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Services to be Performed by Craig Munier, Consultant, January 2012
(Section 1.1 of the Consultant Agreement)

Craig Munier conducted a review, in partnership with the University of North Dakota - Division of Student Affairs, of the Student Financial Aid Office (SFAO). The campus visit occurred on Monday and Tuesday, January 30 – 31, 2012. The purpose of the review was to provide an external assessment of the university’s current SFAO. This review was commissioned by the University of North Dakota and was overseen by Dr. Lori Reesor, Vice President for Student Affairs.

Services to be performed included the following: Conduct a program review of the SFAO at the University of North Dakota. Provide a final written report which identifies the strengths of office practices as well as recommendations for improved efficiencies and effectiveness. The program review should include:

1. Review organizational structure of the Student Financial Aid Office and recommendations for staffing.


3. Review Title IV disbursements, institutional eligibility, and financial aid policies and procedures.

4. Assess scholarship management, coordination, and processes to assure maximization of funds and recruitment strategies.

5. Provide feedback on collaborative efforts with key campus partners:
   a. Admissions
   b. Enrollment Services
   c. Student Account Services
   d. Registrar’s Office
   e. Colleges/Departments
   f. Athletics
   g. Alumni Association/Foundation
   h. Other departments in Student Affairs

6. Review of communication and relationships with students.

7. Provide feedback on space considerations.

8. Review of student employment management.

9. Other areas as deemed appropriate by consultant.

Prepared by Craig D. Munier
Consultant
February 3, 2012
Pre-visit Preparation

In anticipation of the visit the following materials and website information were requested and thoroughly reviewed. Sincere appreciation to staff in both the SFAO and Dr. Reesor’s office for their efforts in compiling these materials. It was helpful in making the best use of time during the brief, two-day visit to campus.

Advance Materials: SFAO, Student Affairs and University organizational charts (with proposed changes if available, incorporating in the Enrollment Management position and/or other modifications).

- List of SFAO positions with titles and brief description of major/primary job responsibilities.
- Current SFAO operating budget.
- Detailed Financial Aid summary report including number of students and dollars received from the following sources for most recent completed year available:
  
  - Federal Pell Grant
  - Federal SEOG
  - Federal Work Study
  - Federal Perkins Loans
  - Federal Stafford - Subsidized
  - Federal Stafford - Unsubsidized
  - Federal PLUS - Parents
  - Federal Grad PLUS
  - State Grants
  - Institutional Need-based Grants
  - Institutional Scholarships (break out athletics from other performance or achievement based awards if possible) can include both endowed funds and tuition remissions/forgone revenue/tuition waivers
  - Waivers for reciprocity agreements, etc.
  - Institutional loans (if applicable)
  - Outside Scholarships (i.e. private, external scholarships not controlled by the institution)

- Enrollment statistics including breakdown of undergraduate, graduate/professional, resident/nonresident, ethnicity, gender, etc.
- Detailed Cost of Attendance figures for 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 (i.e. tuition, fees, room, board, books/supplies, and personal expenses used to award federal financial aid)
- Copy of most recent FISAP report
- Average loan debt for UND students
- Packaging examples
Schedule
Craig Munier, Financial Aid Consultant
January 30-31, February 1, 2012

January 30, 2012

10:38 a.m. Arrive at Grand Forks Airport (Delta Flight #4824)
Lisa Burger will pick Craig up and take to Canad Inns
Lisa Cell (701) 740-2705

11:30 a.m.-12:30 Lunch and meeting with Lori Reesor and Lisa Burger to review schedule
(ND Museum of Art Conference Room)

Twamley 305

12:30-1:30 p.m. Robin Holden, SFA Director

1:30-2:30 p.m. SFA Team Leads
Attending:
Bruce Helgerud, Financial Aid Administrator
Angela Osborn, Financial Aid Administrator
Rohit Kulkarni, Financial Aid Systems Administrator
Kellie Choate, Financial Aid Systems Specialist
Kristen Jezek, Financial Aid Advisor
Jennifer Duffy, Financial Aid Advisor

2:30-3:30 p.m. SFA Scholarship Team
Attending:
Kristen Jezek, Financial Aid Advisor
Angela Osborn, Financial Aid Administrator
Kristen Paul, Financial Aid Associate
Sue Schostag, Administrative Assistant

3:30-4:30 p.m. SFA Professional Staff
Attending:
Bruce Helgerud, Financial Aid Administrator
Angela Osborn, Financial Aid Administrator
Rohit Kulkarni, Financial Aid Systems Administrator
Kellie Choate, Financial Aid Systems Specialist
Kristen Jezek, Financial Aid Advisor
Jennifer Duffy, Financial Aid Advisor
Christina Hutchison, Financial Aid Advisor
Josh Lindenber, Financial Aid Advisor
Jennifer Wolf, Financial Aid Systems Specialist
Loretta Prather, Financial Aid Advisor
Carol Anson, Veteran Services Advisor

4:30-5:30 p.m. **SFA Student Employment Team**  
Attending:  
Jennifer Duffy, Financial Aid Advisor  
Hanna Baker, Administrative Assistant  
Carolyn Keegan, Financial Aid Assistant

5:30 p.m.  
Bruce Helgerud will take Craig back to hotel

6:00 p.m.  
Dinner with Robin Holden, Kristen Jezek, Rohit Kulkarni, and Bruce Helgerud  
(l’Bistro, Canad Inns)

January 31, 2012

Breakfast on your own (Aalto’s, Canad Inns)

7:45 a.m.  
Bruce Helgerud will pick up from hotel and bring to Twamley Hall  
Bruce Cell (701) 330-8632

**Twamley 404**

8:00-9:00 a.m. **SFA Systems Staff**  
Attending:  
Rohit Kulkarni, Financial Aid Systems Administrator  
Kellie Choate, Financial Aid Systems Specialist

9:00-10:00 a.m. **SFA Customer Service Team**  
Attending:  
Angela Osborn, Financial Aid Administrator  
Loretta Prather, Financial Aid Advisor  
Jennifer Wolf, Financial Aid Systems Specialist  
Elaine Erickson, Customer Service Associate  
Mike Ullrich, Office Assistant  
Michon Gilbert, Office Assistant
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10:00-10:45 a.m.  
**Student Account Services**
Attending:
Peggy Lucke, Associate Vice President for Finance & Operations  
Sharon Loiland, Controller  
Lisa Hehre, Assistant Controller  
Matt Lukach, Student Account Relations Manager  

10:45-11:30 a.m.  
**Admissions and Enrollment Services Staff**
Attending:
Sue Sholes, Assistant Director, Enrollment Services  
Deb Melby, Director, Undergraduate Admissions  
Michele Carroll, Office Manager, Enrollment Services  
Kristi Okerlund, Family and Student Program Coordinator, Enrollment Services  
Adam Lundquist, Sr. Enrollment Services Representative/Design Specialist, Enrollment Services  
Casey Koop, Enrollment Service Representative, Enrollment Services  
Ashley Miller, Enrollment Services Representative, Enrollment Services  
Phil Irwin, Enrollment Services Representative, Enrollment Services  

11:30-12:15 p.m.  
**Lunch with students**
Attending:
Nate Elness  
Alexis Sherman  
Tommy Van Norman  
Tiffany Shiu  

12:30-1:30 p.m.  
Robin Holden, SFA Director  
Robin take Craig to Badlands Room  

**Memorial Union – Badlands Room**

1:45-2:30 p.m.  
**UND Foundation Staff**
Attending:
Laura Block, Associate Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer, Alumni Association and Foundation  
Stephanie Peterson, Associate Director of Finance, Alumni Association and Foundation  
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2:30-3:15 p.m. **Campus partners**
Attending:
Student Affairs Council Suzanne Anderson, Registrar
Ray Lagasse, Director, International Programs
Neva Hendrickson, Education Abroad Advisor, International Programs
Jane Sykes Wilson, Education Abroad Advisor, International Programs
Evan Nelson, Director of Graduate Admissions & Recruitment, Graduate School
Academic Areas

3:15-4:00 p.m. Prep Time

4:00-5:00 p.m. **Exit Briefing** with Lori Reesor, Lisa Burger, Robin Holden, and SFA Team Leads

5:00 p.m. Dinner with Lori Reesor and Lisa Burger

**February 1, 2012**

7:30 a.m. Hotel shuttle service will take Craig to Grand Forks Airport

9:00 a.m. Depart from Grand Forks Airport (Delta Flight #4575)
Financial Aid/Scholarship College/Department Contacts 2011-2012

College of Business and Public Administration
- Judy Janke
- Linda Duckstad

College of Arts and Sciences – Mike Meyer (he receives the information as far as how much each department has to offer in scholarships from Stephanie in the Alumni office)
  - Communication - Sharon Hensrud
  - Sociology - Bonnie Espelien
  - History - Gordon Iseminger

JDO School of Aerospace Sciences
- Josh Christianson

College of Education and Human Development
- Lori Pesch (Teaching & Learning)

College of Nursing – Becky Cournia
  - Nursing - Marlys Escobar
  - Social Work - Beverly Blegen

School of Medicine and Health Sciences
- Sandy Elshaug

School of Engineering and Mines
  - Cheryl Osowski (not able to attend)
  - Janet Honek,
  - Joel Ness,
  - Matthew Cavalli
Review Organizational Structure of Student Financial Aid and Recommendations for Staffing.

Observation: In reviewing the SFAO job descriptions and organizational chart, it was not clear how the office is organized. It appeared the Director may still be doing many of the duties that are typically assigned to an associate director level. There is a need to review position responsibilities and clarify supervisory roles and expectations. Some of the overlap in responsibilities is due to an effort on the part of staff to be thorough in specifying every duty and responsibility of each individual in the office, including their secondary or “back-up” roles. However, it also appeared that many of the SFAO staff has significant duties in both what could be referred to as “front office” and “back office” functions. Rarely are individuals strong in both areas, in which case it would appear that almost every member of the SFAO staff is performing major work tasks a good part of each day in areas that do not call on their individual strengths.

Recommendation: Conduct a major review of the office organization. Invite someone in to conduct a Myers Briggs personality inventory, Gallup StrengthsFinder or other assessment as an aid to determining how best to assign staff. Then create a much simpler organizational structure that emphasizes “customer service” or “processing” functions in a typical financial aid office. One such organizational structure might look like the following:

OFFICE OF SCHOLARSHIPS AND FINANCIAL AIDS

Assistant Director
Scholarships

Assistant Director
Client Services (Study Abroad Office Outreach)

Assistant Director
Processing (EDE Data Management)

Assistant Director
Processing Reporting

Assistant Director
Processing Student Loans

Assistant Director
Processing Systems Imaging

Assistant Director
Processing Reporting & Misc Monitoring (All Failing Grades, R2T4, etc.)

Assistant Director
Processing Systems Development

Associate Director
Client Services

Director

Associate Director
Processing

Staff Assistant

Secretary

Client Services Specialists

Clerical Staff Telephones

Clerical Staff

Verification Specialists

Observation: From talking with staff, some of the current job responsibilities may be the result of an inability or unwillingness of some individuals to perform all assigned tasks as well as supervisory staff.
being unwilling or unable to hold people accountable. Instead tasks are reassigned or in some cases
assumed by others in order to avoid confrontation or conflict. The result is, according to some staff, a
demoralization that if not addressed will most certainly result in the loss of some of the stronger
individuals currently employed in SFAO.

Recommendation: As indicated in an earlier recommendation, there is a strong need to review
organizational structure and leadership roles within SFAO. Encourage outside consultant support to
assist with this transition.

Observation: The historical reasons for some functions currently assigned to SFAO may no longer be
valid. Specifically student employment and the Veterans office. Until recently, federal law required that
verterans benefits be treated as a resource in determining student eligibility for federal financial aid.
This is no longer the case.

Recommendation: Consider aligning the Veteran’s office with other university functions responsible for
student success, retention, and graduation initiatives.

Assess Effective Utilization of Systems, Automation, and Technology.

Observation: The individuals primarily responsible for making effective use of systems, automation, and
technology in the SFAO seem well skilled and highly motivated to improve the use of technology in
providing better, more efficient and effective services to students. However, the state-wide
implementation of the PeopleSoft student information system presents serious challenges that must be
overcome in order for SFAO to make any significant strides in this area.

It was interesting to learn that the two largest institutions in the state, the University of North Dakota
and North Dakota State University enroll approximately 30,000 students while the other nine college
campuses that share the PeopleSoft system enroll approximately 10,000 total students. Yet, each of the
eleven campuses are afforded a single vote in deciding priorities for enhancements, further
implementation of the system, etc. The result is a significant state-wide systems investment that is, at
least as it pertains to UND, being vastly underutilized.

In some instances, staff reported learning about new ideas at the PeopleSoft Higher Education User’s
Group (HEUG) annual conference that would be beneficial to students and the university, only to have
any such new initiatives either thwarted or slowly implemented. Some ideas were thwarted by the lack
of support or consensus among the eleven institutions. Other ideas were assigned as priority projects,
but were slow to be implemented because there are only two programmers and two business analysts
assigned to the financial aid modules of the system. Both barriers to implementing new initiatives in the
student information system results in the loss of any strategic advantage that could be gained from the
use of technology from an enrollment management perspective at UND.

Recommendation: This is a “heavy lift”, but there must be some effort to acquire the systems support
of the PeopleSoft system at the state level to better support the unique service needs of the two largest
institutions on the systems. Smaller schools will benefit if the large schools are permitted to take the lead in further developing business processes and systems enhancements that will lead to improved student service and more efficient use of state taxpayer dollars. The risk otherwise, is that the system meets the needs and demands of the least automated and smallest institutions which have the flexibility to do many tasks manually because of their small volume while the large institutions use this multi-million dollar system as little more than a filing cabinet for storing data.

Observation: SFAO staff expressed concerns with the means of communicating with students and with the shortcomings of the “generic” PeopleSoft student self-service portal. In some cases, this results in significant yet unnecessary student traffic, telephone calls and e-mails in the SFAO because students are simply overlooking or having a difficult time finding the information they need in order to complete the financial aid process.

Recommendation: Consider building or acquiring an enhanced student portal that does not require modification of source code to the PeopleSoft system, but will provide students more intuitive access to self-service. This should result in fewer students having problems with routine financial aid processes which will permit SFAO to concentrate staff resources on those students with more serious, or difficult to address issues or problems. This should lead to a noticeable reduction in student traffic to the SFAO and a higher level of student customer satisfaction with a number of functional areas at the University, including Student Accounts, Registration and Records, Admissions, and more.

Observation: SFAO is making good use of ImageNow electronic imaging software. If understood correctly they have implemented electronic work-flows which contribute to staff efficiency, fewer lost or misrouted documents, and access to documents by all staff as needed. They are to be commended for this use of technology in pursuit of both administrative efficiencies and “best practice” service to students.
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Observation: Actual policy and procedures documents were not reviewed, however staff did report that they are written and available to staff electronically and that a process for regularly updating and maintaining these policies and procedures are in place.

All SFAO desk manuals were reported to have been updated recently and accurately reflect current assigned responsibilities for each member of the SFAO staff.

Recommendation: Current job descriptions, desk manuals, and policy and procedures will be helpful in undertaking any reorganization of the SFAO.

Observation: Need-based grant funds controlled by the campus and SFAO would appear to be far from adequate. The following comparison between a “typical” UND financial aid offering and a financial aid offering from a large, public four-year, research-extensive university would best highlight this concern:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Resident Freshmen - University of North Dakota</th>
<th>Resident Freshman - Four-year Public University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Cost of Attendance</td>
<td>$20,892</td>
<td>Total Estimated Cost of Attendance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected Family Contribution</td>
<td>$-</td>
<td>Expected Family Contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>$20,892</td>
<td>Need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Pell Grant</td>
<td>$5,550</td>
<td>Federal Pell Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal SEOG</td>
<td>$800</td>
<td>Federal SEOG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University &amp; State Grants</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>University &amp; State Grants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Perkins Loan</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Federal Perkins Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Stafford Loan</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>Federal Stafford Loan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Stafford Loan - Unsubsidized</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>Federal Stafford Loan - Unsubsidized</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Work Study</td>
<td>$2,800</td>
<td>Federal Work Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Aid</td>
<td>$18,150</td>
<td>Total Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet Need</td>
<td>$2,742</td>
<td>Unmet Need</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is part of the reason for higher than average student loan indebtedness and over $15 million in private, alternative loans. It is understood some of the average indebtedness is due to high costs associated with aviation programs, but it should not be assumed that this explains all of difference.

Observation: Cost of attendance figures may be high for personal expenses, therefore resulting in more “unmet need” than actually exists and higher student indebtedness than may be necessary. It should be noted that the SFAO staff did indicate they have had complaints in prior years about too low of a cost of attendance figure making it difficult for students to receive sufficient funding. If understood correctly, the current cost of attendance “personal” expenses are based on the College Board’s regional expense allowances which may or may not accurately reflect what UND students are typically spending for these expenses. This would need to be evaluated within the context of cost of living factors for the greater...
Grand Forks area. Here is a comparison of the Cost of Attendance figures for UND and another, major, Midwestern, public four-year university:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>UND</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tuition &amp; Fees</td>
<td>6,834</td>
<td>7,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Room &amp; Board</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>8,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books &amp; Supplies</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>3,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>20,734</td>
<td>20,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recommendation: Consider conducting a survey, every five years, of a sample of UND students regarding what they are actually spending on housing, food, clothing, entertainment, utilities, etc.

Observation: SFAO reviews compliance with federal satisfactory academic progress policy every semester. This creates a lot of extra, unnecessary work for staff, and creates stress for students, especially between fall and spring terms if students must appeal the loss of financial aid in that compressed time between semesters. UND’s Satisfactory Academic Progress policy is complex and intimidating to read and understand.

Recommendation: Consider reviewing compliance with satisfactory academic progress policy once a year after all final grades are posted for the spring term. Implement a process of sending students interim letters or e-mail messages when a student begins to approach the maximum timeframe, or is at risk of falling below the minimum completion rate for receiving financial aid. Students who successfully appeal the loss of financial aid for major mitigating circumstances should be placed on an “academic plan” and individually monitored on a semester by semester basis until they graduate, fail to meet conditions of the academic plan, or once again satisfy university policy regarding satisfactory academic progress.

Assess Scholarship Management, Coordination, and Processes to Assure Maximization of Funds and Recruitment Strategies.

Observation: The three-tiered approach to Presidential Scholars is not an uncommon strategy. However, the February 5th admissions deadline for scholarship consideration is not being enforced. This erodes the effectiveness of the scholarships for leveraging enrollment and the scholarships become more of an academic entitlement. Renewal criteria do not seem consistent with the high selectivity of the awarding criteria. In some cases, freshmen are allowed to keep the scholarship with just a 2.25 gpa even if it may be mathematically impossible for student to reach the 3.25 cumulative gpa required of juniors to keep the scholarship. These renewal policies flood SFAO with student scholarship appeals. There is even an institutional expectation that “all first time appeals be approved”! Students do not take the appeal process seriously. One recent appeal consisted of the student writing, “Yeah, I didn’t do what I was supposed to; sorry.” This appeal was approved without grounds.
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Observation: Community of Learners Scholarship Program (CLSP) has a quite modest award criteria (minimum 24 ACT) given that the average ACT score of students at UND is around 23. Also, renewal criteria have a number of qualifications that seem associated with academic behaviors conducive to retention and graduation strategies. However, the University rarely enforces these qualifications which defeats the purpose of having them. SFAO does not feel empowered to modify or enforce renewal criteria, therefore ensuring that they will hear hundreds of appeals from students for little reason.

Recommendation: A complete reevaluation of the University’s scholarship strategy from the perspective of an enrollment management model is recommended. Consider raising awards standards for CLSP, perhaps dropping scholarship to a one-year award and eliminating all of the participation criteria and living on-campus requirements. The University community including campus leadership and faculty need to be clear what the scholarship program at UND is intended to achieve. If it is primarily to leverage enrollment of high ability students then the renewal criteria must be consistent with the scholars’ academic ability and steadfastly enforced. SFAO will need the clear support at higher levels within the administration to do this. These scholarships will not be effective in attracting prospective students if “scholarship deadlines” are not adhered to and will not appropriately motivate enrolled students to strive for high levels of academic achievement if the renewal criteria are known to be unenforceable by the very nature of the criteria themselves as well as in practice, regardless of the grounds or validity of the appeal.

Provide Feedback on Collaborative Efforts with Key Campus Partners.

a. Admissions
b. Enrollment Services
c. Student Account Services
d. Registrar’s Office
e. Colleges/Departments
f. Athletics
g. Alumni Association/Foundation
h. Other departments in Student Affairs

Observation: Robin Holden meets regularly, but by herself, with the Student Accounts staff. This contributes to Student Accounts and Financial Aid staffs not having the opportunity to work constructively together before there are problems in order to better develop a spirit of collegiality.

Recommendation: Director and senior SFAO staff are encouraged to have regularly scheduled meetings (weekly or biweekly) with many of these key campus partners. This will be especially true of Admissions, Enrollment Services, Student Accounts, and Alumni Association/Foundation. SFAO should consider inviting key members of these campus partners to SFAO “all staff” meetings on a rotating basis, so staff are regularly introduced to one another, reminded of what each office is trying to accomplish, etc.

Observation: The Alumni Association/Foundation expressed concern about the lack of stability in recent years in the SFAO position that works most directly with scholarships. This may improve in the future as
both individuals from the Alumni Association/Foundation who shared the concern seemed positive about the person SFAO currently has serving in this role.

Recommendation: The Alumni Association/Foundation expect the SFAO to do quite a lot to provide oversight of the colleges and departments’ compliance with scholarship donor agreements. The colleges and departments should be expected to be held responsible and accountable for this, with SFAO providing some oversight. However, the proportion of administrative effort to financial support makes scholarship administration an ever growing and demanding area that will need additional resources (both personnel and information technology) to be successful. It would seem reasonable that the Foundation be expected to and/or increase their financial support to SFAO as demands in this area grow by supporting a minimum of one full-time equivalent position and a .5 FTE clerical person to assist in this area.

Review of Communication and Relationships with Students.

Observation: Students involved in the review did not have much contact with SFAO nor did they report knowing students who did. They had no negative impressions of the office.

Observation: SFAO staff expressed desire to improve the methods with which they communicate with students.

Recommendation: Suggestions for are an improved self-service portal with announcement capability and other messaging capabilities would help address this concern.

Provide Feedback on Space Considerations.

Observation: The student reception area of SFAO is far too small to accommodate student traffic at even low-volume times of the year and gives the impression that there is always a line of students waiting to be served. This is not a visual that is conducive to recruiting prospective students. Also, this area does not provide a suitable degree of separation in order to ensure student confidentiality.

Recommendation: Space is limited, but with the move of Admissions Processing to new space later this year, this is a good opportunity to expand the space available to SFAO. Given the increasing reliance of students and their families on financial aid in order to finance a college education today, it is arguable the SFAO reception area may be the second most often visited office on campus by prospective students after the Admissions office. Consideration should be given to making the SFAO reception area a suitable “front door” to the university as you would the Admissions reception area.

Observation: SFAO office space was very densely concentrated, which could contribute to higher stress, lower staff morale, and create a visual of the office being cluttered and disorganized, even if this is not the case.
Recommendation: Consider expanding SFAO into some of the space that may open up with moving Admissions Processing, Veteran’s Services and Student Employment to other areas of the campus. Consider retaining experts on office design knowledgeable in “best practices” and minimum optimum space for the type of work conducted by SFAO.

**Review of Student Employment Management.**

Observation: The Federal Work Study (FWS) program, because it is one of the oldest federal financial aid programs, has long been associated with financial aid offices. However, today, FWS and student employment is recognized as the earliest opportunities for undergraduate students to experience skills unique to the world of employment, including interviewing skills, resume building, working with others, etc. While part-time student employment is an important resource for students needing help paying for college, student employment plays a much broader role including contributions to freshmen to sophomore retention, time to degree, and more.

Recommendation: The awarding of FWS eligibility needs to continue to be done by SFAO. However, consider moving student employment and the Job Location and Development (JLD) functions to Career Services. The individual currently assigned to student employment and JLD should move with the position. SFAO is currently using $36,597 for administrative expenses associated with the Job Location and Development program (off-campus student employment development and placement). Federal law allows the institution to claim up to $75,000 under certain circumstances to off-set cost associated with the JLD program. Assuming the institution can meet these federal conditions, consider transferring $75,000 in federal JLD funds to Career Services for off-campus job development, including the JLD Coordinator position. Then transfer $40,000 in state funds from Career Services to SFAO. This will aid in the SFAO reorganization and keep SFAO “whole” with some of the other financial aid responsibilities currently performed by the student employment person.

**Section D: Funds Spent from Federal Share of FWS**

14. Total federal share of FWS earned compensation $911,062
   (a) Federal share paid at a rate up to 75 percent $903,074
   (b) Federal share paid at a rate up to 100 percent for waivers of nonfederal share $7,888
   (c) Federal share paid at a rate up to 90 percent for agencies that were unable to pay regular nonfederal share $0
   (d) Federal share paid at a rate up to 50 percent for off-campus, private for-profit organizations $0

15. Administrative cost allowance claimed (see instructions) $100,849

16. Federal share of Job Location and Development (JLD) Program expenditures $365,977

17. Total federal funds spent for FWS (fields 14 + 15 + 16) $1,047,808

Observation: There is a high demand by campus employers at UND for Federal Work Study funds. This may be a cause for some reluctance in claiming additional, though justifiable, JLD funds for administrative purposes. Two significant reasons for this heightened demand for FWS funds are because the campus allocates FWS funds to departments and other campus employers. Also, the matching funds in the FWS program at UND is 70% federal and 30% institutional match.
Recommendation: Eliminate the FWS departmental allocation process and allow campus employers to compete in an open market for FWS eligible student employees. This should result in departments creating more interesting and rewarding student work experiences and paying higher hourly wages in order to attract student employees. More rewarding work and higher wages will contribute positively towards improving student retention and graduation. Also, consider modifying the FWS “match” to either 50% or 60% federal funds with 30% continuing to come from University sources and employing departments contributing 20% or 10% match. This will expand the program to allow more students to participate in the program and help meet expanding campus need for student employees.

Observation: SFAO receives and processes thousands of employment forms for both institutional student employment and FWS student employees. This dates back to a time when the student employment process required SFAO to “sign-off” on FWS eligibility. The JobX student employment system, prohibits students without FWS eligibility from applying for FWS positions. This makes SFAO’s role of receiving and processing of student employment forms unnecessary.

Recommendation: Regardless of whether the student employment function remains in SFAO or moves to Career Services, the processing of student employment forms should be transferred to a payroll or human resources function. These forms are an unnecessary distraction for an already overburdened SFAO, especially as the University envisions moving to an enrollment management model and the role SFAO will need to play in the future in order for the university to meet its enrollment goals.

Other Areas as Deemed Appropriate by Consultant.

Observation: Communication between functional areas and SFAO was mentioned several times. It is difficult for a financial aid office to be as responsive as they would like, especially during peak times of the year.

Recommendation: SFAO and the campus may consider implementing some type of instant messaging system like Lotus Notes SameTime or another product so key staff in Admissions, Student Accounts, and other offices can connect with very busy financial aid staff when it is important to do so.

Observation: Some tension between Admissions Processing, Enrollment Services, and Financial Aid may exist. The timely awarding of scholarships and financial aid to prospective students is directly impacted by the work of Admissions processing.

Recommendation: Admissions processing leadership should meet weekly or at least bi-weekly with SFAO staff responsible for scholarship awarding and systems. There will be from time to time errors in how admitted students are entered into the admissions system which, if not addressed quickly could result in errors in scholarship or financial aid awarding. Error reports and regular communication will keep these problems to a minimum.