliness of responses. Returning control (and financial responsibility) to the universities would be associated with appropriate staffing, responsiveness, and reduction of system liability.
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)?
Yes, it is my understanding that a change to the century code would be required.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Yes
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Change in the law Change in the employment status of the lawyers involved Promulgation of unit operating policies and procedures
Who would need to be involved?
Legislature SBHE NDUS Universities and their senior leadership

What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Unknown
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Everyone through optimization of the review process of a large cache of documents, agreements, polices and the like.
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?
There would need to be a shift of financial resources from the OAG to the NDUS and its constituent campuses.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

Priority 10:

Input 10.11 (formerly X.5)
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:
#168: When purchasing products, all past and future orders of the same product are required to be added together to establish the proper procurement level. There are no clear guidelines establishing the length of the period to be used to establish the procurement level. Agencies are expected to calculate how much of the product they will possibly procure in the future to determine a proper procurement level. The language in the Century Code has been interpreted to include the entire lifetime of the agency for product procurement. Comments from Institution & State Procurement Office: It's possible that some clarifying language could be added to NDUS 803.1 and 840, but these statements do not reflect Institution PPS sourcing/contracting practices "all past and future orders of the same product are required to be added together" – disagree, this is not how Institution would calculate the required procurement requirements "There are no clear guidelines establishing the length of the period to be used to establish the procurement level" – disagree, Institution would utilize the anticipated annual spend multiplied by the anticipated or requested contract length to determine the procurement requirements "This one is interesting. There are really 2 parts to this. The first being signature authority. Who has the authority to authorize the total potential purchase on this contract? So you are going to have to calculate this despite any changes to procurement process. From the procurement side, it ties back to the item above and the required level of competition. The AG's Office does not recommend any contract be evergreen (no end date/auto renewed) so there should always be a time limit. The point of doing a longer termed contract is that you just assume this is a full procurement and you won't have to do it again for quite a while. If you want to do shorter termed contracts, you are more likely to fall under a threshold." – CTS Procurement comments.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Save time for procurement staff
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)?
Clarifications within NDUS procedure – 803.1 Purchasing, 840 Contracts

Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Some of the sections that apply to this subject include, but are not limited to N.D.C.C. Ch. 54-44.4, NDAC 4-12.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Workgroup of NDUS procurement professionals to review/suggest changes to procedure.
Who would need to be involved?
Workgroup of NDUS procurement professionals to review/suggest changes to procedure.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Minimal.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
One -three months.
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, suppliers, 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?
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.

The meeting adjourned at 3:10 p.m. CT.

4. Future Meeting Logistics – May 1, 2023, at 1:00 p.m. CT.

Approved May 1, 2023.