**Client Code 215** 

# North Dakota University System Office BISMARCK, NORTH DAKOTA

# **Audit Report**

Two-year Period Ended June 30, 2018

> Joshua C. Gallion State Auditor

Office of the State Auditor Division of State Audit



Office of the State Auditor

# Report Highlights North Dakota University System Office

May 23, 2019

Audit Period: July 2016 – June 2018

#### Why We Conducted this Audit

The purpose of this audit was to determine that:

- The Minnesota North Dakota reciprocity agreement was properly approved, supported, verified, recorded on the financial statements, and to ensure the reallocation of the revenue to the various institutions was proper; and
- Financial transactions including expenses were made in accordance with law and appropriation requirements at the North Dakota University system office (NDUSO) and at Core Technology Solutions (CTS), the information system arm of the North Dakota University System.

#### Minnesota-North Dakota Reciprocity Agreement

The North Dakota University System participates in several student exchange/reciprocity programs allowing higher education students to take advantage of out-ofstate academic programs typically at a lower tuition rate. The most impactful of these is its agreement with the state of Minnesota. The Minnesota – North Dakota Public Higher Education Reciprocity Agreement allows students in North Dakota and Minnesota to pursue educational opportunities at public institutions in the other state at tuition rates substantially less than those established for traditional out-of-state students. During the audit period 6.864 North Dakota students and 21.689 Minnesota students took advantage of the program. The agreement awards a tuition reciprocity reimbursement to the state receiving the greater number of students from the other state. This has resulted in revenue of \$21,291,617 for North Dakota during the two-year period, which it then redistributed to the state's public higher education institutions.



Source: North Dakota University System and Campus Solutions/PeopleSoft Financials



#### Areas for Improvement

View the full report at www.nd.gov/auditor

## **KEY PERSONNEL**

### State Auditor's Office Staff

Robyn Hoffmann, CPA, Audit Manager Alex Mehring, CPA, Lead Auditor Travis Klinkhammer, CPA Jason Schwartz

## **Client Staff Contacts**

Dr. Mark Hagerott, Chancellor Tammy Dolan, VC for Administrative Affairs/CFO Robin Putnam, CPA, Director of Financial Reporting Sharon Schwartzbauer, Accountant Darin King, Vice Chancellor IT/CIO Aaron Mitchell, CPA, CTS Controller

# **Contents**

Transmittal Letter	1
Audit Results	2
Minnesota – North Dakota Public Higher Education Reciprocity Agreement	2
Conclusion	2
Background Information and Results	2
Internal Control	3
Scope	3
Methodology	4
Statutory Audit Requirements	4
Conclusion	4
<b>Background Information and Results</b> Noncompliance Surrounding Procurement (Finding 18-01)	<b>4</b> 5
Internal Control Lack of Approval of General Ledger Transactions (Finding 18-02)	<b>6</b> 7
Scope	8
Methodology	8
Authority and Standards	8
Financial Statements	10
Statement of Net Position Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position Statement of Cash Flows	10 11 12
Statement of Appropriations	14





STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA OFFICE OF THE STATE AUDITOR FARGO BRANCH OFFICE 1655 43<sup>rd</sup> STREET SOUTH, SUITE 203 FARGO, NORTH DAKOTA 58103

Transmittal Letter

May 23, 2019

State Board of Higher Education Audit Committee

Dr. Mark R. Hagerott, Chancellor, North Dakota University System

We are pleased to submit this audit of the North Dakota University System Office for the two-year period ended June 30, 2018. This audit resulted from the statutory responsibility of the State Auditor to audit or review each state agency once every two years. The same statute gives the State Auditor the responsibility to determine the contents of these audits.

The primary consideration in determining the contents of these audits is to produce informative audits to improve government. Statutory audit requirements are an important part of these audits and are addressed by our standard audit objective. Additionally, whenever possible additional audit objectives are included to increase responsiveness and effectiveness of state government.

Robyn Hoffmann, CPA was the audit manager. Inquiries or comments relating to this audit may be directed to the audit manager by calling (701) 239-7291. We wish to express our appreciation to Chancellor Hagerott and his staff for the courtesy, cooperation, and assistance they provided to us during this audit.

Respectfully submitted,

/S/

Joshua C. Gallion State Auditor

cc: Legislative Audit and Fiscal Review Committee Chris Kadrmas, Legislative Council Fiscal Analyst

# Audit Results

#### Minnesota – North Dakota Public Higher Education Reciprocity Agreement

The review of the Minnesota – North Dakota Reciprocity Agreement was designed and conducted to meet the following objectives:

Is the Minnesota reciprocity marginal expenditure calculation properly approved, supported, verified, and recorded on the financial statements?

Is the reallocation of reciprocity revenue from Minnesota to the individual North Dakota University System (NDUS) institutions proper?

#### Conclusion

We conclude that the North Dakota University System Office is in compliance with the scope of their agreement with the Minnesota Office of Higher Education.

#### **Background Information and Results**

The Minnesota Office of Higher Education and the North Dakota State Board of Higher Education entered into a reciprocity agreement for the purpose of improving higher education for the residents of Minnesota and North Dakota by providing greater availability and accessibility to educational opportunities. The agreement is to be reviewed annually and can be modified at any time upon agreement of both parties. Tuition is set so that Minnesota reciprocity students attending NDUS institutions will pay the North Dakota resident rate, plus a surcharge, while North Dakota reciprocity students attending Minnesota institutions will pay the higher of the Minnesota or North Dakota resident rate for the type of campus attended. As determined in the Memorandum of Understanding during the audit period, the state receiving the lessor number of students will pay the other state a tuition reciprocity reimbursement. The state which owes the reimbursement calculates their obligation using the marginal expenditure calculation (See below).

# **Marginal Expenditure Calculation**

Operational Expenditure per Full-Time Equivalent Student

- x Marginal Expenditure Rate
- = Marginal Expenditure Rate per Full-Time Equivalent Student
- Resident Tuition Rate
- = Remaining Marginal Expenditures per Full-Time Equivalent Student
- x GAP FTE (Difference in state flow of students)
- = Gross State Obligation
- Student Payment (Total Tuition Payment in Excess of Resident Tuition)
- = Net State Obligation

Source: MN-ND Public Higher Education Reciprocity Agreement

During the audit period numerous students from both states took advantage of the Minnesota – North Dakota Reciprocity program. North Dakota had 6,864 students that choose to enroll at a

Minnesota public institution of higher education, while Minnesota had 21,689 students enroll in North Dakota public higher education institutions. Beyond the increased opportunities and accessibility for students in both states to obtain post-secondary education, the agreement benefited the state of North Dakota through the reciprocity reimbursement paid by the state of Minnesota during the two years of the audit. This reimbursement totaled \$21,291,617 of revenue, which was then redistributed to the North Dakota public higher education institutions based on Minnesota reciprocity students enrolled (See chart below for distributions).

# MN Student Enrollment

School	2016-2017	2017-2018
Bismarck State College	13	24
Dakota College at Bottineau	5	4
Dickinson State University	5	5
Lake Region State College	43	36
Mayville State University	88	114
Minot State University	5	13
North Dakota State College of Science	508	536
North Dakota State University	5,374	6,013
NDSU Graduate Schools	149	146
University of North Dakota	3,801	3,829
UND Graduate Schools	375	369
UND School of Law	1	1
Valley City State University	115	116
Williston State College	0	1
TOTAL	10,482	11,207

Source: MN Student Enrollment Headcount Report - Campus Connection

# **Revenue to Each ND Institution**

School	2016-2017	2017-2018
Bismarck State College	\$21,883	\$30,708
Dakota College at Bottineau	\$7,862	\$5,083
Dickinson State University	\$7,305	\$6,040
Lake Region State College	\$74,793	\$48,564
Mayville State University	\$123,208	\$122,024
Minot State University	\$6,978	\$14,891
North Dakota State College of Science	\$819,401	\$670,790
North Dakota State University	\$5,862,397	\$4,880,781
NDSU Graduate Schools	\$125,222	\$87,713
University of North Dakota	\$4,300,677	\$3,239,230
UND Graduate Schools	\$333,585	\$225,003
UND School of Law	\$304	\$234
Valley City State University	\$156,460	\$120,305
Williston State College	\$0	\$176
TOTAL	\$11,840,075	\$9,451,542

Source: MN Reciprocity 16-17/17-18 Campus Allocation Payment

#### Internal Control

We gained an understanding of internal control surrounding these areas and concluded as to the adequacy of their design. We also tested the operating effectiveness of those controls we considered necessary based on our assessment of audit risk.

Auditors are required to report deficiencies in internal control that are significant within the context of the objectives of the audit. A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect (1) misstatements in financial or performance information, (2) violations of laws and regulations, or (3) impairments of effectiveness or efficiency of operations, on a timely basis. Considering both qualitative and quantitative factors, we did not identify any deficiencies in internal control that were significant within the context of our audit objectives and based upon the audit work performed.

#### Scope

This audit of the North Dakota University System Office is for the two-year period ended June 30, 2018. We conducted our audit in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The North Dakota University System Office has operations in the following locations. Each location was included in the audit scope:

- The Bismarck office in the State Capitol
- Core Technology Services in Grand Forks and Fargo

#### Methodology

To meet this objective, we:

- Interviewed appropriate agency personnel.
- Queried the ConnectND (PeopleSoft) system for data analysis. Significant evidence was obtained from ConnectND.
- Inspected documentary evidence.
- Tested Minnesota-North Dakota Reciprocity Agreement calculations to ensure compliance with the operating agreement and annual Memorandum of Understanding administrative memos.
- Tested significant controls surrounding the Minnesota-North Dakota Reciprocity Agreement calculation.

In aggregate there were no significant limitations or uncertainties related to our overall assessment of the sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence.

#### Statutory Audit Requirements

The objective related to our statutory audit requirements is:

Are there any exceptions to report relating to statutorily required audit testing?

Statutorily required audit testing includes: performing the post audit of financial transactions, detecting and reporting any defaults, determining that expenses have been made in accordance with law, appropriation acts, and emergency commission action, and evaluating blanket bond coverage. Defaults are defined as failures to do something required by duty or law. Bonding coverage provides insurance to state agencies for any default or wrongful act on the part of any public employee or public official.

#### Conclusion

Except for the following findings, no exceptions relating to our statutorily required audit testing were identified.

#### Background Information and Results

The North Dakota University System was established in 1990 to serve as the policy coordinating entity for North Dakota's 11 public institutions of higher education. It is governed by the State Board of Higher Education as mandated by North Dakota Century Code 15-10-01.2. The system has two main components, the system office in Bismarck, ND and Core Technology Services in Grand Forks, ND and Fargo, ND. The System Office contributes administrative functions to the

North Dakota University System. Core Technology Services provides information management and technology services to the North Dakota University System students, faculty, staff, and state residents. Core Technology Services supports ConnectND North Dakota's implementation of the Oracle/Peoplesoft Accounting system as well as supporting third party systems that integrate into ConnectND.

#### Noncompliance Surrounding Procurement (Finding 18-01)

#### Condition:

Core Technology Services (CTS) did not properly procure 5 out of the 14 transactions tested (\$3.2 million).

#### Criteria:

NDCC section 15-10-17 part 5, states in part, that the SBHE may determine policy for purchasing by the University System in coordination with OMB as provided by NDCC chapter 54-44.4 and NDCC section 44-08-01 part 3.

NDUS procedure 803.1, part 3 states in part, for services \$100,000 and over, they must be purchased from formal bid process or a Request for Proposal (RFP). In addition, part 3.d states in part, contracts may not exceed a term of 10 years.

NDUS procedure 803.1 part 4 states that sole source, emergency or purchases made from discount contracts under a group alliance or consortium for goods or services do not require competition based on written approval of the procurement officer or other official delegated that authority and as documented on the Alternate Procurement Request form. Sole source requests based on personal preference, cost or price, perceived quality, vendor performance, delivery time, trade-in allowance or no cost options or accessories or other special packages or deals are not permitted; rather, these items may be considered in evaluating bids or proposals

# **Procurement Quick Guide**

What is Procurement?	How Does Procurement Work?
<ul> <li>Procurement is the process of acquiring commodities or services. This includes:</li> <li>Acquisition</li> <li>Solicitation of bids/proposals</li> <li>Evaluation and selection of sources</li> <li>Preparation and awarding of a contract</li> <li>Contract administration</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>A lead procurement officer is designated</li> <li>A reasonable estimated value is assigned to the purchase</li> <li>The method of procurement is determined</li> <li>Applicable laws/regulations are applied</li> <li>Solicit as many sources as practical</li> <li>The purchase is made</li> </ul>
Source: N.D.A.C. §4-12-02-02, NDUS Procedure 803.1	

#### Cause:

CTS was not aware that services whether unique or not are required to go through the procurement process. In addition, procurement records were not kept by other NDUS institutions who procured contracts for CTS.

#### Effect or Potential Effect:

Without soliciting formal bids, competitive pricing was not obtained as required by NDUS procedures, and ultimately, noncompliance with NDCC chapter 54-44.4.

#### **Recommendation:**

We recommend that CTS properly procure commodities and services in compliance with NDCC and NDUS requirements.

#### North Dakota University System Office Response:

CTS partially agrees with the findings.

CTS agrees in 2 of the 5 cases that an Alternate Procurement process to document the variance from procurement procedures should have been conducted. CTS made changes to its practices after these procurements took place.

In the other 3 cases, CTS feels the findings do not accurately reflect current business processes and circumstances surrounding the original procurement. The original procurement processes were performed prior to CTS being a business entity in FY13. In two of these three remaining cases, a new procurement was performed either at the time or shortly following the transactions identified. In the final case, the original 2004 contract does reference an RFP, however CTS is not in possession of nor does CTS know of any documentation of the solicitation. CTS did resign a new contract in 2017 with current NDUS terms and conditions, but felt policy wasn't clear that an Alternate Procurement was required to continue paying for support/maintenance of an existing software product.

To avoid future issues, CTS will adjust procedures starting on 6/7/2019 to utilize the Alternate Procurement procedure to document when we are resigning contracts to continue to provide existing IT services. Current practices already include regular reviews for software contracts to determine if the product should be continuing to be maintained or if there is a business need and funding available to perform a procurement. As these are decided, proper procurement processes are followed. However, it is important for us to note that until all software has been refreshed, findings such as this may continue to occur in the future.

#### Internal Control

We gained an understanding of internal control surrounding these areas and concluded as to the adequacy of their design. We also tested the operating effectiveness of those controls we considered necessary based on our assessment of audit risk.

Auditors are required to report deficiencies in internal control that are significant within the context of the objectives of the audit. A deficiency in internal control exists when the design or operation of a control does not allow management or employees, in the normal course of performing their assigned functions, to prevent or detect (1) misstatements in financial or performance information, (2) violations of laws and regulations, or (3) impairments of effectiveness or efficiency of operations, on a timely basis. Considering both qualitative and quantitative factors, we identified the following deficiency in internal control that was significant within the context of our audit objectives and based upon the audit work performed.

#### Lack of Approval of General Ledger Transactions (Finding 18-02)

#### **Condition:**

Core Technology Services (CTS) did not approve journal entries for 27 out of the 32 tested.

#### Criteria:

Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO) of the Treadway Commission publication *Internal Control - Integrated Framework* states that proper design and implementation of internal control policies and procedures for approval are necessary to ensure objectives are effectively achieved.

# **General Ledger Entries Lacking Step 3 Approval**



#### Cause:

CTS does not have proper procedures in place to ensure that there is a review and approval by an appropriate individual.

#### Effect or Potential Effect:

With a lack of approval, CTS is susceptible to an increased risk of error going undetected or not being caught in a timely manner.

#### **Recommendation:**

We recommend that CTS review and approve journal entries before they are posted to the general ledger.

#### North Dakota University System Office Response:

CTS agrees with the recommendation. As of Spring 2019, CTS has already implemented mandatory workflows where all journal entries, whether initiated in house or not, are approved by the CTS Controller.

#### Scope

This audit of the North Dakota University System Office is for the two-year period ended June 30, 2018.

The North Dakota University System Office has operations in the following locations. Each location was included in the audit scope:

- The Bismarck office in the State Capitol
- Core Technology Services in Grand Forks and Fargo

#### Methodology

To meet this objective, we:

- Performed detailed analytical procedures including computer-assisted auditing techniques. These procedures were used to identify high-risk transactions and potential problem areas for additional testing.
- Used non-statistical sampling, and the results were projected to the population. Where applicable, populations were stratified to ensure that particular groups within a population were adequately represented in the sample, and to improve efficiency by gaining greater control on the composition of the sample.
- Interviewed appropriate agency personnel.
- Queried the ConnectND (PeopleSoft) system for data analysis. Significant evidence was obtained from ConnectND.
- Observed the North Dakota University System Office's processes and procedures.
- Inspected documentary evidence.
- Tested compliance with appropriation laws and regulations and where necessary, internal control was tested which included selecting representative samples to determine if controls were operating effectively and if laws were being followed consistently.
- Reviewed adequacy of blanket bond coverage by comparing coverage to state bonding guidelines.
- Performed an analysis and selected a sample of high-risk transactions, including travel expenses, procurement, appropriation laws, general ledger interfacing, and journal entries for further testing.

In aggregate there were no significant limitations or uncertainties related to our overall assessment of the sufficiency and appropriateness of audit evidence.

#### Authority and Standards

This biennial performance audit of the North Dakota University System Office has been conducted by the Office of the State Auditor pursuant to authority within NDCC chapter 54-10.

We conducted this performance audit in accordance with *Generally Accepted Government Auditing Standards* issued by the Comptroller General of the United States. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

The criteria used to evaluate internal control is published in the publication *Internal Control – Integrated Framework* from the Committee of Sponsoring Organizations (COSO) of the Treadway Commission.

# **Financial Statements**

#### Statement of Net Position

	Ju	ine 30, 2018	Ju	ıne 30, 2017
ASSETS:				
Cash & cash equivalents	\$	16,205,038	\$	16,793,710
Accounts receivable, net		7,004		133
Due from Student Loan Transfer Fund		921,000		
Due from other NDUS institutions		1,281,207		106,720
Due from state general fund		475,679		1,802,349
Grants and contracts receivables, net		50,251		1
Other assets		45,072		36,730
Capital assets, net		3,376,840		3,870,796
Total assets	\$	22,362,091	\$	22,610,439
Deferred outflows of resources	\$	2,528,617	\$	919,779
LIABILITIES:				
Accounts payable	\$	1,758,227	\$	2,511,053
Due to other NDUS institutions		142,233	•	121,983
Accrued payroll		636,060		748,009
Deposits		254,889		65,657
Pension liability		4,627,818		2,492,377
OPEB liability		214,906		
Other noncurrent liabilities		16,259		23,212
Due to others		1,550,340		1,657,111
Total liabilities	\$	9,200,732	\$	7,619,402
Deferred inflows of resources	\$	156,341	\$	166,470
NET POSITION:				
Invested in capital assets	\$	1,904,699	\$	3,198,143
Restricted For:	Ŷ	.,,	Ŧ	2,
Expendable:				
Institutional		13,908		13,908
Other		61,610		73,456
Unrestricted		13,553,418		12,458,839
Total net position	\$	15,533,635	\$	15,744,346

Source: NDUS Annual Financial Reports

	Ju	ine 30, 2018	JL	ne 30, 2017	
REVENUES AND OTHER ADDITIONS:					
State appropriations	\$	51,702,410	\$	60,719,355	
Student tuition and fees		5,267,726		4,816,722	
Sales and services of educational departments		1,551,116		1,888,250	
Other nonoperating revenues		4,524,770		4,041,174	
Federal grants and contracts		231,127		265,311	
Nongovernmental grants and contracts		99,500		20,000	
Auxiliary enterprises				5,000	
Gifts		17,025		18,720	
Endowment and investment income		10,410		28	
Total revenues and other additions	\$	63,404,084	\$	71,774,560	
Grant and special grant expenditures Salaries and wages Operating expenses Data processing Transfer to the Industrial Commission Depreciation Interest on capital asset-related debt		10,043,058 16,430,910 10,251,864 5,644,729 3,471,359 1,543,756 6,859		11,655,190 16,667,638 10,951,127 4,291,067 2,406,216 1,509,955 285	
Total expenses and other deductions	\$	63,431,778	\$	70,023,929	
Revenue over expenses	\$	(27,694)	\$	1,750,631	
NET POSITION					
Net position-beginning of the year, as restated	\$	15,561,329	\$	13,993,715	
Net position-end of the year	\$	15,533,635	\$	15,744,346	

## Statement of Revenues, Expenses, and Changes in Net Position

Source: NDUS Annual Financial Reports

### Statement of Cash Flows

e 30, 2018	June 30, 2017
5,248,634	
280,378	,
6,629,172)	•
6,024,688)	•
6,039,244)	•
	5,000
388,851	2,067,847
175,936	4,528
3,588,474	4,033,300
9,010,831)	\$ (41,049,964
1,645,333	\$ 60,791,339
17,026	18,720
0,043,058)	(11,655,190
(8,492)	12,332
3,471,359)	(2,406,216
3,139,450	\$ 46,760,985
1,383,748	\$ (1,655,246
1,049,800)	(501,177
(54,792)	(61,366
(6,860)	(286
(0,000)	(200
272,296	\$ (2,218,075
10,413	\$ 28
10,413	\$ 28
(588,672)	\$ 3,492,974
6,793,710	¢ 12 200 726
	\$ 13,300,736 \$ 16,793,710
6,205,038	\$ 16,793,710
<u>з</u> ,	,200,030

(Continued from previous page)

TO NET CASH USED BY OPERATING ACTIVITIES	June 30, 2018	June 30, 2017
Operating loss	\$ (42,761,033)	\$ (48,966,955)
Adjustment to reconcile net loss to net cash		
used by operating activities		
Depreciation expense	1,543,756	1,509,955
Other nonoperating revenues (expenses)	3,596,818	4,048,127
Change in assets, deferred, outflows, liabilities and		
deferred inflows		
Accounts receivable adjusted for interest receivable	(1,181,357)	1,219,430
Grant & contract receivables	(50,250)	(1)
Other assets	(8,344)	(14,827)
Accounts payable and accrued liabilities adjusted		
for interest payable	(732,576)	
Pension liability	2,135,441	829,363
OPEB liability	31,893	
Net change in deferred outflows	(1,608,838)	(537,562)
Net change in deferred inflows	(10,129)	(47,964)
Accrued payroll	(90,167)	(337,573)
Compensated absences	(51,978)	56,875
Deposits	175,933	4,528
Net cash used by operating activities	\$ (39,010,831)	\$ (41,049,964)

Source: NDUS Annual Financial Report

## Statement of Appropriations

		015-2017 Original	А	ppropriation				Balance
		propriation		djustments		Expenses		6-30-17
Expenses by Line Item								
Capital Assets	\$	8,368,836	\$	(1,467,375)	\$	6,887,614	\$	13,847
Deferred Maintenance Pool		8,700,000		(8,700,000)				
Student Fin. Assistance Grants		25,634,276		2,283,073		22,120,356		5,796,993
Veterans Assistance Programs		325,000				325,000		
Scholars Program		2,113,584		182,682		2,029,436		266,830
Title II Grant		1,006,472				531,350		475,122
Native American Scholarships		649,267		600		644,056		5,81 <i>°</i>
Commendatory Grants		4,800		(314)		4,031		45
Technology		46,330,965		(1,927,472)		44,403,493		
Education Challenge Fund		23,500,000		(425,953)		22,124,500		949,54
Education Incentive Program		3,349,000		18,883		3,362,007		5,87
Tribal Community College Grants		1,000,000		(32,750)		967,250		
Academic & Tech Ed Scholarships		14,054,677		2,055,072		12,677,219		3,432,53
Student Exchange		4,275,015		218,216		3,719,775		773,45
Open Education Resources		110,000		(2,750)		107,250		
Two-Year Campus Marketing		800,000		(23,254)		776,746		
Campus Security funding pool		3,000,000		(3,000,000)				
Student Mental Health		316,000		183,029		457,990		41,03
Competitive Research Program		7,050,000		(461,775)		6,588,225		
Biennium Carryover				1,098,649		1,098,649		
System Governance		7,702,343		(314,356)		6,795,434		592,55
nternal Audit Pool		300,000		(19,650)		280,350		
Contingent Appropriation		1,050,000		(1,050,000)				
TOTALS	\$1	59,640,235	\$	(11,385,445)	\$	135,900,731	\$1	2,354,05
General Fund Authority	\$1	54,629,019	\$	(11,385,445)	\$	131.364.637	\$1	1,878,93
Federal Fund Authority		1,006,472		(,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	Ŧ	531,350		475,12
Special Fund Authority		4,004,744				4,004,744		,. <b>.</b>
TOTALS	\$1	59,640,235	\$	(11,385,445)	\$	135,900,731	\$1	2,354,05

#### For the Biennium Ended June 30, 2017

Source: ConnectND Financials

#### For the Year Ended June 30, 2018

	2018-2019					
	Original	Appropriation FY18		Balance		
	Appropriation	Adjustments		Expense		6-30-18
Expenses by Line Item						
Capital Assets	\$ 6,605,326		\$	3,471,359	\$	3,133,967
Student Fin. Assistance Grants	21,917,306	\$ 796,993		10,147,428		12,566,871
Veterans Assistance Programs	277,875			277,875		
Scholars Program	1,807,115	266,830		852,323		1,221,622
Title II Grant	1,006,472			231,128		775,344
Native American Scholarships	555,323	5,811		287,967		273,167
Technology	61,527,347			28,638,439		32,888,908
Education Challenge Fund	2,000,000			1,197,913		802,087
Education Incentive Program	2,863,393	5,876		377,725		2,491,544
Tribal Community College Grnts	600,000			300,000		300,000
Academic & Tech Ed Scholar.	12,016,749	3,432,530		7,342,000		8,107,279
Student Exchange	3,699,342	773,456		1,749,756		2,723,042
Student Mental Health	284,400	41,039		143,947		181,492
Competitive Research Program	6,027,750			3,013,875		3,013,875
Biennium Carryover		592,553		254,845		337,708
Dual-Credit Pilot Program	200,000			84,180		115,820
System Governance	8,393,238			3,564,548		4,828,690
Two-Year Campus Study	40,000			33,753		6,247
Shared Campus Services	500,000			156,000		344,000
TOTALS	\$130,321,636	\$ 5,915,088	\$	62,125,061	\$	74,111,663
General Fund Authority	\$103,909,530	\$ 5,915,088	\$	51,702,410	\$	58,122,208
Federal Fund Authority	1,006,472			231,128		775,344
Special Fund Authority	25,405,634			10,191,523		15,214,111
TOTALS	\$130,321,636	\$ 5,915,088	\$	62,125,061	\$	74,111,663

Source: ConnectND Financials

You may obtain audit reports on the internet at: www.nd.gov/auditor or by contacting the Office of the State Auditor at: Email: ndsao@nd.gov Phone: (701) 328-2241

#### Office of the State Auditor

600 East Boulevard Avenue – Department 117 Bismarck, ND 58505-0060