

Joint Administrative Services Board
November 28, 2011 Regular Meeting 12:00 pm

At a regular meeting of the Joint Administrative Services Board held on Monday, November 28, 2011 at 12:00 pm in Meeting Room C, Berryville Clarke County Joint Government Center, 101 Chalmers Court, 2nd Floor, Berryville, Virginia.

Members Present

David Ash; J. Michael Hobert; Michael Murphy

Members Absent

Sharon Keeler; Emily Rhodes

Staff Present

Tom Judge, Lora B. Walburn

Others Present

Ed Leonard

1. Call To Order - Determination of Quorum

After determining that a quorum was present, at 12:09 pm Mr. Hobert called the meeting to order.

2. Adoption of Agenda

Add Item 4 Comments On Matrix Consideration Previously Raised by Dr. Murphy.

By consensus, the Board approved the agenda as proposed.

3. Approval of Minutes

Page 3, 4th point from bottom of page: add after a model “**acceptable to all.**”

Mike Murphy moved, seconded by David Ash, to approve the October 24, 2011 meeting minutes as changed. The motion carried as follows:

Sharon Keeler	-	Absent
Robina Rich Bouffault, Alternate		Absent
Emily Rhodes, Chair	-	Absent
Michael Murphy	-	Aye
J. Michael Hobert, Vice Chair	-	Aye
David Ash	-	Aye

4. Technology

A. The original agreement

Tom Judge recapped discussion from the October meeting regarding the Board’s request that the technology governance be clearly addressed noting that the responsibility of Joint Administrative Services for EDP matters was somewhat ambiguous. He drew the Board’s attention to Scope of Activities - Joint Financial Services Office that specifically references EDP Hardware/Software selection and operation under responsibility and the third paragraph under Priorities. Mr. Judge explained that finance systems were among the first automated systems and it is unclear whether as more systems were added, governance would continue as a function of Joint Administrative Services.

B. The addendum revising certain titles

- Mr. Judge touched on the April 1994 amendment renaming the Board, as well as the Administrative Services Director.

C. The agreement creating a consolidated maintenance department for which the JAS Board has a dispute resolution role

- Following review, the Board discussed Item G Dispute Resolution.

D. The by-laws of the JAS Board

- Previous amendments to the bylaws did not address on IT.
- By-Laws of the Clarke County Joint Administrative Services Board Article X Instruments and documents of the Joint Board:
 - Discussed the process of minute preparation, distribution and review.

- By consensus:
 - Agreed that more formal communication with the respective bodies was needed.
 - Agreed that Tom Judge will provide the respective bodies with written updates of JAS actions and resolutions.
 - Agreed that the JAS Board may take action that becomes a recommendation to other governing bodies to either accept or reject with a default position that without an objection the action is approved; and with an objection/rejection, it is returned to the JAS Board for follow up.
 - Agreed to rewrite Article X to clarify that the Administrative Services Director shall present to each Board the agreed upon actions of the JAS Board for their consent or objection; to make a standing agenda item; either the board consents or objects.
 - Agreed that the governing bodies are not disagreeing with the minutes but with the actions taken by the JAS Board.
 - Agreed to modify Paragraph 1 to read “The official instruments of the Joint Board are not only a record of notice, the agenda, and the minutes of meetings but also notice of action or resolution. Where the Joint Board wishes to provide advice to the Board of Supervisors and/or the School Board, it may do so by resolution.”
 - Agreed to modify Paragraph 5 to clarify that “the actions,” in resolution form, shall be certified to the governing bodies and changing to “majority plus one”
 - Agreed to modify Paragraph 4 changing . . . After corrections, the County Administrator and the Division Superintendent shall bring the actions in writing before the Board of Supervisors and the School Board, respectively, at the next meeting of each Board, and the minutes to the Joint Administrative Services Board.” It was suggested that reference to the actions of the Administrative Services Director could be noted in this paragraph.
 - Agreed to modify Paragraph 6 to read “If neither the Board of Supervisors nor the School Board object by majority vote at their next meeting following the Joint Board meeting at which the action was taken, the action will be final. If either Board does object, the matter will be reconsidered by the Joint Board.
 - Agreed to add a new article that describes the process of getting, receiving and making decisions.
- Tom Judge was tasked with making the agreed upon revisions and to provide the revised drafted documents to the JAS Board members prior to the January meeting.
- Chairman Hobert requested that in accordance with Article 11 Paragraph 2 Tom Judge prepare a review of prior year activities and to prepare a plan for the coming year.

E. A draft amendment to the JAS agreement concerning technology governance

- To clarify IT governance in the Memorandum of Agreement, the Board agreed to add under Direction and Control between the last two paragraphs the following: “The Joint Financial / Administrative Services Board shall be responsible for information technology governance. This responsibility includes: establishing information technology standards, establishment and review of technology plan, recommending projects for funding, reviewing and recommending procurements of information technology, monitoring technology implementations, establishing business processes related to technology implementations that are based on best practices, and establishing and monitoring standards and practices to ensure the security of information technology.”
- JAS Board needs to determine the scope and depth of technology monitoring and implementation.
- It is envisioned that School and County IT Directors will bring to the JAS Board their respective plans and procurements to provide an opportunity to take advantage of commonalities, economies of scale, etc.
- What is currently lacking in the definition is that for the IT governance process to work, it must have collaboration and review to maximize efficiencies and economies of scale.
- Need to define an annual review and approval process for software acquisition.
- Too few IT staff to support current applications.
- Agreed to the exclusion of software specific to classroom instruction.
- Need to spend more not less on IT.
- Professionals suggest going slowly with the implementation of IT governance.

Next Steps:

- Revise bylaws.
- Update direction and control section of agreement.
- Provide follow up on best practices.
- List definitions of what contract would be.
- Need to know what the contracts will look like between:
 - Constitutional Offices
 - Board of Supervisors
 - School Board
- Develop an implementation schedule

- Where we are going
- View
- Core
- Timeline
- Priorities
- Procurement process

5. Summarization of the Matrix

Dr. Murphy summarized his actions in exploration of options to aid in the hiring process / applicant tracking and other personnel systems. He advised that he would like to further explore "ApplTrac," the system used by Winchester City Schools.

There was discussion regarding the benefits and disadvantages of boutique systems versus integrated systems.

6. Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled meeting is set for Monday, January 23, 2012 at noon in Meeting Room AB of the Berryville Clarke County Government Center.

7. Adjournment

At 2:05 pm, Mike Murphy, seconded by David Ash, moved to adjourn the November 28, 2011 meeting.

Minutes Recorded and Prepared by: Lora B. Walburn