



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](mailto:ndus.office@ndus.edu) Web: [ndus.edu](http://ndus.edu)

**North Dakota State Board of Higher Education  
May 1, 2023, Efficiency and Opportunity Committee Ad Hoc Agenda and Materials**

The State Board of Higher Education Efficiency and Opportunity Ad Hoc Committee met Monday, May 1<sup>st</sup> 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
- President Armacost, Ms. Karla Stewart and Ms. Peggy Varberg, UND
- President LaFave, VCSU
- President Steve Easton, Dr. John Miller, DSU
- President Bernell Hirning, WSC
- Mr. Darin King, CTS
- Mr. Corey Quirk, CTS
- President Jensen, BSC

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. Jane Grinde
- Ms. Dina Cashman
- Mr. Chris Pieske

Others Participating:

- Ms. Meredith Larson, Assistant AG

## **Committee Business**

1. Agenda  
And
2. April 3, 2023, Meeting Minutes

Warford moved, Black seconded, to approve the agenda and April 3, 2023, meeting minutes, as presented.

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

## **Committee Discussion**

1. Continue Review of Survey Responses
  - a. Revisit Priority 1.3
  - b. Campus Priorities – Priorities for Action
  - c. Categories of Campus Inputs (with scattergram)
  - d. Campus Priorities – Priorities Reviewed and Acted On
  - e. Response to Governor’s Red Tape Reduction

The committee discussed the following components and processes based on campus inputs:

- Immunizations – Vice Chancellor Johnson will reach out to Dr. Wynne and the Student Affairs Council, then forward to SBHE Academic and Student Affairs for a recommendation for full Board.
- Procurement and surplus property – the ability to generate additional revenue by individual sale (sale by campus/system). Requirement in Century Code Century 54-44; SBHE Policy, and NDUS Procedure. UND recommends the Admin Affairs Council; Mr. Krebsbach stated that the procedure is currently being reviewed by legal counsel and could be an opportunity to make additional changes through the admin council, OMB, and Foundations. It would require a change in the Century Code which wouldn’t take place until the next legislative session. Chancellor Hagerott inquired if book collections could be covered in discussions, it affects faculty costs to access the books that are turned over and then sold online. Member Warford said it should be a separate topic; measurable value is different than hard material with set values and depreciation.
- Procurement – The Committee requested the Admin Affairs Council to review. Ms. Stewart will work with Vice Chancellor Krebsbach and the procurement team to gather more info and a possible proposed solution.
- Identity management system and Synchronizing drives for campuses – NDSU is the only campus not synchronized, 9 campuses already completed, 10<sup>th</sup> one is currently being worked on, takes planning and work by CTS. End users have a more streamlined process. Darin will report back of timeline to complete the 10<sup>th</sup> and reach out to NDSU for planning and assistance. Mr. Bollinger will discuss it further and it will be removed from the committee list.

Chair Hacker stated many of the items discussed could potentially become a legislative requests/change.

- Lease reporting – limit what is needed for reporting, and how frequent; there is an SBHE Policy that has already been amended and it will be moved to completed list. Mr. Krebsbach and Ms. Wilke are finalizing a recent request by BFC regarding budget reporting.

- Receivables – there was not enough information/details to discuss and Mr. Bollinger from NDSU will get more information and forward it to the controllers' group.
- Centralized enterprise service management – Service One - Knowledge management - Project is underway, steady progress, Mr. King stated that there are even more items than listed out for the committee; he explained that an agile approach has been taken, proper progress is being made. It requires many people as the main resource to get completed. The committee requested moving it to CTS working items that will be discussed at the strategic planning session.

Chair Hacker stated reiterated that the CTS items will be an item at the Board's strategic planning retreat. There are a lot of moving parts and many CTS items that are already underway. The movement forward is a one stop data storage that will address several of the items being discussed.

- Admission/Recruitment/Student Service in Onboarding Student Enrollment – student email when enrolled in more than one campus; their email will be their primary campus (5 classes at NDSU, 1 at LRSC, their primary will be NDSU). CRM issue by Laura Oster from NDSU – Mr. King will investigate the dual credit component, a student email defaults to the first campuses they were ever enrolled in. Ancillary systems that need to be run and then uploaded to PeopleSoft, such as math scores they need to enroll. Dual credit scholarship last year, students had to upload several transcripts, depending on how many campuses they have taken classes from to apply for them. ASAC is already discussing the exchange of transcripts, Ms. Johnson will discuss with Financial Aid Director, Brenda Zastoupil for more info and/or options.
- Campus Connection (primary categories) – consolidated systems and data system/data governance. CTS has a proof of concept in progress, like a one stop data market. It was noted that this item will have a large financial request to be completed and the tentative plan is to move forward with a request at the next legislative session.
- 10.7 has already been addressed, it is working effectively, and will be removed from the list.
- The next few items listed are complex that will require proper input and evaluation from multiple stakeholders across the system. They could require a fiscal analysis to determine transitional and operational impacts, and in some cases, it may require statutory and/or policy changes to maintain compliance. The financial implications of IT consolidation versus not and how it would affect campuses is what the core discussions will be.
- Gifting/anti-gifting (10.12) – refer to Admin Affairs in collaboration with legal counsel to determine legality of request and if it is governed by NDCC and/or under OMB for all state agencies.
- Mr. King stated he has follow-up on 5.1., supplier portal. He met with the controller's group to confirm this was put in place in response to an audit finding. and that was confirmed. They did form a supplier portal work group as a subset that has been working through the details. The group agreed it takes more time than they would like to make a change, however, they acknowledged it's appropriate given the risks and potential fraud. Mr. King noted that during his meeting with the group he provided individuals with an opportunity to contact him directly if they did not want to speak during the meeting; he did not receive additional concerns. He also noted that the working group is attentive to the concerns noted by some and continues to work to make the process as efficient as possible.

2. Future Meeting Logistics – a June meeting will be determined and invite sent out.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 p.m. CT.

Approved June 12, 2023.

## Efficiency and Opportunity Survey with Campus Inputs

Submission Deadline: January 26, 2023

Updated April 27<sup>th</sup>, 2023

### Revisit Priority 1.3:

<b>INPUT 1.3</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
Campus Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
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.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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?
<b>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)?</b>
I do not believe this is Century Code directed.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Campuses must reach 100% completion to stay in compliance.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
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.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
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.
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
None Known
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
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.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Faculty, staff, and institutions are the most benefitted by saving time and duplication.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
Not sure there are implications assuming all employees are required to take the trainings and affirm they understand the content.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
None significantly known

Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

## Efficiency and Opportunity Survey with Campus Inputs

Submission Deadline: January 26, 2023

Updated April 10, 2023

### Priorities for Action

#### Priority 8:

<b>INPUT 8.1</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Immunization management (NDUS policy 506.1) -Removal of barriers for exemptions can give each campus a false sense of security and is an enormous amount of busy work and resource investment for each campus in tracking a requirement that is not truly required. If the exemption is going to remain easy, it would be better to discontinue the requirement as it doesn't truly keep the campus safe. Also, without faculty and staff being required to provide proof of immunization, the policy doesn't keep the campus safe from disease. For these two main reasons it would be better to discontinue the policy and save the staff time and student frustration in tracking down records.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Savings in staff effort and time for a policy that doesn't have an impact.
<b>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)?</b>
Efficiency, staff time savings
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Yes, NDUS policy 506.1 and state law
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Change to NDUS policy and possibly state law
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
NDUS, campus health personnel, public health
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
None
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Unsure
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Students who no longer need to track down records.  Staff who no longer need to track records
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
Unsure
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>

Cost savings for staff time
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

<b>Input 8.2 (X.10)</b>
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:
Disband the State of North Dakota's State surplus oversight and procedures. Allow UND to sell its surplus property directly through online auction services similar to the Federal Government and by other States. Currently UND loses money to surplus its surplus property because of unneeded red-tape and the process is labor intensive and is not designed to maximize sales value.
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, labor savings and increase revenue from the sale of surplus property.
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 am not familiar with the century code for this issue, but it would take a change to policy/procedures and the current practice to allow UND to sell surplus property directly through an approved auction site.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
Yes. At a minimum regulations, policy and procedures governed by the State.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
State authority for UND to sell directly through an approved auction site like other States.
Who would need to be involved?
Governor's staff and UND administration.
What would be the estimated transition costs?
No transition costs but would increase UND's annual revenue related to the sale of surplus property. Well established auction sites used by other States would take a small commission rate based on the sale price, but the net revenue to UND would still be greater than the current State surplus property system and procedures.
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
The change could be made instantly or set a date like July 1, 2023.
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Since surplus property might have been funded by students, student would benefit. Indirectly students, staff, faculty, ND Citizens and ND Taxpayers would all benefit from the use of a modern auction site used by other States with an established National customer base.
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. Some who claim property at no cost or revenue to the original purchaser might claim they are negatively impacted.
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?



Currently UND loses money annually to get rid of its surplus property because of the excess red-tape, unneeded indirect costs and loss of revenue.

Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

## Priority 9:

### INPUT 9.1

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:

Develop an environment where only one computer account is used at NDSU (currently there is one for NDSU services and another for NDUS ones).

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

We receive the highest number of calls and complaints regarding confusion between NDSU and NDUS accounts. Would allow prospective, new and existing students as well as employees to utilize one account regardless of the service being used.

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 practice and technology.

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?

Develop a strategy where NDSU accounts can be used for NDUS services. One account for any function. Important to maintain the account at NDSU to take advantage of the vast array of services managed by its identity management system.

Who would need to be involved?

CTS engineers and NDSU engineers

What would be the estimated transition costs?

The cost would likely be in reprioritizing existing staff resources.

What would be the estimated timeline for completion?

12 to 24 months.

Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?

Prospective students would not be confused at which account is used when as they engage the admission process. New students would no longer think that documentation referring to the difference between NDSU and NDUS accounts are typos. More effective use of Help Desk staff to resolve other calls. Better integration when faculty use the NDUS LMS and NDSU portal for advanced functions.

Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?

No NDSU students or employees

Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
Perhaps in labor but may not be is using existing staff
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

<b>Input 9.2 (formerly X.4)</b>
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:
<p>#102: The threshold at which an architect or engineer is required for construction project is currently at \$200,000. Once the threshold reached there is also an increased level of contractual documentation required of the contractor awarded the project. Recently a \$300,000 project was completed, it was an Ag storage building (a pole barn) which because it was above threshold an architect was paid \$32,000 to design a pole barn. You are able to go to your local lumber yard to get plans and materials for an engineered pole barn included in the price of buying the materials. Secondly, the contractor was required to submit the same contractual documentation as if it was 50 million dollar project. We are seeing fewer or no contractors bidding these smaller projects because of the government red tape required. And when they are submitting a bid it is inflated to cover the headache of the red tape. Currently projects under \$200,000 are complete by using Contract Service Agreement we still require insurance documentation and contractor license and we work with purchasing to procure competitive bids for these projects. If the threshold was raised to \$500,000 it would enable the smaller projects to be complete without the red tape headaches for the contractors.. COMMENTS: Procurement would support this threshold change. Sherry Neas' state procurement team to provide some data to help inform a determination on this at a future PAC meeting.</p>
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
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 admin code and NDUS policy/procedure
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
48-01.2-02.1. Public improvement construction threshold. Section 1
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Change in conjunction with OMB to nd admin code
Who would need to be involved?
OMB
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?
Efficiencies to the procurement process benefit citizens and NDUS staff

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 may be found through process efficiencies.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
Who does this efficiency impact?
Rank order this entry against your other entries
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?
<i>Change in century code</i>
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/UND 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 10:

<b>INPUT 10.1</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Mid-Year Lease Reporting: Change the policy, so the Mid-Year Lease Reporting is no longer required. This requirement takes substantial time for campuses to prepare, while providing minimal value to the NDUS office. This requirement is to report current leases, which are also reported at year-end.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Reduced time for campus personnel to prepare Mid-Year Reporting.
<b>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)?</b>
Change to policy/procedure
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Change to Policy 804.8 and Policy 909.9
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Change to policies as indicated above.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
SBHE and NDUS
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
No cost
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
The mid-year reporting period immediately following the change of policy.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Finance staff at campuses
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
No negative impacts
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Time savings from not having to gather lease data for mid-year reporting.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>

Items 3, 4, 6, 97, 109, 110, 118, 139, 140, 145, 155, 160, 161, 169

## INPUT 10.2

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:

In the SLSC we receive an ach notification receipt email from CAS and then a few days later we receive via postal mail a ach notification from some of the schools that payment was received. Seems the printing and mailing of the notification could be eliminated and delivered electronically saving in time, paper, ink and postage. If this is happening for other campus ach payments to vendors across the system seems a significant savings could be realized. A broader scale review across the system on accounts payable and receivable practices should be done if ach payment is possible rather than creating and mailing checks. On an even broader scale the entire system should review document delivery methods and converting to digital delivery use and storage of documents rather than mailing out paper documents and storing paper in file folders. We have done this in the SLSC over the past 6 years and had significantly reduced office expense for paper, postage, and physical storage cabinets etc.

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

Speed of delivery. Postage savings, paper, envelope office expense savings, time, etc

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 practice

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

ACH procedure

What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?

System wide review

Who would need to be involved?

Campus A/R Offices, NDUS

What would be the estimated transition costs?

N/A

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, NDUS system, taxpayers

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?
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

<b>INPUT 10.3</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Create formalize trainings and online handbooks for the various modules within our SIS related to the various components of (Registration, records, financial aid, student accounts and etc) and other third party software (Ad Astra, Perceptive, etc)
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Reduction of staff time to create the resources (oftentimes we are unaware of all of the software features available). Simplification and ease of training, duplication of efforts from the 11 campuses for new hires.
<b>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)?</b>
Change in current practice
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
No
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
1. A conversation with CTS 2. A meeting with various SIS users to determine the type of training and topics needed for their respective units regarding the SIS and other third-party software (Ad Astra, Perceptive, etc)
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
1. Presidents, Provosts, Registrars, and other appropriate members who may be impacted (ie Financial Aid) 2. Current on-campus staff who process the reports and the CTS staff
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Unknown
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Fall 2024
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Students, staff, faculty, citizens of ND and taxpayers will all benefit from more accessible, streamlined and comprehensive training of staff and faculty. This may result in consistency across campuses and a reduction of on-campus time and process efficiency.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>

Unknown
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
See above answer
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

<b>INPUT 10.4</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
For all start and end-of-term processes be conducted by the system office (CTS staff) for the following: - Priority Registration - Dean's List - Academic Standing - Census Reporting
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Reduction of staff time and to ensure consistency.
<b>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)?</b>
Change in the current practice with some changes in policy as there would need to be consistency in NDUS policy for Academic Standing Standards and priority registration levels. (NDUS Procedure 403.7.5 Satisfactory Academic Progress)
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Yes, the calculation of satisfactory academic progress is required under financial aid regulations and there are some ties to accreditation standards.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
1. A conversation with CTS as the system already has access to the necessary data. 2. A meeting with various campus leaders on the impact of this proposal. 3. Formal adoption of relevant policies and procedures.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
1. Presidents, Provosts, Registrars, and other appropriate members who may be impacted (ie Financial aid) 2. Current on-campus staff who process reports and the CTS staff
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Unknown
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Fall 202
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>

Students, staff and taxpayers. This may result in consistency across campuses and a reduction of on-campus time and process efficiency
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
May require the need for more staff by the system office
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
See above answer
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

<b>INPUT 10.5</b>
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:



#### Admission/Recruitment/Student Service in Onboarding

-The recruitment landscape is changing rapidly and requires nimble response from campuses. The slow nature of the admission user group and need to be in consensus on approaches to application processing make this extremely challenging. Examples follow.

oThe lack of control over the admission CRM for many years prevented NDSU from implementing a mobile friendly applications years after all of our competitors offered this feather. UND and NDSU finally departed from the University System CRM and incurred the expense of the platform in order to get a system that met our needs.

oStandard protocol for questions on the application for admission is limiting and sometimes results in unnecessary data collection or data collection in a manner that does not work for our campus. For example, we need more inclusive gender and race/ethnicity questions on the application for admission.

oCampus Connection, Blackboard and email address defaults to a student's first institution of enrollment which causes confusion when students later enroll at a different institution.

oNDSU should be allowed to offer general education credits through dual credit so that students who later enroll have a consistent and seamless educational experience.

oOverall confusion between NDUS and NDSU technology, the need for two separate logins and understanding which logins are needed for which things. Also, confusion in general about NDUS log in when they are attending NDSU. They often think it is a typo in instructions.

oDelay in communication between various technologies and Peoplesoft

Example. Both the Math placement (on Blackboard) and English placement scores (on Qualtrics) take one business day from point of student taking the tests to being reported to Peoplesoft, which then allows the scores to appear on advising transcripts. Advisors don't know how to place students without the scores. Therefore, students who want to speak to an advisor and then register (mostly transfer students) have to wait. Many students expect more immediate reporting. It takes another business day for the scores to get from Peoplesoft to TargetX. This is the system that tracks if all pre-reg steps are done allowing students to then register and/or make an orientation reservation. Therefore, it takes two business days to know if all pre-reg steps are done.

Dual Credit Scholarship Application - the forms and process was very difficult for students – we have all the data needed, why are we asking students to upload transcripts from NDUS institutions which we already have

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

better student experience allowing for greater recruitment results  
-more efficient processing capability for 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)?**

Internal practice/procedure

**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?**

Multiple, but in general listening and responding to the needs of the campuses.

**Who would need to be involved?**

Admission user group. CTS.

**What would be the estimated transition costs?**

Unknown

<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Unknown
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Students, Institutions, Taxpayers
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
None
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Unsure
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>

<b>INPUT 10.6</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
<p>Development requests/Data concerns/Software applications</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Development requests for Campus Connection processing modules are a challenge. Development times are long, requests need to go through user groups for a consensus vote from all the NDUS institutions which have different needs that don't necessarily fit in the same use cases. The translation process for development of a request is cumbersome, with a system Business Analyst collecting information from the original requestor and passing those to developers that go back through to the requestor. Requests can fall short of being useful for their intended purpose, requiring workarounds, or discontinued use of the module. Although there is some documentation for existing modules, and the Business Analysts are generally helpful, many processes do not have complete documentation, or access to the documentation is unknown.</li> <li>• System data reports in campus connection, are not well documented.</li> </ul> <p>The source of the data is not always clear (which tables and criteria are being used, if there are views for the data, what those views are capturing, etc.). Data extracts are inconsistent and are most often not available as a scheduled export that can be sent to a file repository, so work arounds are necessary to email, or manually download the data.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is a query environment for Student data, but there is no easy way to extract data to an accessible storage location or comprehensive data warehouse that can connect to applications (powerBI, Excel, SAS, etc.) or processing solutions without manually moving scheduled queries from a Movelt service account or from the process monitor logs, or setting up a patchwork of scripts to move data around. This can result in delays for users of the data (1-2 day delays) as well as errors.</li> <li>•NDSU has adopted applications (Blackboard and Perceptive Content are examples), that were then purchased by the system for all the system institutions with constraints on access for development that would have been available as a campus installation. Campuses are often left out of the decision making or are not allowed administrative access to applications.</li> </ul> <p>•eForms</p> <p>While e-forms are appreciated in that the workflow can be housed directly in Peoplesoft, they are cumbersome in use, and because they are universal to all campuses they be confusing to students. The email confirmations that are sent after a student submits a form are general enough to be unhelpful and harmful in some instances as they refer students to their campus official (who is that?). The communication on these should be allowed to be specific for each campus, even when the form is shared by all campuses (i.e. withdrawal form).</p> <p>•Training / Communication</p> <p>There is a general lack of training manuals/documentation for many Peoplesoft functions that staff need to use. This is especially true for finance modules for people who only use occasionally. It would be helpful to have reports that are more user friendly and detailed.</p>
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
<p>Better student service</p> <p>More efficient processes</p> <p>More reliable data with easier access</p>
<b>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)?</b>

Unsure
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?
Changes to practices at CTS; more consultation with campuses
Who would need to be involved?
CTS; Campus IT; User groups
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?
Students, Staff and Taxpayers
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 due to efficiency
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

<b>INPUT 10.7</b>
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:
Financial Aid Directors need to be immediately notified in a potential data exposure/breach. -Campuses have ultimate responsibility for the security of our students' data related to Title IV Funds (Financial Aid Directors in particular). During the latest data breach/exposure, CTS directly notified Department of Education of the breach and campuses were not notified until several weeks later. Since our Financial Aid Directors are listed as the primary Destination Point Administrators on our SAIG agreement, they had a need to know this information. If DOE had reached out to them about this matter they would have been caught completely unaware and could have jeopardized our federal financial aid eligibility. We are still not clear what data was accessed in the latest event, whether or not financial aid information was exposed, and whether students need to be notified. The lack of communication was extremely concerning.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Timely compliance with Department of Education requirements.
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 in understanding the campuses have ultimate authority and accountability for their students' data.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?

Federal requirements.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Create a protocol for notification to financial aid directors.
Who would need to be involved?
CTS, financial aid directors, campus presidents
What would be the estimated transition costs?
Nothing
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
Immediate
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Students, campuses, state board of higher education, university system.
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?
No Change
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

<b>INPUT 10.8</b>
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:
Allow Campuses to make their own operational software decisions. Campuses funded the implementation of FAMIS Cloud, our MMIS System, yet CTS is the one that contracted for the services and would like campuses to work through them, rather than directly with the Vendor for any issues. This is inefficient. They have also allowed one campus to implement a completely different system, creating an inefficiency for the future.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
More control by the customer (the campus) to implement and oversee software that would be most effective for their specific operation.
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, policy and procedure.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
I believe a change like this would require a change in NDUS Policy.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
This would have to be phased in as campuses look for additional software.
Who would need to be involved?
Campuses / CTS / NDUS

What would be the estimated transition costs?
Unknown
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
TBD
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?
Unknown
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
It could involve additional up-front expenses. However, the State of ND currently uses portions of AssetWorks. We could look at piggybacking off that systems and eliminating FAMIS.
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

<b>INPUT 10.9</b>
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 CTS purchases software for the NDUS, it typically buys software that is the most vanilla version of the product that the vendor offers. This creates inefficiencies because instead of leveraging the software to it's full capabilities, in some cases we don't have access to all modules / time saving items in the software due to the version that we are using. Also, it is difficult to operate with one license (FAMIS, T2) since any changes can adversely affect another campus user. It is hard to get everyone on the same page to effect positive change. Some campuses are more progressive than others and want to leverage solutions differently than others.
What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
There could possibly be staff reduction savings if the software was able to be used at it's highest levels. Also, we could have fewer individuals doing manual processes that could be achieved by the software.
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 require a policy / procedure change in how CTS procures software. They would need to involve the campuses at a more granular level.
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
A procedure, as described above.
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
Some sort of campus user group / council could be set up so decisions on individual software could be discussed and if it made sense to have a vanilla version, only one license for the entire system, etc.
Who would need to be involved?
End users of the product.

<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Unknown
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
To be determined. This would be determined as new software products were brought into the fold or updated.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
All of the above. Long term, students, staff, faculty and the ND Taxpayer should all benefit in some way, whether it be through better data, time savings, staff reductions or a smaller outlay of taxpayer dollars.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
I don't see anyone being negatively impacted by this. Staff reductions (where appropriate) could take place upon retirements or vacancies.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Costs savings would be long term. There could be additional expenses to campuses if additional licensing costs are passed on to the campuses vs. being funded by CTS.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>

<b>INPUT 10.10</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Review of the current systems are selected, managed and controlled within the NDUS system to develop a strategic plan, action items and KPI/ROI measurements for the systems/departments supporting and utilizing the systems. NDUS needs to be end-user focused to drive the success of the campuses and the students.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Identify the duplication of effort between departments, manual processes, time to complete tasks, and lack of empowerment that exists due to current systems. Current systems are not end-user friendly to those within the system (students or employees) or those looking to join the university system of ND.
<b>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)?</b>
An overall review of all aspects should be completed. In order for ND universities to compete and meet the needs of students today, a growth mindset needs to be incorporated. The way we have always done it does not serve the students of today or the needs of industries in today's world or the employees of the university system. Code, policy and procedures need to be much more fluid and applicable to today's technology and the capabilities of technology.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Unsure; however, every time a question is asked or an idea for change is raised the perception is nothing can change or be addressed due to century code, a university policy or procedure.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>

Empowerment of the campuses regardless of size, location or perceived importance. Each campus has value to add and employees need to be given the empowerment and professional development to drive the changes needed to bring students into the campuses. SBHE needs to look forward and not remain stuck in the past in order to make the ND University relevant in today's world.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
Campus employees, community leadership development organizations, businesses with strong technology and engagement programs regardless of location. SBHE needs to look at a broader scope of input in order to develop best of class and be an innovative leader in the education realm.
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Unknown until a definitive scope is developed.
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
There is no end to this type of growth and development but a need to pick some low hanging fruit and start making an impact is critical to drive success of our university systems. The COVID pandemic and the impact of shut down should be a major lesson learned for the NDUS and SBHE. The ability for education systems to be ready or already providing high level remote learning was already established throughout the country yet ND systems were left scrambling and unable to provide a seamless non-frantic solution to students and employees.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
A review in status quo and implementation of more effective processes would benefit all across ND. Making our university system more progressive and a best in class of opportunity would attract more students, stronger educators and stand out employees.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
Those not willing to grow and change with the needs of today's world. Those that do not believe in education and professional growth being an on-going process that never stops.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Yes, there would be a financial impact initial to move forward but the hard and soft savings would be felt for years to come as NDUS builds a more competitive and best in class system for students and the world at large.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention</b>

<b>Input 10.12 (formerly X.11)</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
<p>NDUS Procedure 806.1.3.b.iv-states purchases of meals or snacks are not allowable for departmental activities, including coffee breaks, and periodic departmental staff meetings, even if the meeting is required.</p> <p>The change in NDUS policy to not allow use of dollars to periodically pay for meals for departments/employees to say thank you, reward good work, etc. Also allowing only a cake to be purchased for a retirement. Now supervisors are purchasing these things out of their own pockets.</p> <p>A change to allow this to happen maybe on a quarterly basis or even twice a year, would be advantageous for morale. We are consistently striving to find ways,that are low cost, to reward our employees for their great work. This one point goes far in doing just that. It levels recognition as well when the department can do this at a meeting of all their employees.</p>
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
We have heard a lot of feedback from departments about negative impact on morale.
<b>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)?</b>
Change would need to be made to NDUS procedure/policy.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
NDUS Procedure 806.1.3.b.iv
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Very low implementation as the procedure would simply be reversed to allow the action
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
SBHE/NDUS would carry the weight of reversing this position to allow.
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Not transition cost.
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Can be implemented immediately. Communication from the NDUS office would be needed to reframe this procedure.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Staff and Faculty-positive morale/retention step.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
None.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
This change would create additional expense. However, there could be cost savings by using this as a retention goal, it is a small cost that could retain good employees, which can save many dollars needed for recruiting for vacancies.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>



## PRIORITIES FOR ACTION

CTS	Impact	Importance	Possible Next Steps	Action Taken by Efficiency and Opportunity Committee	Date of Action
9.1	3	3	Nine out of eleven NDUS institutions currently synchronize NDUS identity credentials with local institutional identity systems. This mitigates end user confusion in most cases because the dotted ID and password are synced.		
10.2	5	5	This should be referred to Admin Affairs		
10.3	8	8	This is recognized and will be improved as CTS initiates the ITIL Knowledge Management Practice in May 2023. Focus is to improve self service capabilities , consolidate sources, and standardize practices.		
10.4	8	4	This should be sent to the Registrar's user group for consideration.		
10.5	5	5	These are separate items that need to be addressed individually with appropriate user groups.		
10.6	5	5	These are separate items that need to be addressed individually with appropriate user groups.		
10.7	2	8	This was added to our information security incidence response checklist.		

10.8	6	3	This is a complex request that requires proper input and evaluation from multiple stakeholders across the system. It will require a fiscal analysis to determine transitional and operational impacts. And in some cases, it may require statutory and/or policy changes to maintain compliance. Envision 2035 will be kicked off at the May SBHE retreat and technology will most certainly be a central component of the process (technology was one of the advisory teams for Envision 2030). Suggest handing this off to the Envision 2035 technology work group for in-depth study.		
10.9	5	5	This is a complex request that requires proper input and evaluation from multiple stakeholders across the system. It will require a fiscal analysis to determine transitional and operational impacts. And in some cases, it may require statutory and/or policy changes to maintain compliance. Envision 2035 will be kicked off at the May SBHE retreat and technology will most certainly be a central component of the process (technology was one of the advisory teams for Envision 2030). Suggest handing this off to the Envision 2035 technology work group for in-depth study.		
10.10	5	5			

Budget/Financial	Impact	Importance	Possible Next Steps	Action Taken by Efficiency and Opportunity Committee	Date of Action
10.1	8	4	Policy changes in process and should be approved by SBHE at the March 2023 meeting		

8.2	6	2	NDCC 54-44-40.6 governs what can be done with surplus and so the law would need to be changed by the legislature.		
10.12	5.5	2	Refer to Admin Affairs in collaboration with legal to determine legality of request - is this request governed by NDCC?		

Academic Affairs	Impact	Importance	Possible Next Steps	Action Taken by Efficiency and Opportunity Committee	Date of Action
8.1	9	2	This policy is in the process of being changed.		

Procurement	Impact	Importance	Possible Next Steps	Action Taken by Efficiency and Opportunity Committee	Date of Action
9.2					

## Efficiency and Opportunity Survey with Campus Inputs

Submission Deadline: January 26, 2023

Updated April 10, 2023

### Priorities Reviewed and Acted On:

#### Priority 1:

<b>INPUT 1.1</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
Campus Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
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.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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.
<b>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)?</b>
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.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
No. Audit activities appear to be generated on an ad hoc basis and scheduled at the discretion of the audit personnel of the NDUS, or in response to requests from the SBHE itself or from legislative groups. Annual scheduling of audit activities would also allow the SBHE to make adjustments to its strategic plan that is typically amended each year at the June meeting.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
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.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
SBHE, audit subcommittee, NDUS auditors, CFO working group, and campus presidents (or designated representatives).
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
No fiscal impact
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
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.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
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.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
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.

<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
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.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>
Implementing an audit calendar with a focus on annual planning is of primary interest to our institution.

<b>INPUT 1.3</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
Campus Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
All employees are required to complete the state Fraud, Theft, Waste, and Code of Conduct Training. Though I understand the importance of this training, some may be required to take this training more than one time in a given year because of when they start. I believe this is partially a campus issue, but not certain who sets the timeline parameters for completion.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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?
<b>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)?</b>
I do not believe this is Century Code directed.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Campuses must reach 100% completion to stay in compliance.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
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.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
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.
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
None Known
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
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.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Faculty, staff, and institutions are the most benefitted by saving time and duplication.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
Not sure there are implications assuming all employees are required to take the trainings and affirm they understand the content.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>

None significantly known
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.

<b>INPUT 1.4</b>
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, trial 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.

<b>INPUT 1.5</b>
Who does this efficiency impact?
Campus Level

<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
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.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Simplified administration of departmental budgets. More accurate allocations of resources. Fairer distribution of budgets between academic departments.
<b>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)?</b>
Change in Board policy to again allow course fees.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
No.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
The Board would need to reverse its guidance.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
The SBHE.
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Zero.
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Immediately.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Campus departments and administrators.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
Insignificant negative impacts.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Zero.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>
TBD - Lease reporting reductions TBD - Modification to Anti-gifting NDCC to allow student clubs accounts -or- allow students to use funds on university general ledger for fund-raising/donation and altruistic purposes that is prohibited under new legal interpretations. 75 - Background Checks modifications 149 - Online security Requests 109, 155, 147, 161, 169, etc. - Centralized I.T. Services don't work well for all the reasons already stated in those submissions. Other states have better overall systems in a decentralized environment. Good data structures were not always developed correctly during the initial Peoplesoft implementation and persist to this day. Common Vanilla systems don't serve the institutions and management well and have resulted in many of inefficient shadow databases that require substantial effort to keep in sync. 170 - SAAG reporting issues

<b>Input 1.6</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
System Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Changes in State Board of Higher Education member selection when an incumbent is running for their second term.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
More timely action, save time on selection, and keep institutional knowledge on the Board.
<b>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)?</b>
Change of constitution and current practice.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Article VIII of the North Dakota Constitution
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
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.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
Legislature, citizens
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
None
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
More than one year for voting process to take place.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Government committees for selection, governor's office, Board. Reduce time and effort for NDUS and Governor's Office to reappoint an incumbent board member.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
None
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
None
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>
10

<b>INPUT 1.7</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
Campus Level



<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
We need a change allowing graduating dual credit seniors to register for degree-seeking courses without completing another application.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Improved efficiency in student recruitment and registration.
<b>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)?</b>
policy or procedure
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
admission policy 411
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Changes to IT systems and policy and procedure
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
CTS, NDUS, SBHE
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
No additional budget
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
6 to 12 months
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
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.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
Nobody would be negatively impacted
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Improved in-state enrollment of North Dakotans.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>
Yes

<b>INPUT 1.8</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
Campus Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Create a uniform goals submission process that works best with both campus and system workflow and doesn't create additional workload for campuses. SPOL is not intuitive to use and very cumbersome. It wastes several hours of time for multiple staff when submitting goals and the again when reporting on them.

What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?
Create a more timely process for goals to eliminate unnecessary workload for campuses.
Would you classify the efficiency/opportunity as a change to century code, change to policy/procedure, change in current practice, or other (if other, please be specific)?
Current practice
Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?
no
What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?
System goals would be available prior to institutional goal creation.
Who would need to be involved?
NDUS staff
What would be the estimated transition costs?
none
What would be the estimated timeline for completion?
immediately
Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?
Institutions and therefore ND Taxpayers. The benefit would be eliminating the double effort of preparing goals and changing them when the NDUS goals are sent out.
Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?
N/A
Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?
More efficient
Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.
<p>Procurement Item #106 – Agree with raising the thresholds for procurement.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Procurement Item #131 – Agree with only posting bid openings on the website to save on advertising.</p> <p>AG – Referred Item #170 – Agree with minimizing these monthly SAAG reports.</p>

## Priority 2:

<b>INPUT 2.1</b>
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.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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.
<b>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)?</b>
None
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
None
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
The creation of a financial dashboard for each of the institutions by NDUS/CTS.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
Campus Finance Personnel, NDUS and CTS
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Any labor cost to create the dashboard would be minimal compared to the amount of time it would save the institutions.
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
FY2024
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
All institutions and their employees who have financial responsibility for any aspect of the operation.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
N/A
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Any labor cost to create the dashboard would be minimal compared to the amount of time it would save the institutions.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>
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.

<b>INPUT 2.3</b>
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:

<b>INPUT 3.1</b>
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:
<p>PeopleSoft information system challenges for Financial Aid compliance and functionality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>

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

<b>INPUT 3.2</b>
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.

<b>Input 3.4 (formerly X.9)</b>
Who does this efficiency impact?

<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
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 its jurisdiction, so that UND can manage its own fleet.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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.
<b>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)?</b>
It is my understanding that a UND exception can be granted by the Governor's appointee who oversees the DOT and Fleet Services.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Yes, see above.
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Century Code change or an exception granted to NDUS or UND from the Governor's appointee who oversees the DOT and Fleet Services.
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
Governor and Secretary over DOT and State Fleet Services.
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
\$200K-\$400K in annual costs savings/new revenue for UND.
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
Probably best for UND and State Fleet Services to transition from State Fleet vehicles over three years.
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
The cost savings and improved services would benefit students, staff, faculty and ND taxpayers.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
No one would be negatively impacted.
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
\$200K-\$400K in annual cost savings and new revenue for UND.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>

#### Priority 4:

<b>Input 4.4 (formerly X.6)</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>



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.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
Dramatic reduction of duplication of effort required by each unit developing and promulgating its own policies and procedures.
<b>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)?</b>
Change in policy/procedure development process.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
No
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
SBHE, NDUS, and campus policy changes
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
SBHE, NDUS Office, and all campuses
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
Unknown
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Reduction of faculty and staff duplication of efforts.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
None.
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>

## Priority 6:

<b>INPUT 6.2</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
Campus Level
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Authorization forms with multiple signature needs
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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.

## Priority 7:

<b>INPUT 7.1</b>
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

<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Change the NDUS policy/procedure for Capital Projects
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>
NDUS and SBHE
<b>What would be the estimated transition costs?</b>
None
<b>What would be the estimated timeline for completion?</b>
As soon as the policy is updated
<b>Who may positively benefit from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the benefit?</b>
Campus - capital projects would be submitted and approved by the SBHE one time.
<b>Who may be impacted negatively from this change (students, staff, faculty, North Dakota citizens, North Dakota taxpayers) and what would be the impact?</b>
No one - projects would still be reviewed and approved by the SBHE
<b>Is there a fiscal impact to making this change, either in cost savings or additional expenses?</b>
Time savings
<b>Upon reviewing the attached red tape reduction list, identify the priorities you agree with that should have immediate attention.</b>
Items 3, 4, 6, 97, 109, 110, 118, 139, 140, 145, 155, 160, 161, 169

<b>Input 7.2 (formerly X.7)</b>
<b>Who does this efficiency impact?</b>
<b>Briefly identify and describe the efficiency/opportunity within the NDUS that can be addressed by the State Board of Higher Education:</b>
Return the control of the university's Office of General Counsel to the university.
<b>What internal and/or external improvements would be realized (i.e., removal of duplication of efforts, more timely action, reduced cost, etc)?</b>
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.
<b>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)?</b>
Yes, it is my understanding that a change to the century code would be required.
<b>Is there a current law, regulation, policy, or procedure that regulates or relates to this item?</b>
Yes
<b>What steps would be needed to implement this proposed efficiency/opportunity?</b>
Change in the law Change in the employment status of the lawyers involved Promulgation of unit operating policies and procedures
<b>Who would need to be involved?</b>

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, policies 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:

<b>Input 10.11 (formerly X.5)</b>
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:
<p>#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 &amp; 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.</p>
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.