Administrative Affairs Council Retreat Minutes
August 5, 2014 – 12:00 noon-5:00 PM
August 6, 2014 – 8:00 AM-12:00 noon
Minot State University - Student Center Building, Fisher Room- NDUS

Participants
Tamara Barber – BSC
Kara Bowen – DCB
Mark Lowe – DSU
Corry Kenner and Joann Kitchens (via telephone) – LRSC
Steve Bensen – MaSU
Dennis Gladden and Keith Johnson (via telephone) – NDSCS
Bruce Bollinger (via telephone) – NDSU
Alice Brekke and Peggy Lucke (Peggy via telephone) – UND
Brian Foisy – MiSU
Doug Dawes – VCSU
Laurie Furuseth – WSC
Laura Glatt, Cathy McDonald, Robin Putnam, Mick Pytlik, Rick Tonder, Teri Thorsen and Terry Meyer (via telephone) – NDUS Office

Ms. Glatt called the meeting to order. She said two items were added to the agenda and asked the group if they had any more to add. There were none. The two items added by Ms. Glatt are:
1. P-cards
2. Future retreat schedule

Identify Fiscal Institutional Dashboards/Demo
Ms. Glatt reported that CTS has developed a new dashboard tool as a demonstration project. The chancellor has encouraged an online dashboard for use by the SBHE, but also the general public to gauge performance. The Chancellor has been very clear that, as the Board works its way now through the strategic plan, each of those goals will have a specific metric around it describing what the target is, what’s the benchmark, how are we going to measure it. The intent is that those metrics would feed the dashboard - the dashboard will measure how we are tracking against our strategic plan. Ms. Glatt stressed that the dashboard contents are in draft form and subject to change. Admin. Affairs Council will need to be involved in the development of appropriate fiscal dashboards.

Ms. Madhavi Marasinghe gave a presentation on the functionality of the web-based software, used for the dashboards. The data comes from multiple sources, such as PeopleSoft, Campus Solutions, IPEDS, Hobsons, etc. Ms. Glatt noted that while Chancellor Skogen is anxious to get the external dashboard live, there are also internal dashboard tools available. For example, the last two screens demonstrated (receivables and retention - impact on revenue) were developed recently by UND. According to Ms. Marasinghe, when UND people arrive at the dashboard, they
will see UND data, when BSC logs onto it, they will see BSC data, etc. Ms. Glatt said it would be helpful for all campuses to know what is available. Ms. Marasinghe said they create queries that all campuses can access and use their own data to generate the report. Ms. Glatt encouraged everyone to know what reports the other campuses are developing to avoid duplication of work.

When asked if the iDashboard license is for UND or the entire system, Ms. Marasinghe replied that it is just for UND at this time. She added that they are working with the company to see what licensing options we have. The basic cost to UND was approximately $35,000, which came with ten builder licenses and ten user licenses. Each user license is about $650 and then there is the 20% maintenance. Ms. Brekke said a lot of the focus has been internally so that people will have access to make real-time data-driven decisions.

Ms. Glatt referred to the AGB article that was distributed with the agenda materials “The Most Common Performance Indicators for Institutions and Their Boards.” She said that while we do not have to follow the examples identified in this article, she hopes they will generate some ideas and discussion about appropriate “fiscal” dashboards, but also help to replace some or all of the current semi-annual budget reporting.

Ms. Barber suggested some of the metrics from the annual financial statement MD&A may be appropriate for the dashboard. Ms. Glatt agreed, and said this would complement the CFI information. It was suggested that LarsenAllen provided some financial dashboards information in their last training. This might be helpful to review.

It was agreed that the focus should be on the CFI. Ms. Glatt said on the first draft of the strategic plan from the past week, the financial goals or objectives that she recalls are: tuition and fee rates, housing costs, encouraging the use of open textbooks to help reduce costs, reducing student debt, financial aid, etc. Ms. Glatt asked the group if they feel this will give a fair idea of the financial health of our institutions, or should the dashboard include the condition of our facilities, the size of our plant, the cost of the plant, etc., those types of factors that are also important for decision makers to know and understand. She said she feels the dashboard should highlight not only strategic plan goals progress, but also financial health information. Ms. Brekke said she feels we should first determine what questions we are trying to answer with the dashboard. Are they commonly asked questions, are those questions coming from legislative bodies and/or by the media, and where do we want to steer them? Once we know the questions, this should help us prepare the dashboard to provide the information most requested and not get so many factors involved that it loses its value. Ms. Glatt sees it more as showing constituents what we think is important to demonstrate progress and/or demonstrate financial health/position not as a repository for information, although that may be in another logical place.

Ms. Glatt said she will keep everyone up to date on any developments in the fiscal institutional dashboards. In addition to what comes out of the strategic plan, Ms. Glatt expressed her belief
that adding CFI as an overall indicator of health makes good sense. Further, she said a draft of fiscal dashboards and other measures will be drafted for continued discussion with the Council.

**Discuss Roles and Membership of Various User/Working Groups and Relationships to Councils and System Office**

Ms. Brekke noted concerns about several issues:
- Reports and information generated and provided centrally, without validation by campuses
- Potential inconsistencies in data among and between campuses
- Including the correct “expert” individuals (functional and level) in review of data, issues, policies, etc.
- Communication (or lack thereof) between functional areas

Ms. Glatt added that one of the things that is being worked on now, which may help, is Sharepoint, which is used to share information between NDUS campuses and the system office. This single repository may help expedite the vetting process, and with proper access, multiple people can view the data.

1. Data requests
2. Putting together a work group to tackle a particular question or problem
3. Development work being done to add new functionality or to change functionality, of existing function

Everyone agreed that structures and responsibilities vary from campus to campus, and it is important for all to help facilitate sharing of information both at the System and campus levels.

Ms. Glatt said that both academic affairs and student affairs councils have started to meet jointly, on occasion. Ms. Glatt asked if there was any interest from this group to meet with one or the other of those councils on a regular basis. The Council suggested that only as needed to address particular issues that cross functional areas.

**Discuss Opportunities for Shared Services**

Ms. Glatt said that Chancellor Dr. Skogen has asked the Cabinet to look at how we deliver payroll services across the NDUS and if there are some different options for how we deliver them. In addition to ACA implications, the chancellor realizes that we can’t expect to have the level of expertise in every one of these business units and has asked how we can better share knowledge and resources throughout the system. President Bresciani was asked to chair the review, which will consist of campus payroll, human resource staff and CTS. This group is to have their report and recommendations completed by November 2014. Based upon the chancellor’s comments and the discussion which took place at last week’s SBHE meeting, one of the goals on the Board’s strategic plan is that we behave more like a unified system. In that discussion, there were a couple of things that emerged:

1. Speaking with a unified voice.
2. Looking at the way we do business differently, especially as it relates to administrative functions, to become more efficient and streamlined.
In the near future, board member Don Morton will be presenting on how Microsoft streamlines their payroll services (all of Microsoft’s payroll is run through Fargo, North Dakota). Ms. Glatt said whether we end up using that same model, they are very clear about the need for streamlined services in their strategic plan. This doesn’t mean that the shared services will be centralized at the System Office, as there is a great deal of skill & expertise at the campus level. There are a number of things that will be considered when developing these shared services, such as what the issue is, what the service is, where does it make the most sense, what are the ramifications for placing it ‘here’ vs. ‘there’, etc. It’s no secret that Williston State College is having a difficult time retaining people because of the economy in that area. President Nadolny has been asking for quite some time for assistance, as a result. For example, their financial aid director recently resigned after one month, leaving no one in the financial aid office.

Payroll will be the first issue that is addressed but it is important for this group to determine where the next logical opportunities for exploration may be. Mr. Gladden suggested we set up a few pilot projects with the larger campuses doing some of the smaller schools’ processes.

Ms. Brekke said there are other systems in the United States who have already moved in this direction, and she said there is some information available that begins to get to what are some of the criteria should be looking at as we are considering the model we want to utilize. She said UND belongs to a research organization “Education Advisory Board” who has done a lot of research in this area, looking at what works, what doesn’t’ work, and the explanations of why or why not. Ms. Brekke said she hopes that before we make any decisions, we take a little bit of time to review what others have already done and learn from them.

It was asked if it is the view of the Board that this leads to saving money or is it doing things more efficiently, doing things better? Is there the assumption that if we move payroll somewhere else that we are going to eliminate the payroll person at these smaller campuses, because that may not be the case. Ms. Glatt said she thinks it is both - efficiency in terms of cost-saving but also effectiveness and reducing risk.

In response to a question from Ms. Barber, Ms. Glatt will send a list of the members of the committee chaired by President Bresciani to review opportunities for payroll shared services. Ms. Glatt reiterated that the Board is committed to this issue and although they have not drawn any conclusions about what will or will not work, expect review and progress.

In response to Ms. Glatt’s request for suggested opportunities for shared services, the following ideas were expressed:

1. Payroll
2. Accounts receivable/collections/student loan service center (Ms. Glatt said this is an activity that can be outsourced to a third party, as well, if necessary.)
3. Information technology/shared hardware
4. Capital projects management
5. Building monitoring
Ms. Brekke explained the shared service center that UND has started to develop. They began to ramp up UND’s “business service center.” Recognizing that we have a fair number of small departments and it doesn’t make sense for each department’s administrative support to have the whole range of skills to be doing the administrative support, the financial duties, etc. Ms. Brekke said they put together a group, worked with the department and identified a core set of services that group would provide and then identified to whom these services are going to be provided in the initial roll out, so it included everything within finance and operations, IT groups (before this was outsourced to the System group and co-located with CTS). Now they are layering some of the “orphan” tasks/responsibilities. For example, when the support person for the international program department left, they didn’t replace that person. Rather, the service center has that capacity and is now absorbing that. So, as UND works with the staff at WSC, part of what they will start with, according to Ms. Brekke, is ‘here is a group that can already do all of these core services’ and how might that work and how does that support what Williston needs. We also have a separate arrangement with CTS for some payroll services provided, as well.

Identify Potential 2015 Legislation
Ms. Glatt said recommendations for potential legislation to be introduced by the SBHE, must be filed by December 3 or 4, 2014. We have until the October 15 Cabinet meeting to get proposed legislation to the Cabinet for review.

Ms. Brekke said she remembers something being distributed last January relative to offsets of North Dakota individual income tax refunds for balances owed by students. The NDUS, not the Tax Department, would have to initiate such legislation. It was considered last cycle, but too late to meet the bill introduction deadline. Ms. Glatt said we would want to consult the Tax Department. It was suggested that we pursue this legislative change.

Ms. Brekke said the specific powers and duties of the State Board of Higher Education, as outlined in North Dakota Century Code, spell out the Board’s authority to authorize the employment of law enforcement officers and concurrent jurisdictions. There has been some question recently regarding whether current Century Code language is actually reflective of what’s currently happening in the 11 institutions across the state.

A question was raised about whether student residency laws should be re-visited regarding audit concerns on documentation for residency. This will be discussed later on the agenda.

It was suggested by the Council that we pursue legislative changes for:
1. Offsets of North Dakota individual income tax refunds to collect money owed by students
2. Century Code language regarding the Board’s authority to authorize the employment of law enforcement officers and concurrent jurisdictions.
3. (Possibly) Determination of residency for tuition purposes

Ms. Glatt asked Mr. Tonder about recommendations in the Paulien master plan report which may necessitate statutory changes. Mr. Tonder said not at this time, but perhaps some are identified later as implementation plans are developed. There was some discussion about recommending a minimum dollar threshold for projects of any type that would not require legislative or Budget Section approval, including change in amount and scope. Or perhaps changes of a certain scope/amount do not require legislative approval. Consider increasing the current gift/grant $385,000 limit to something higher.

Ms. Hegstad said NDSU would like to have an option to charge all graduate assistants the resident rate. She questioned whether changes in NDCC would be required to necessitate this change or not. This is similar to how all other NDUS employees and their spouse dependents are charged the resident tuition rate.

Ms. Glatt asked for any other thoughts related to legislation. There were none. Ms. Glatt asked if there would be interest in creating a small group to work with Mr. Tonder regarding what approach we want to take and come up with some drafts and if so, is there anyone that wants to volunteer to work on that with him. It was suggested that Mike Ellingson, NDSU; Dallas Fossum, NDSCS; and Mark Johnson, UND, work with Mr. Tonder. Ms. Glatt said any proposals that come from this work group will be brought to the Council for consideration.

Ms. Glatt said she will follow up with the Tax Department and she will visit with Mr. Sagsveen regarding the law enforcement issue.

Regarding the residency issues, Ms. Glatt said those will likely feed into the discussion and work group we will discuss later on the agenda.

**Discuss Facility Master Plan Recommendations**

Ms. Glatt said the SBHE recently received the Paulien Report and asked Mr. Tonder to bring them an implementation plan for consideration by October 2014. Mr. Tonder said the implementation of these recommendations hinges on the formulation of the NDUS strategic plan. As Paulien pointed out, master planning is really a result of strategic planning, and they also indicated that master planning falls in between strategic planning and capital planning.

Under the “institution master plan process” section of the summary, one of the key components of master planning is to establish a data-driven process for evaluating projects that includes information on space inventory and space utilization. These are two things that Mr. Tonder believes the legislature is going to expect from the NDUS, in terms of data: 1. Full understanding of our deferred maintenance, and 2. subsequent space utilization. How well do
we use our space and how much space do we have? Mr. Tonder said that at the last interim higher education committee meeting, there was some expectation that this master plan would have had a more thorough space utilization study. The biggest challenge, is that we do not have a consistent way of identifying classroom utilization, types of classes and types of delivery methods and how that might affect the classroom needs at each institution.

Mr. Tonder said he asked the consultant to come up with a plan that would allow us to make recommendations in the enrollment process in terms of using PeopleSoft so the data is consistent throughout each campus. Even if you may use different sets of data, the data will be consistent so that we can cull from that the information needed for space utilization.

He said the NDUS budget request also included $750,000 to continue the inventory of deferred maintenance, and to continue to update master plan and space utilization information. In response to a question from Ms. Glatt, Mr. Tonder said the VFA team will be back to look at the other 75% of the facilities and do the same evaluation. In response to a question from Mr. Bensen, Mr. Tonder said it would be just class I and II buildings. Mr. Bollinger asked if they were going to look at underground items, such as sewer systems. Mr. Tonder said multiple institutions have asbestos or some other type of hazard mitigation issue and they typically don’t get into a lot of these details since a lot of that is hidden. They’ll base it on age of buildings and they have a multiplier that is used for hazardous material abatement. The only campus that had a detailed infrastructure report was NDSCS.

Ms. Glatt said one thing she’s heard from numerous legislators, including at the last interim higher education committee meeting, is “we aren’t funding any projects until we know space utilization.” She asked Mr. Tonder what the timeline is for having the space utilization study completed and whether it is possible to have it done prior to the start of the 2015 Legislative Session. Mr. Tonder said we will have a recommendation on how we can remedy the situation prior to the session; however, we will not have all of the information by then. Ms. Glatt then asked if there is anything that can be done in the short term that will provide the legislature with some comfort or some data in the meantime. Mr. Tonder said deferred maintenance should be the big issue this session and we do have comprehensive information for that piece. In addition, there are projects tied to accreditation needs.

In response to a question about whether the academic side will be engaged in the space utilization study discussion, Mr. Tonder said the consultant’s experience in higher education should be helpful in providing business best practices. Mr. Tonder went on to say that establishing design standards, not specifications, will also be helpful long term.

With regard to the recommendation to “revise the 6-year planning schedule,” Mr. Tonder said it is important to ensure we deal with master planning in the initial year, followed by capital planning. The master plan defines how we’re going to get where we need to go, based on strategic planning. Capital planning is the development of those projects and development of
those budgets so that they fit the master plan. Mr. Tonder said those are some of the more concrete recommendations that came from the consultant.

Mr. Tonder said this group could expect to see a detailed implementation plan draft from him by September 1, 2014. That will give this group opportunity to vet the report before it is presented to the board. Ms. Glatt said she believes Chancellor Skogen intends to sort capital projects for priorities into different buckets. She’s not sure how many buckets he’s going to have but she believes there will be at least the following groups:

1. Health/safety bucket
2. Deferred maintenance
3. Program and accreditation needs
4. Others

She added that she feels there will be two or three different lists of capital project priorities, each with their own priority order. Mr. Tonder reminded that the master plan also points to an extraordinarily high probability of up to 20,000 in increased enrollment over the coming years. How does that bear on space utilization and the existing facilities we have? Mr. Tonder said from the campus perspective, if your strategy is that you’re going to move more toward online enrollment versus on-site enrollment, you have to make decisions on the types of facilities that you need for the future.

**Review code of conduct**

The Council reviewed the code of conduct.

**Discuss 2013-15 Performance Funding**

Ms. Glatt provided an update on performance funding. She said that after some earlier consideration to possibly use the funding for Predictive Analytic Reporting (PAR), the Chancellor has directed the funding be allocated based on three measures previously approved by the SBHE--two measures about retention and the one about completion. Ms. Glatt said that a committee had been discussing models around these three measures, but has not developed a recommended approach to date. Due to her time constraints involved in ACA implementation, she asked if any Council members would like to assist with developing proposed allocation models.

**State Employee Tuition Waiver**

Ms. Glatt sent the revised SBHE Policy 820, Tuition Waivers, with the agenda materials. She said many operational and policy questions have emerged. First, is a question about whether individual institutions are able to indicate that no funding is available for the 50% employer payment, due to budget constraints. Ms. Glatt said that while the policy permits institutions to adopt implementing procedures, providing no funding would not be consistent with the spirit of the policy. The second issue is whether there any other consistent procedures about who is eligible, what will be paid, etc. Consistency across the NDUS will help eliminate confusion and frustration. The third issue relates to the fees, which got very complex when money is now passing between institutions.
Ms. Barber said that at BSC, the supervisor does have to approve the class the employee wishes to take to be sure it is something that will be helpful to the job they are performing or the needs of the organization. Mr. Foisy said he supports this position, especially for those courses where the employing campus is incurring a cost. Ms. Glatt said the state staff senate has discussed this issue and one of the examples they have brought up is the janitorial or trade technical staff who are required to be on the job 8:00-5:00, they can’t leave their position to go take an on-campus course. For them, the online availability is a really big issue. Also, the courses they are taking and the degree they are working toward will not likely be one in the janitorial (or other trade technical staff) field.

Ms. Glatt asked whether the course needs to be part of a degree plan and should it be approved by the employee’s supervisor. What about satisfactory completion of the course? It was pointed out that payment contingent upon successful completion will be challenging since it would require payment to wait until the end of the term. It was suggested consideration be given to the requirement that if the employee is unable to obtain acceptable grade, they will not be able to take it again through waiver or employer payment. Mr. Foisy asked if these limitations would apply to just the online courses or for all courses, including those taught online and on campus. Ms. Glatt said she’s assuming this is based on the new policy provisions (courses on a campus other than the employing institution) because under the prior policy, there were no restrictions; however, that is not to suggest we can’t consider similar requirements for both.

Following a discussion about possible methodologies for setting an appropriate “budget” for tuition payments under the policy, it was decided to let each campus determine their own budget.

There was still confusion expressed about whether under the new policy an employing institution pays 50% of tuition taken elsewhere, regardless of delivery type. Mr. Foisy asked whether the current employee waiver is portable. Ms. Glatt said that was her understanding. She said the reason for the proposed change is to cover online courses. Mr. Foisy said, if your employee is willing to be there physically they can take a course anywhere within the boundaries of this state with a 100% waiver. Ms. Glatt said one thing we will need to be careful about is that we understand any changes that may impact something employees already have access to or make any adjustments through a transition plan. Mr. Kenner said MaSU offers a couple of programs through IVN at LRSC. They currently waive the tuition for those students but now under the new policy, those students are going to have to pay for half of their course and LRSC will have to pay half, essentially reducing the employee benefit. Mr. Bensen said any higher ed employee that takes a class at MaSU presently is getting the tuition waived, regardless of the delivery method. Ms. Glatt said there is nothing in the policy preventing an institution from going beyond the minimum requirement of the policy. It was agreed that clarification is needed on section 3(b).
Regarding fees, Ms. Glatt summed up the discussion with this statement: If you’re on campus, taking on-campus courses from your own institution, you waive tuition and fees, except the mandatory fees. If it’s an online course, then the employing institution is only paying 50% of the tuition and none of the fee, and the employee pays 100% of fees and 50% of tuition.

Mr. Foisy suggested we consider an alternative approach to employee waivers wherein if his employees take classes on my campus in any way, shape or mechanism (IVN, classroom, technology, etc.), I’ll waive the tuition and the fees. If they go somewhere else, then I pay half the tuition, they pay half the tuition and they pay all of the fees. However, this may result in a reduction in benefit at some campuses, since some are currently providing more than required by policy. Ms. Glatt said that any changes will have to be considered for impact to current benefits and considered in any transition.

With regard to fees it was suggested that mandatory fees are not waived for anyone else, so they should not be waived for employees. Ms. Hegstad said NDSU is not interested in waiving fees for bond payments. Ms. Glatt pointed out that bond payments are blended into the college and university fee, which means we would have to prorate the college and university fee and this may get pretty messy. Most of Council members said they don’t want to deal with separating out the bond fees from the campus and university fee.

Ms. Glatt said work has been ongoing to outline operational items, including defining, coding, recording and reporting. This will be provided at a later date. She said they are also examining potential tax issues related to waivers and will consider suggested changes to the fundamental model discussed today. Any changes will have to be thoroughly discussed with faculty and staff before moving ahead.

**Discuss Common Audit Recommendations**

Ms. Glatt referred to the common audit recommendations and campus response matrix that was sent out with the agenda materials. This was created to provide a summary of audit recommendations that were common to nearly every campus. She said the internal control and compliance audit was not completed at three institutions this year, but those will be done next year.

Regarding, “inadequate controls for waiver adjustments to student accounts,” the controllers and student finance group will be examining this issue and will bring back a recommendation to this group.

Ms. Glatt said regarding the audit recommendation related to student residency determination and documentation, she visited with Dr. Cowen about addressing this issue through the Admissions group. However, Dr. Cowen suggested it should be addressed by the Admin. Affairs Council. The Council members pointed out that the initial application is processed by the admissions office and it is the consensus of the Council that the academic group needs to address this issue. Mr. Bollinger said he’d be happy to come up with the criteria for NDSU and then provide that criteria to the admissions group for processing. Ms. Brekke asked if the
expectation is that we come up with a common standard. Ms. Glatt said yes, to the maximum extent possible. Ms. Brekke UND had looked at some alternative solutions, but wanted to wait for this discussion. It was pointed out that John Grettum suggested to the SBHE committee, as part of the presentation on the audit, if you’re going to use a driver’s license, it should be at least have been issued 12 months earlier.” Some campuses expressed concern about the volume of work and the staffing required to collect and keep the recommended documentation, etc. Ms. Hegstad said it’s important to keep in mind that this is not something that needs to be done with all ND residents. This would not apply to students who have been verified and approved for residency based on graduating from a ND high school. Ms. Hegstad asked if this had been discussed by the admissions user group. They aren’t necessarily part of an administrative affairs or academic affairs council, but there is an admissions user group that she feels would have a lot of valuable insight on this. Mary responded by saying that based on her discussions with their admissions staff, they have discussed this and every campus is kind of looking at it a little differently, and would each like to retain their own practice. She believes that direction will need to come from a higher level on consistency. Ms. Hegstad asked about NDUS legal counsel position.

**Update and discussion, as necessary, on Pathways Plan (Cathy made revisions to highlighted section on 10/2/2014)**

Ms. Glatt said the report submitted to the SBHE in June 2014 recommended a delayed implementation of the tuition model changes, until after the new admissions index is in place, so the impact on enrollments and revenues are better understood. Under the proposal, campuses would submit plans by March 1, 2015, with Fall 2017 as the final implementation date. Campuses could begin implementation as soon as Fall 2015. The Board took no action in June, but we anticipate they will act on the modified tuition model plan, as part of their strategic plan adoption in October. One of the recommended changes is that we move away from common rates within each tier. Ms. Glatt also reminded campuses of the need to engage their students in the process.

In response to a question, Ms. Glatt said the SBHE continues to be very adamant that the new strategic plan does not replace Pathways, so the Pathways Tuition model reference will be embedded in the new strategic plan. Ms. Glatt said the Chancellor’s goal, at the September 10, 2014 Cabinet meeting, is to spend the better part of that meeting going through the draft strategic plan. His intent is to send it out to the presidents in advance of the meeting for their review, as some decisions must be made at that time. Following that, the strategic plan must go to the SBHE for consideration and approval. Mr. Bollinger asked if NDSU will be able to make tuition model changes in Fall 2015. Ms. Glatt said she believes that if plans are submitted by March 1, 2015, and the SBHE takes those up on a timely basis, that yes, NDSU would be able to begin conversion in Fall 2015. Mr. Bollinger said another thing that this will affect is waivers and related audit issues. Ms. Glatt said that was one of the reasons the Auditor’s Office delayed doing the waiver performance audit. We have been delaying policy changes to coincide with the final tuition model changes. Ms. Glatt said the other challenge may be if the legislature imposes a tuition freeze next biennium. The new tuition model will impact rates for
nearly every student, due, at a minimum, to blending together tuition and fees. Other rate changes may be the result of load, course mix, delivery type, etc.

Ms. Glatt said that although the SBHE is likely to consider the recommended change to eliminate common rates within tiers, we still need to be sensitive to common programs across campuses. So at least think about those things as you are developing rates and having those conversations with your counterparts to see what they are proposing. Mr. Bollinger said he’d send Ms. Glatt a revised tuition model plan for NDSU and asked to seek Chancellor guidance on whether it meets the SBHE’s objectives, before they hold meetings with students on the proposed plan.

Update on SharePoint Project
Ms. McDonald said the NDUS Office has been engaged with CTS to develop an intranet website for the NDUS system office and CTS. She said there will be different portals, such as academic affairs, administrative affairs, etc. Ms. McDonald said initially the discussion was to have it in place by the legislative session, because we know we always have so many requests during the session.

At this time, they are developing the SharePoint site for use during the session to assist in gathering and review of data. Mr. Bollinger said they used SharePoint before and only certain people had access to this site and the ability to update the information. At that time, it was only the VP’s. Mr. Bollinger asked if they are going to open that up so that he can delegate an employee to input NDSU information when requested. Ms. McDonald replied that yes, that’s part of what workflow; however, that hasn’t yet been defined. Ms. Glatt noted that while access is important, we will also want to be sure that in the end, the VP has approved the submittal.

Other
Yesterday, Ms. McDonald sent some questions to this group that OMB has asked on the biennial budget request. Ms. Glatt and Ms. McDonald will be answering the first 7-8 of those questions and the rest of them are to be completed by campus personnel. Ms. Glatt said she emailed a draft response to a couple of those questions on campus security and continuity of operations to the list serve. She asked if anyone has any questions on those.

In response to a question, Ms. McDonald said responses are due August 25. Ms. Glatt asked if anyone had any concerns on responses regarding the campus security or continuity of operations. There were none expressed.

Ms. Glatt said she wants to talk about the timing of the Administrative Affairs Council retreat recognizing that summers are equally as busy. Ms. Glatt said she will continue to try to find a window in the summer—June, July or August—when most council representatives can be available.

P-Cards
Mr. Foisy said Dr. Shirley asked him why MiSU doesn’t allow travel expenses on the p-card. VCSU, on the other hand, puts as much as they can on the p-card. Responses indicated that most campuses allow motel room charges, but not meals. Lodging and air fare are the only travel-related expenses that most institutions typically allow to be charged to the p-card, and they have a policy that if they charged anything over & above the state-allotted rate, the employee is responsible for reimbursing the campus. Someone said that if after two times they can’t collect from them, they pull the p-card. Mr. Foisy said they have discussed moving toward allowing travel expenses on the p-cards but asked if it was possible to have the employee sign something at the time they are issued the card that if you charge something over & above the state rate limits, that amount will be deducted from your next paycheck. Mr. Pytlik said OMB has a form out there already and they are the master-holder of the p-card program. The form says “improper use of this card can be considered misappropriation of state funds. This may result in cancelation of procurement card, reimbursement to the state for improper use, disciplinary action up to and including termination and possible criminal charges.” It may not be sufficient to permit a garnishment on their paycheck. It was the consensus to pursue the possibility of adding standard language to permit garnishments for overpayment; however, this will have to be reviewed with legal first.

NDSU has an issue with international travel on the p-card but Mr. Bollinger said he’d prefer to withhold any comments until they hold scheduled meetings with OMB. They are trying to work out a process by which employees could pay for international travel using credit cards, whether that be J.P. Morgan or another vendor. Mr. Bollinger will share what they find out after their meeting with OMB, etc.

Meeting adjourned.