

**Report from the SIU System Working Group on Shared Services  
Completed June 18, 2020**

The Shared Services Working Group (The Group) was formed as part of the Southern Illinois University System’s strategic planning process. President Dan Mahony created a total of eight working groups with members selected from Carbondale, Edwardsville and the School of Medicine with the goal of providing building blocks for a system strategic plan.

**Team Members**

Scott Belobrajdic	Associate Vice Chancellor	Enrollment Management	SIUE
Scott Bridges	Chief Informaiton Officer	Information Technology	SIUC
John Frost	Director	Undergraduate Admissions	SIUC
Rich Hampton	Director	Financial Affairs	SIUE
Steve Huffstutler*	Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology and Chief Informaiton Officer	Information Technology	SIUE
Judy Marshall*	Vice Chancellor for Administration & Finance	Administration & Finance	SIUC
Teresa Smith	Director	Human Resources	SoM
Bob Thumith	Director	Human Resources	SIUE

\*co-chair

**Group Charge and Process**

The Group was charged with exploring shared services that could be used collaboratively across the SIU system, to include provision of SIU’s baseline today and what is already working well, in addition to areas for improvements. Any suggestions were to include advantages and disadvantages as well as clear methods of assessment. Other factors to be considered included cost savings and efficiencies, with the goal to save money, not spend more money. The analysis process included general discussions between working group members, a literature review, and the formation of subgroups assigned to specific topics. Discussions were held with the appropriate stakeholders on each campus, and their input is included in the recommendations.

**Recommendations**

Early in the process, The Group agreed upon a definition of shared services that would be applied: “A collaboration between campuses in line with best practices that is more efficient in terms of cost, effectiveness, and end-user satisfaction than could be accomplished by the campuses individually.” To that end, recommendations have been developed in five areas:

1. Human Resources
2. Information Technology
3. Financial Affairs, primarily procurement and accounting
4. Treasury Services
5. Undergraduate admissions

## **Report**

The report contains a section for each of the five primary areas. Each section includes an analysis of current shared services, if any, and opportunities for new collaborations.

## **HUMAN RESOURCES**

Currently there are few, if any, shared services between the Human Resources functions at the three sites. It should be noted, however, that the payroll processing function for the School of Medicine (SOM) is handled at Carbondale.

Three key areas were identified as priorities for shared systems consideration:

- **Time and Attendance Reporting**
  - Currently all three sites have paper/manual timesheets, leave and benefit management, tracking and reporting which not only results in a tremendous inefficiency in Human Resources but also impacts every university department. The manual, cumbersome processes undoubtedly causes a larger margin of error as well as lack of “real time” data.
  - SIUE uses the Banner system which may have the capacity to meet many of the system’s needs in terms of tracking and process flows. This would require SIUC, including SOM, to move its HR process from the current Oracle-based application (AIS) to the Banner system used at SIUE. In the near-term, the conversion is expected to have significant additional costs, as much as \$1 million, due to the terms of current contracts and the required licensing changes. Those costs would likely be reduced over the long-term. This topic is also included in the Information Technology – ERP section below.
  - Timeline: 4-year implementation as a component of new systemwide ERP.
  - Costs: \$1 million if pursued before a new systemwide ERP is implemented.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: \$1.3 to \$1.8 million over 7 years.
- **Hire Touch**
  - All three sites use HireTouch, a cloud-based solution, for applicant tracking and processing. A review of, and combining our contracts into one system contract, could reduce costs immediately.
    - Employee background screening through Accusource could be another area to potentially save costs.
  - Timeline: 1 year.
  - Costs: No extra costs expected.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: A systemwide contract should result in modest savings.

- **Document Scanning**
  - SIUC and SOM still have paper personnel files, while SIUE has moved to an electronic system. Paper personnel files creates a number of inefficiencies for staff. Exploring a comprehensive, shared document scanning program would be beneficial.
    - SIUE uses Image Share for document scanning.
    - SIUC and SOM both use Laserfische for document scanning.
    - SIUC also uses Banner Document Manager in its student information system (another opportunity for a systemwide document scanning and management tool outside of the Human Resources function.)
  - Timeline: 2 years.
  - Costs: No extra costs expected.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: To be determined.
    - Savings are expected as separate licenses are consolidated across the system.

Two additional areas were identified for shared services consideration:

- **Benefits administration**
  - State health insurance benefits are centralized and are moving more and more to employee self-service. Benefits administration may be an opportunity to reduce personnel costs at each of the sites. This would require some technology investments for shared tracking/communication.
- **403b (retirement) administration**
  - There are multiple retirement vendors offered to our employees at each site. Reducing the number of approved vendors and then collaborating on administration and compliance would reduce risk and increase efficiencies.

Further, it is recommended that key staff working in the Human Resources function at all three sites create a formal group with regularly scheduled meetings to exchange information and discuss ongoing opportunities for shared services.

These areas were specifically identified as functions which should remain separate:

- **Employee and labor relations**
  - Employee and labor relations requires onsite in-person administration in order to be effective. This is not a service that could easily be shared, but we could streamline and share policies, guidelines and philosophies.

- **Recruitment**

- Each site has its unique staffing needs based on many factors. Sharing this service across sites is not feasible. There may be room for further efficiency between SIUC and SOM by a review and refresh of our hiring policies and procedures.

## **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY**

Historically, the Information Technology (IT) departments at each campus have been collaborative, collegial, and responsive to common needs and issues that cross campus boundaries. Shared services promise tremendous efficiencies and possible savings but can also have additional hidden costs.

The past few years have indeed seen a shift to a more collective shared services approach, and success can best be illustrated by the combined efforts of each campus toward IT procurement. Net results have been savings of more than a million dollars to date. Other examples include the shared use of the Administrative Information System (AIS) for financial management (supported by SIUC IT staff) and systems used by Internal Audit and P-Card processes (supported by SIUE IT staff). The CIOs at each campus recognize that more can be done and are committed to moving forward.

Despite the collaboration and progress made to date, some opportunities for shared services are not as easily implemented. Current staffing and funding are not adequate to realize large-scale shared service benefits. Investment, in some cases significant, would be required. Timing is also of key concern, with regards to contract length and end date at each campus. Functional offices, and really the campuses at large, must be willing to change, adopt, and embrace a shared services approach.

In the absence of funding to create positions dedicated to the development and maintenance of shared services, the formation of a formal working group with regular scheduled meetings is suggested to share information and discuss ongoing opportunities for shared services.

The following initiatives are currently working well:

- **Combined licenses for software that is shared between campuses**

- Over the past several years, SIUC and SIUE have been working in tandem to combine common software licensing where appropriate and where benefits were realized by both campuses. Working together over the past several years, SIUC and SIUE have saved over \$1 million in licensing costs. The campuses recently worked together to negotiate different licensing terms with a vendor who increased costs by 237% with little notice.

- **Cooperation and consultation**
  - SIUC, SIUE, and SOM communicate and work well together when appropriate. In fact, currently, all three sites have high level IT administrative positions holding the President, Vice-President, and Secretary positions on a state-wide consortium group comprised of Illinois public higher education institutions. This is not only a complement to our cooperation among ourselves, but with other universities in Illinois. Another example is a combined Microsoft contract shared by the three sites that provides access to a level of professional support not otherwise financially feasible. This relationship contributes to the sharing of initiatives, challenges, and training opportunities.
  
- **Sharing resources when needed**
  - SIUC, SIUE, and SOM share resources well when appropriate. The opportunities for sharing tend to be more conducive to SIUC and SIUE because of the unique requirements at SOM. However, when any site experiences an emergent situation, the others are quick to reach out to help and share resources if needed.

The following areas were identified as opportunities for greater efficiencies:

- **Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP)**
  - A common platform, or single shared ERP environment, should streamline operations, reduce the need for shadow systems, provide the ability for more strategic staffing, and allow all sites to make better use of technology.
  
  - We recommend forming a task force comprised of stakeholders from all three sites to study options moving forward. All ERP contracts were purposely aligned and will expire in 2 ½ years. This time will allow the task force to study what options are available, costs, impact on resources, and implications of each option.
  
  - The task force should be comprised of stakeholders and functional users from all three sites to encourage buy-in at the onset.
  
  - Any ERP evaluation and the likely replacement will burden current staffing levels. Additional governance and oversight will need to be created to ensure needs are being met at each campus.
  
  - Upfront costs will be significant due to the structure of current contracts, and staff implementation time will be lengthy. There may be increased costs because of current licensing. Currently, all campus' database licenses are

covered by the current contract. While ERP costs may lower over time, moving to a new contract would result in unbudgeted costs that could be as high as \$1 million.

- The potential is high for efficiencies, standardizations, and cost savings over time, especially if combined with efforts to standardize business processes across the system.
- Timeline: 4-year implementation
  - Contracts are aligned to expired in 2 ½ years. It will be a heavy lift to meet this deadline.
- Costs: New costs of almost \$2M over 7 years
  - All campuses' Oracle licensing is tied to the current ERP licenses. Changing will require additional system wide Oracle licensing of over \$2M over 7 years, plus any new licensing costs.
- Savings/Efficiencies: Initial cost high, but long-term savings and efficiencies
  - Factoring the initial addition of a system wide Oracle licensing of over \$2M over 7 years, the overall savings and efficiencies would still vary from \$1.3M to \$1.8M over a 7-year period. So, even with new costs of \$2M, the savings over that same period would range from \$1.3M to \$1.8M. Other efficiencies might include all campuses on the same systems with consistent business practices.
- **Procurement**
  - We recommend creating the position of shared IT Procurement Officer to take the lead in negotiating and procuring major software purchases for the SIU system. This position will focus on combining proposed licensing on software and services used by all campuses to allow SIU to enjoy the greatest fiscal benefit possible.
  - Repurposing an existing position would not require significant upfront cost. The position would be expected to pay for itself through yearly cost savings.
  - Timeline: Immediate to 1 year
    - Would leverage a current position.
  - Costs: Approximately \$25K
    - Primary position would receive an upgrade to take on the extra duties and responsibilities.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: After initial investment, would see long-term savings and efficiencies

- After the initial investment of the upgrade, costs would be offset by savings from combined licensing, contracts, etc. Estimated savings could be as high as \$1-\$2M annually across the system but will vary.
- **Learning Management System (LMS)**
  - SIUC currently uses D2L and SIUE uses Blackboard for learning management systems used to host online and hybrid courses that are leveraged by almost all faculty and students at each site. We recommend forming a task force comprised of stakeholders from all three sites to study shared LMS options moving forward.
  - A system-shared LMS, possibly cloud-based, offers the opportunity for shared management, with LMS support still residing on each campus. If management is centralized, the campus performing the function will need additional resources.
  - The upfront cost may be high, and consolidation to a single system would be a multi-year project.
  - Potential for efficiencies, standardizations, and cost savings since both SIUC and SIUE fund their own systems currently. If consolidated, would avoid a funding duplication source.
  - Timeline: 3 years
    - Forming a committee to explore could happen right away. The process of choosing and consolidating to a single LMS would be a 3-year project minimally.
  - Costs: \$2.2M
    - Both SIUE and SIUC would continue to maintain their current LMS's during any transition period, costing approximately \$1.2M over a 3-year period. If a completely new system was adopted, would require approximately \$600K of additional funding for licensing alone and \$400K in implementation costs over that same period.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: Approximately \$400K recurring savings annually in licensing alone. Added efficiencies will create additional savings.
    - Once adopted, both Universities would use a system contract instead of separate contracts and systems saving of approximately \$400K/year. Consolidation of some staffing duties would incur additional savings.
- **Information Security**
  - We suggest examining the creation of a shared information security umbrella, much like what exists for the general counsel and audit functions at SIU. A

shared model would consolidate and normalize information security for each site.

- A Chief Information Security Officer and shared information security umbrella for the SIU System could be put in place in a relatively short amount of time.
  - Critical to the effectiveness of the shared security umbrella would be dedicated information security staff.
  - Additional funding estimated at \$320,000 would be required for full staffing. However, this cost would be offset if able to minimize or prevent cyber-security events.
- Shared services for information security offer the potential for efficiencies, standardization, and increased information security across the system.
- Timeline: 1 year
  - An existing CISO position would be leveraged with an upgrade to manage the umbrella. Additional positions would be hired during the first year.
- Costs: Approximately \$320K annually
  - Initiative includes new, annual, ongoing costs. However, it creates efficiencies and long-term savings.
- Savings/Efficiencies: Saves \$500K first incident, savings go up from there
  - After the initial addition of new ongoing funding, initiative creates a system wide information security umbrella offering efficiencies, standardizations, and higher security stance across the system. If the umbrella avoids just one incident, it saves \$500K in cybersecurity insurance alone, and increases with each avoided incident.
- **High Performance Computing**
  - We recommend sharing High Performance Computing (HPC) resources. Both SIUC and SIUE have invested in HPC infrastructure and support services. SIUE has increased its support of HPC (for research and instruction) rooted from a successful NSF campus cyberinfrastructure grant and increased involvement managing researcher-specific HPC infrastructure. SIUC's HPC environment is part of the nationally recognized XSEDE community, an NSF-funded organization.
  - SIUC and SIUE faculty and SIUE IT staff have submitted proposals to the NSF and other sponsors that could enhance or complement campus-level resources. The nature of these proposals and their sometimes connection to specific projects and/or researchers presents difficulties for the concept of true shared services in the HPC space.



- Next steps would include the creation of an HPC advisory group consisting of stakeholders from each site to guide future HPC investments – staff, equipment, and resources – to avoid duplicate investment and make sure that shared resources are available to faculty and students on each campus.
- This initiative would have low upfront costs and low implementation time. The expected outcome would be increased research and curriculum opportunities. There will be recurring costs to maintain systems or add positions as required.
- Timeline: Immediate
  - Advisory group could be formed almost immediately with no additional costs
- Costs: Ongoing costs to maintain systems
  - There will be on-going costs to maintain the systems and add positions as needed. These decisions will be guided by the combined advisory group. Overall goal would be to include support for the system in submitted grants leveraging the systems in order to become self-sustaining.
- Savings/Efficiencies: Ongoing costs, but the creation will create additional savings and efficiencies
  - The ultimate goal would be to support for the system in submitted grants leveraging the systems in order to become self-sustaining. Efficiencies in operations would also be a focus.
- **IT Operations**
  - We recommend creating an IT management task force comprised of IT upper management from all three sites to focus on shared efficiencies, consistencies in operations, possible new services, and possible areas for fiscal savings. Whereas the IT groups do work together very well when needed and appropriate, this could provide a formal opportunity for sharing and planning with no upfront cost.
  - Timeline: Immediate
    - Could be organized immediately.
  - Costs: No Additional Costs
  - Savings/Efficiencies:
    - Organized group discussions will focus on savings and efficiencies.

## **FINANCIAL AFFAIRS (PROCUREMENT and ACCOUNTING)**

The financial affairs units at all three sites currently utilize a number of shared services that are working well:

- **Illinois Public Higher Education Cooperative (IPHEC)**
  - The utilization of Illinois Public Higher Education Cooperative (IPHEC) awards by SIU offers a substantial savings and increased efficiency in best practice procurement. IPHEC is able to leverage the spending of all Illinois universities to drive down costs through group agreements.
- **Procurement Reporting as a System**
  - SIU is recognized as one System, even though there are multiple sites. SIU receives a single appropriation from the State and submits reports to the state as a single unit. Reports required by the Illinois Procurement Code, include Business Enterprise Program Goal and Expenditure reports, Small Business Act report, Cooperative Purchase report, etc. While we have three purchasing offices, we work well together for our common goals.

- **Accounting and Finance Integration/Collaboration**

The accounting, finance, and audit functions are highly integrated among SIU system sites. Many functions are coordinated jointly while others are managed by the individual unit that is best suited to coordinate that particular function. Examples of these functions include the following:

- Investment allocation between campuses- SIUE allocates, SIUC posts entries
- Multiple shared responsibilities for financial audit that crosses campuses.
- SIUC performs consolidation of the Annual Financial Statements from the three sites.
- Administrative Information System (AIS) – the general ledger, AP, Purchasing, and financial reporting has utilized a shared system since 1999.
  - System-wide testing for AIS shared between SIUC and SIUE.
  - Shared vendor master file with all sites.
  - SIUE loads fiscal officer reports for system.
- SIUC coordinates business interruption insurance, requiring data provided by SIUE.
- State appropriation reconciliation for the SIU system is done by SIUC.
- SIUE manages SIU system US Bank portal for vendor ACH payments.
- SIUC prepares consolidated annual Housing and Auxiliary (HAFS) Bondholder's Report.
- System-wide GASB 87 implementation and working group
- System-wide ACH fraud and processes documentation group
- SIUE provides system-wide data for GATA reporting to the state (via Internal Audit)

While there are many instances of current shared services, opportunities have been identified for additional shared services to facilitate even greater efficiencies within financial affairs:

- **Business Enterprise Program (BEP)**
  - The BEP promotes the economic development of diverse businesses – those owned by minorities, women, and persons with disabilities. SIU, along with other state agencies and universities, has a goal to spend 20% on goods and services procured through certified-BEP businesses. This program has been identified as critical by procurement leaders.
  - As reporting to the state is system-wide, it is recommended that resources with procurement diversity program expertise be coordinated with the SIU system to provide a greater efficiency in achieving our goal. This would be similar to the University of Illinois’ Office of Procurement Diversity. There would be an upfront cost to centralize this function.
  - Timeline: 1 year.
  - Costs: New staff position might be required.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: Better compliance with state goals regarding procurement diversity.
- **Procurement System**
  - All Illinois universities now have the opportunity to use an electronic procurement system through a recently negotiated IPHEC contract with a provider of this service. All three Purchasing Directors are very interested in this program and exploring the options of the integration with AIS. While this would require some upfront costs, there is the potential for savings in the medium term.
  - Using the electronic system will alleviate some of the shortcomings of the current system, which has had no significant changes since implementation 20 years ago. On-line purchase requisitions were never implemented and there is no e-procurement system or contract management system available.
  - Timeline: Immediate to 1 year.
  - Costs: Less than \$20,000.
  - Savings/Efficiencies: Better use of procurement staff time through the elimination of current cumbersome paperwork requirements.
- **SIU Prime Vendor Contracts**
  - The SIU Purchasing departments utilize the IPHEC contracts, when they are available and economically feasible for our needs. On occasion, it is more beneficial to explore options as a System to collaborate on contracts that

would meet our specific needs. This collaboration has no cost and has the potential for both short and long-term savings.

- Timeline: Immediate
  - Costs: None
  - Savings/Efficiencies: Potential for significant savings, dependent on contracts
- **Single Use Accounts**
    - To streamline the payment process, decrease the amount of time and costs to issue checks, and increase the P-Card rebate, the current provider, JPMC, has a program for single use accounts. All SIU sites have been discussing implementing the program, and it is highly recommended that this dialogue continue. Implementation will result in short and long-term revenue enhancement.
    - Timeline: Less than one year.
    - Costs: None expected.
    - Savings/Efficiencies: Potential for thousands of dollars of new revenue, dependent on use of the new accounts.

Also, an area was identified that should remain as a specialized, separate function at each site:

- **Specialized Procurements for Services, Supplies, and Equipment**
  - Each SIU procurement office serves departments that have specialized requirements, and we recommend that this continues. For example, at the School of Medicine, there are procurement experts in the contracting areas of medical services and supplies. These are very specialized and highly regulated services and commodities. It is critical for clinical operations, education and training of medical students and residents that procurement is done by individuals with that expertise in person. This expertise is also true for medical research. Other examples include specialized units such as the School of Pharmacy and School of Dental Medicine at SIUE and university farms and the aviation program at SIUC.

Finally, it is recommended that key staff working in the procurement and accounting functions at all three sites create a formal group with regularly scheduled meetings to exchange information and discuss ongoing opportunities for shared services.

## **INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH & STUDIES**

Historically, the Institutional Research and Studies (IR&S) departments at each university have been internally focused due to the fact that each department reports for the respective university. The Directors of Institutional Research and Studies have a long history of collaboration on state

projects and requirements and a common presentation of information, as needed. Currently, the SIUE department is fully staffed and the Carbondale department has a number of vacancies, including the director's position. Additionally, each department has underlying and unique responsibilities that are different. Each office also has different responsibilities that would present challenges in a true shared services IR&S.

Fundamentally, a true shared-services approach for IR&S would require common systems, policies and procedures as a first step to realize efficiencies and savings. Currently, there are separate student and HR systems at the two universities and the School of Medicine; the general ledger system is shared but is separate from the student and HR systems (in a standard ERP system all the systems are integrated into a unified whole). The impact of this is that there are functionally separate systems that require a great deal of work to pull accurate information that must then be matched between systems.

In addition to different systems, each university has developed policies and procedures to support the mission, vision and values of the respective university. While many of these are similar, they are not the same. As the systems reflect the operational needs of the universities, common policies and procedures would need to be adopted in order to implement shared systems.

There are a number of opportunities for collaborative initiatives:

- **IR Governance**

- We suggest examining the creation of a shared IR&S umbrella, much like what exists for general counsel and audit functions at SIU. Both universities have a director of IR&S, but the SIUC Director is "acting." A shared IR&S umbrella would consolidate and normalize responsibilities for each University. The IR&S responsibility at the School of Medicine generally falls under the function of the SIUC IR&S operation.
- Critical to the effectiveness of the shared IR&S umbrella would be dedicated staff at each university location in order to respond to data needs for each respective site. It is likely that appropriate staff already exists at each University to support such a model but that would have to be evaluated. The cost, hidden or otherwise, would be at the system level and within the normalization of the responsibilities across the system.
- Timeline: Three to five years A consolidated ERP system would be required.
- Costs: Salary for an executive director position at the system level.
- Savings/Efficiencies: Consolidation of responsibilities at the system level.

- **IR Operations**

- We recognize that more frequent collaboration would be beneficial for the normalization of processes within each IR&S department at each University.

An example could include the IBHE cost study whereas each IR&S department could evaluate approaches to improve upon processes using collaborative lessons learned. In lieu of a shared, system-wide IR&S umbrella this would be an initial, preemptive step to further collaborate together in the development of a system-wide best practice approach for data reporting across the System. Further, this effort would serve to provide an inventory of responsibilities within each IR&S department at each University in an effort to more formalize the mission and function of Institutional Research & Studies across the System.

- Timeline: 3 to 6 months.
- Costs: None
- Savings/Efficiencies: Improved system wide reporting.

- **System-Wide Fact Book**

- We recommend the creation of a system-wide Fact Book to include data from all universities within the System. SIUC has developed an online, interactive Fact Book with great success. IBHE has done something similar at the state level. A system-wide Fact Book would require further research regarding feasibility but could offer tremendous potential for reporting efficiency. The benefit is that a system-wide Fact Book could be updated more efficiently and would use dashboard type functionality for an enhanced user experience.
- Timeline: 18 to 24 months,
- Costs: The new Microsoft contract will include a visualization tool that may be utilized. There may be costs for additional staff time.
- Savings/Efficiencies: Improved system wide reporting.

## **TREASURY**

Treasury Operations is a system-wide office and serves three primary functions: Capital Financing, Investment Management, and Cash and Liquidity Management.

### **Capital Financing**

As currently structured, the Capital Financing operations are organized to maximize the benefit of shared services. Capital Financing services managed by Treasury include, but are not limited to, securing appropriate project and financing approvals, engaging an expert financing team, determining the best financing structure, establishing the financing timeline, securing rating agency credit ratings, investing bond proceeds, managing compliance with debt financing covenants, IRS, SEC and state regulations, ensuring payments to bondholders are completed accurately and timely, and routinely reviewing the debt portfolio for refunding opportunities.

## Investment Management

As currently structured, the Investment Management operations are organized to maximize the benefit of shared services. These services include, but are not limited to, consolidating all system funds into one investment portfolio in order to maximize investment returns, securing investment management and custody services, monitoring investment portfolio for compliance with state statutes, investment policy and investment guidelines, and rebalancing the investment portfolio periodically.

## Cash and Liquidity Management

The Cash and Liquidity Management operations present the best opportunities for improvement. Currently, Treasury Office staff manage daily cash flows and bank balances, oversee bank account fraud protections, negotiate banking and financial services contracts, and assist campus departments with the implementation of banking products that support their business processes. Campus departments, such as Accounts Payable, Bursar's Office, Payroll and Accounting, are the ultimate end users of most banking products. As such, changes to banking products are currently driven by individual site needs or dictated by the University's banking partners. Changes to banking services are heavily reliant on the availability of campus department, Information Technology and Treasury resources for implementation and ongoing support. The current arrangement has resulted in an inefficient banking structure, duplication of processes, and increased exposure to potential fraud and errors.

- Within the Cash and Liquidity Management function, opportunities for improvement by restructuring banking services include:
  - Reduce the number of banking relationships
  - Consolidate payment, reconciliation and information transmission processes
  - Implement new technologies
  - Update banking related internal processes
- A summary of potential benefits from the restructure of banking services includes:
  - Reduce fraud & errors
  - Increase earnings potential and generate cost savings
  - Reduce required staff time
  - Better align accountability, authority and responsibility
  - Strengthen expertise to ensure banking-related compliance
  - Enhance customer service and employee safety
- Timeline: 1 to 2 years for full implementation. The RFP could begin immediately.
- Costs: None. Staff effort will be involved.
- Savings/Efficiencies: To be determined; a summary of benefits is listed above.

Treasury staff currently maintain close working relationships with business office staff at campus sites. It may be beneficial to formalize the current arrangement into a working group with periodic scheduled meetings.

## **UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS**

The last area considered for shared services opportunities was the admissions function, specifically undergraduate admissions.

One opportunity was identified as a priority for shared services within the SIU system:

- **Purchase of Prospective Student Names**
  - Share the names of third-party vendors being used for enrollment initiatives for the purpose of pursuing system-wide contracts with potentially advantageous terms.
  - Under current practice, each campus contracts separately with vendors including ACT, NRCCUA, and The College Board, among others, for the purchase of the names of prospective students.
  - Contracts negotiated at the system level would be expected to result in more favorable pricing based on increased volume, resulting in overall savings.
  - Timeline: Immediate
  - Costs: No additional cost
  - Savings/Efficiencies: Joint contracts would be expected to result in a lower unit cost.