

Phase 1 Financials Additional Training

- Web Training on 1099 reporting in January.
- Ongoing support, including Next Year Budget Entry.

Phase 2 Payroll/HR

- Post live training December 1, 2, & 3: State, Federal, Vendor Reporting, Personnel Actions, Applicant Tracking.
- W2s, 1099s and ACA reporting in early January.

Phase 3 Revenue and Permits.

- Schedules established for Permits and Code Enforcement and for Accounts Receivable/General Billing.
- Must sort out transition issues: three simultaneous revenue collection systems during implementation.
- Animal License and Business License modules approved.
- See customer file discussion below.

Tom Judge reviewed the above points. Highlights include:

- Will continue to roll out employee self-service. Current users include:
 - Parks part-time staff
 - School Administration
 - School IT
 - Social Services
- Need to determine functionality of the Treasurer's office during transition.
- Need to schedule implementation of animal license and business license modules.

4. The Customer File

Gordon Russell and Tom Judge have been researching the setup of several files related to the Revenue modules: Customer file, Central Property File, and Real Estate Master. The research has involved several conversations with Tyler Technologies consultants, the cities of Falls Church and Staunton, as well as other communities. The results of this research will be shared at the meeting, perhaps with recommendation for the setup.

Highlights of review by Tom Judge include:

- This is the most complex part of the implementation.
- Will try to keep to one customer record for all modules.

- Per Gordon Russell, real estate records will be maintained as a separate entity unless there is a perfect overlay with all the other customer entities that might be associated.
- Researching requirements for maintaining personal property records.
- Hope to appoint a central address “changing” department.
- Need to conduct review of current data.

Following review, **David Weiss moved that the Joint Administrative Services Board sanction the idea of cooperation among all departments in order to create the best customer file that we can.**

Tom Judge asked to amend the motion to appoint a keeper for new customer records.

Treasurer Sharon Keeler agreed to be the control point for addition of new customer records.

Following additional discussion, **David Weiss withdrew his motion** and asked that the language be brought before the Board at its next meeting.

David Weiss opined that he believed it was important to indicate that the Joint Administrative Services Board is officially pursuing this course of unification.

Tom Judge suggested the motion as, ***“be it resolved that the County move forward with the use of a common customer across all departments and agencies to the greatest extent possible and that the deciders as to the creation of customers will reside in the office of the Treasurer, which department is responsible ultimately for the collection of the revenue.”***

Chuck Bishop, seconded by Sharon Keeler, moved the motion suggested by Tom Judge. The motion carried by the following vote:

David Ash	-	Aye
Chuck Bishop	-	Aye
Sharon Keeler	-	Aye
Charles “Chip” Schutte	-	Aye
David Weiss	-	Aye

5. Invoice Processing

Please find attached a listing of the number of invoices entered over approximately the first six months of using MUNIS.

Highlights of review and discussion include:

- Emily Johnson, Accounts Payable Clerk, inputs the greatest number; responsible for checking all other entries; inputs invoices for Social Services.
- Ruby Miller, Office Manager Maintenance, is a close second in number of invoices processed. Joint Administrative Services has offered to input utility invoices; however, it is believed that it

is Ms. Miller's preference to input because it would be more time consuming to go back in Munis to check the invoices if JAS performs the entry. Joint Administrative Services is happy to renew the offer to take back some of the burden.

- Joint Administrative Services should enter invoices for items received through Purchasing; however, with the increase in drop shipments, there is a lot of confusion about where invoices should go resulting in invoice entry for items for which persons did not issue the purchase order. This could be resolved by providing invoicing instructions to vendors.
- Annette Gilley inputs all regional organizations.
- Perception among smaller users is that this system is taking more time than it did before on paper. These users enter small batches, which is where the perception comes that it is more time consuming.
 - The majority of persons entering are low-volume users.
 - Low volume users enter invoices when received to facilitate timely payment.
 - David Ash observed that holding invoices to make a batch adds pressure, creates a sense of urgency on approvers and limits the time available for the approver to ask questions and review supporting data.
 - To alleviate the burden on low-volume users, we may want to select one staff member to enter invoices on behalf of more departments.
 - Emily Johnson has expressed concern about potential problems that could arise by waiting to enter invoices.
 - Currently, invoices are paid with the next scheduled check run after entry even if before due date; however, invoices can be entered to be paid when due.
 - Tom Judge opined that the perception of low-volume users will change as other modules are added.
 - Some high volume users also assert that processing takes longer in Munis.
 - Tom Judge offered to take a lot of the volume, even beyond utilities, from Ruby Miller but noted that his impression was that she wanted to enter these invoices. He suggested that the joint maintenance group might want to discuss further.
 - Sheriff Roper commented that his department would prefer to process its invoices for, like Maintenance, they also check/verify the invoices while processing.
 - Chuck Bishop put forth that with Munis the information / workload is not shared as previously. Previously, the paperwork would be complete or nearly [requisitions filled out, invoice coded, etc.] before being turned in for approval; now, with basically one point of entry, the added responsibility and processing time affects other priorities.
 - Tom Judge suggested adding more users.
- Two principals agreed to from the beginning:
 - If you send out the purchase order, then you do the receiving and the invoice.
 - If the invoice happens to land in your basket even if you aren't the one that sent out the purchase order you should key it in anyway rather than have the courier run it around.

- Tom Judge stated that the problem here is that the vendor has sent the invoice to the wrong address. The answer is to put the invoice in but to send an email to the vendor asking them to change the address and send it to Emily Johnson.
- Some people prefer to receive and key the invoice.
- Emily Johnson indicates that at her batch rate it takes one to two minutes to key an invoice.
- Purchase requisitions are not required for purchases under \$800.
- Purchasing will enter requisitions for items under \$800 as requested. It will also handle the receiving and invoicing.
- Continue to track situation and evolve as needed.

Mr. Weiss stated that he has been told that there are issues with training schedules, training inadequate or ineffective, computer systems not up when training sessions start, Tyler employees absent or not knowledgeable of system capabilities. He asked additional discussion ways to improve Munis function. Highlights include:

- CCPS:
 - Some frustration initially; and while there are still some rumblings, it is not as much.
 - Complaints about training include instruction during sessions on how the back end worked when attendees were expecting instruction on how to operate the system.
 - Individual training conducted.
 - Not hearing as much as he used to and believes that employees are becoming more accustomed to the system.
 - Budget training was conducted using a “Go To Meeting” format.
 - Must wait for new vendors to be approved by Joint Administrative Services to place orders.
- Treasurer:
 - Still confusion but hopeful that it will work out.
 - Uncertain how her office will make three different systems work.
 - Timing could have been better. Taylor’s schedule placed training/set up during tax season.
 - She and her Deputy III will be working during the Thanksgiving holiday to input codes.
- County Administration:
 - Processing in Munis takes too long, whether perception or reality. Six months into the new program and users do not see any time savings.
 - System is cumbersome.
 - Question why we are investing the time and effort to teach a user how to input in Munis if it is not something done often enough to become proficient.

- While still hopeful, there has been no indication that time saved in another area will offset the increased workload.
- Munis appears to negatively affects other programs while logged in; so to prevent issues, other programs must be closed before opening Munis.
 - Tom Judge stated that this was not a Munis problem. Noting a similar problem at the high school, he opined that this might result from using too much bandwidth, a wireless connection, too much loaded onto the system, or too untidy in the background.
- Tom Judge offered to show users how to set up ways to make the system quicker such as shortcuts, create a list of favorites, set up views across the top of the screen.
- Sheriff:
 - Excited about Munis, very pleased.
 - Looking forward to the new budgeting process and building the process.
 - Next year at this time, the budget process should be much easier.

David Weiss opined that in order for things to be addressed staff must be very specific. He remarked that the County should take some proactive steps to address valid concerns. He further noted that some issues could be resolved by more one-on-one training.

Tom Judge responded that his staff should be more available to provide one-on-one instruction. He informed the Board that Annette Gilley has been providing one-on-one report training.

Chairman Schutte reminded that during the planning phase the Board had anticipated issues around the six-month mark.

Tom Judge remarked that it would take time to implement and that some modules were a long way from complete. He further noted that it would take some time to absorb. Mr. Judge concluded that the organization had done well but there was still a lot of follow up in individual cases.

6. Next Meeting Date December 21, 2015

Adjournment

At 2:06 pm, Chairman Schutte adjourned the meeting.

Minutes Recorded by David Ash and Transcribed by Lora B. Walburn