

October 24, 2011 Joint Administrative Services Board Regular Meeting 12:00 pm

As a regular meeting of the Joint Administrative Services Board held on Monday, October 24, 2011 at 12:00 pm in the Meeting Room AB, Berryville Clarke County Joint Government Center, 101 Chalmers Court, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, Berryville, Virginia.

Members Present:

Sharon Keeler, J. Michael Hobert, Michael Murphy, David Ash, Emily Rhodes

Staff Present:

Tom Judge, David Baggett (arrived at 12:14 pm), Gordon Russell, Amanda Kowalski

Also Present:

Anthony Roper, Clarke County Sheriff

**1. CALL TO ORDER – Determination of Quorum.**

Ms. Rhodes called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Mr. Hobert moved, seconded by Dr. Murphy, to approve the minutes as presented.

The motion carried as follows:

Sharon Keeler	-	Aye
Emily Rhodes, Chair	-	Abstain
Mike Murphy	-	Aye
J. Michael Hobert, Vice Chair	-	Aye
David Ash	-	Abstain

**3. TECHNOLOGY**

*a. Draft Information Technology Governance Policy*

Mr. Judge gave a brief background on the need for a Governance Policy regarding technology, reviewing the ‘Quick Draft’ he wrote and which is included in the agenda.

Mr. Hobert questioned the change of names in the board. Mr. Judge explained that it was his doing based upon the scope of activities the board decides upon.

Mr. Baggett jointed the Board at 12:14 pm.

Mr. Judge further reviewed the sections inside the Technology Governance Policy, including the purpose and definitions of line items inside

the purpose section. Mr. Judge noted that that the purpose of the policy will be constantly evolving with technology.

Mr. Judge reviewed the policy for system cooperation, noting that there has to be a provision to keep the different bodies working together.

Mr. Judge also noted that high data standards need to be established by the JAS board for the ease of updating and training across several governmental entities.

Lastly, Mr. Judge reviewed the high importance of security and correct implementation upon acceptance of any technology in governmental entities.

*b. IT Budgeting and Decision Making*

Upon completion of the review of the Governance Policy, the board then discussed their thoughts and ideas of the draft.

- Dr. Murphy noted that the JAS and MOU documents need to be parallel documents. Dr. Murphy noted that the definitions inside the draft are very helpful and that only minor tweaks would have to take place. Dr. Murphy stated that time will have to be spent on open versus proprietary on the establishment of standards and that a definition of the technology plan needs to be established as well. Overall, Dr. Murphy noted that this is a very good start on the policy.
- Mr. Roper stated that he would be interested in working with the board regarding the policy and requested that the Sheriff's department sign off before any plan go into effect. Mr. Hobert stated that the agreement would be to establish constraints in a homogenous area, questioning if the personnel policy would be an issue. Mr. Roper stated that he did not see it as a setback. Mr. Judge noted that there are differences in policies between different governing boards; however, there is a need to have as many homogenized business practices as possible. Mr. Roper noted that many of his policies are restricted by the Code of Virginia. Dr. Murphy noted that there has to be a process in place, taking into consideration the different policies in place.
- Mr. Hobert spoke the difficulty in delegating authority for appointed officials, noting the challenge with establishing policies that are accepted by all. He also spoke on accountability throughout all the entities.
- Mr. Ash stated that it may be more feasible to look again at the original agreement, noting that the original agreement was pieced together. He also stated that the scope needs to be defined and clarified better.

- Dr. Murphy verbalized the need to create a matrix to define the outcome and the persons involved with each task. Mr. Baggett agreed that a matrix need be created for the purpose of creating overlap between departments. Mr. Baggett stated that the board needs to agree on the scope before the matrix can be created. Mr. Ash spoke on each department having their own individual interests and needs in a program, questioning the ability to find a common ground. Dr. Murphy noted there needs to be a technology exception list created for each department.
- Ms. Rhodes suggested that the original agreement be looked at further to better identify the scope of work. The board members agreed that it did. Ms. Rhodes also stated that specific common goals need to be established.
- Mr. Hobert spoke that a concrete foundation needs to be established in order to 'sell' this policy to each department.
- Mr. Russell stated that the scope needs to be narrowed to core financial issues within the county and not a broad scope for all departments. Mr. Baggett spoke on the evolving technology among each department.
- Dr. Murphy stated that there are going to be more software exceptions to the ERP model that what originally thought between the different departments. Mr. Judge recommended that the board members do background research on IT governance structures to establish a set of standards and exceptions.
- Mr. Russell spoke on the difficulty with clear boundaries of authority on networks within departments.
- Mr. Hobert noted the difficulty of the Board agreeing on a module acceptable to all and the difficulty of having the whole county agree upon equanimity.
- Mr. Judge reviewed the articles he prepared for the meeting, noting that the author stated to start slow with implementing IT governance.
- Mr. Ash stated that the Board is ultimately going to be in control of implementing an ERP to the rest of the department county-wide and that a solid commitment is needed from every member. Dr. Murphy stated that there is now a solidly defined mission in place, whereas before there was not.

- Mr. Baggett spoke on the common ground that he shares with the county's IT needs and responsibilities.
- Mr. Judge spoke on the success of the focus groups that were performed previously.
- Dr. Murphy proposed that both he and Mr. Judge sit down and construct a framework and scope for the ERP model acceptable to all and come back to the Board for review and discussion.
- Additionally, Mr. Hobert requested that a revised memo of agreement be constructed for Board review. Mr. Judge will review the document and bring back to the Board a revised document for approval.

**4. NEXT MEETING NOVEMBER 28**

**5. ADJOURNMENT**

Ms. Rhodes adjourned the meeting at 1:58 pm.

---

Minutes Recorded and Prepared by: Amanda W. Kowalski