

AGENDA

Joint Administrative Services Board
January 23, 2012 12:00 p.m.
Joint Government Center

1. Call to Order.

Determination of Quorum

Selection of Chairperson

Selection of Vice-Chairperson

Establishment of meeting calendar. Please consider the following:

Date	Time	Location	Topic(s)
02/27/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	Health Ins, Budget, Technology
03/26/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	Health Insurance, Technology
04/23/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	Health Insurance, Technology
05/21/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	Health Insurance, Audit, Technology
06/25/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	TBD
09/24/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	TBD
10/29/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	TBD
12/17/12	12:00:00 PM	JGC	Director Evaluation, TBD
01/24/13	12:00:00 PM	JGC	Organization, Budget

2. Approval of Minutes. (November 28 Minutes Attached) (pg. 3).

3. Proposed Revision of Memorandum of Agreement creating Joint Administrative Services Board. Please find the following attached:

a. A cover memo to Boards regarding governance (pg.8).

b. A rewrite of the agreement adding the responsibility for information technology governance (pg. 12).

c. The same document, but showing changes from the original 1993 Memorandum (pg. 15).

d. A sample governance agreement between the City of Hampton Commissioner of Revenue and IT Department (not fully applicable to Clarke) (pg. 20).

4. JAS FY 13 Budget Request. Please find an operating budget request attached. In addition, attached is the ERP system request adopted by the board in September, which will also be forwarded (pg. 28).

5. Audit of Health Insurance Group Membership for Dependents. Neighboring localities such as Fauquier, Prince William, Fairfax, and Loudoun have contracted with outside firms to investigate dependents enrolled in the group health insurance program. These audits have led to savings through the identification of dependents

claimed who are not in fact eligible. A similar, but in-house, study is proposed for Clarke, with Joint Administrative Services working in cooperation with the personnel functions of the Government and School Division to confirm the credentials of claimed dependents.

6. Requiring New Vendors to Accept Electronic Funds Transfer (EFT) payments.

A sustained effort has been made over the last ten years to get vendors to accept electronic payment. This effort has had marginal success, though the advantages for both the vendor (faster payment) and County (no postage and handling) are substantial. It is requested that the Board consider requiring any new Clarke County vendor to accept EFT payment.

7. Director Evaluation. An evaluation form is attached for consideration by the Board (pg. 33).

8. Next Meeting will be February 27 (Health Insurance Renewal).

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 "AppiTrac," 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

MEMORANDUM

TO: Clarke County Board of Supervisors and Clarke County School Board

CC: Government and School Managers

FR: Joint Administrative Services Board

DT: 1/1/12

RE: *Information Technology Governance and Memorandum of Agreement Update*

BACKGROUND

In September of 2011 the Joint Administrative Services Board adopted a budget request to the Board of Supervisors for funding of an Enterprise Resource Planning System (ERP). This computer application would replace a number of systems currently in use, as well as automate certain functions now handled manually. It requires that information management systems be organized across departments and agencies. A study to determine the feasibility of such a system recommended the creation of a governance structure which could make decisions on policies and standards for this system as well as guiding its implementation.

Information technology governance has developed in public and private sector organizations to manage the increasing volume and variety of technology solutions adopted by organizations. Adopting common standards and policies for technologies increases efficiency, allows cross training, and reduces the burden on information technology staff. The JAS Board therefore recommends extending the concept of IT governance beyond the ERP system alone, to include other areas of common interest.

In November 2008, the Board of Supervisors and School Board had approved the Technology Collaboration Agreement, and although this agreement was never actually implemented, cooperation in the areas of phone systems, network switches, building security systems, and building environment control systems were pursued informally. Nevertheless, there have also been several opportunities lost, and it is now clear that much more can be achieved with a formal IT governance structure.

The attached amendment to the Joint Administrative Services Board assigns the Information Technology Governance function to the Joint Administrative Services Board as recommended in the Government Finance Officers Association study of March 2011. The Board would establish policies, adopt standards, oversee implementations of funded projects, and approve plans for information technology matters *when it is in the County's overall interest to do so*. The Board will choose its areas of involvement as occasions arise, and become involved when it has the capacity and opportunity to add value. Indeed, literature on the subject recommends that IT governance move slowly, and only where the benefits are clear and compelling.

There would be no structural change to the management of the Government and Schools respective IT operations. Rather, the advice of IT Directors and other managers will be regularly sought as standards and policies are created.

SCOPE

The scope of the Joint Administrative Services Board's involvement is likely to evolve over time with changes to technology, but the initial scope of its involvement is likely to be as follows:

Traditional Telephone Systems. The County has standardized on Avaya. It is distributed to all government buildings and several school buildings with plans to extend to the remaining school buildings. Involvement anticipated when extension or upgrade planned.

Handheld devices including PDAs, tablets, and cell phones, as well as associated "apps". These technologies are accelerating, and some involvement may be recommended to establish standards, but the issue has not arisen to date, so no involvement is anticipated at this time.

Radio Systems. The Government operates one system, and the Schools another. Discussion has occurred over issues of shared tower space, and providing school administrators with emergency channel access, but little or no involvement by the JAS Board is anticipated at this time.

Building Environment Control Systems. A cooperative procurement was recently performed that could lead to the establishment of a standard for Government and School buildings over time. This would ultimately permit the Joint Maintenance Department access to all buildings using a single instance of software, a single maintenance contract, and simplified training of maintenance staff. This is an area where JAS involvement is anticipated in the future.

Building Security Systems. Camera systems of common design are installed at the current high school and middle school, and procurement is underway for installation at the new high school. Similar systems are designed for the Joint Government Center, and may be installed at the renovated circuit courthouse. Fire and access (burglar) alarms are also a part of this category. Some JAS review will be required with extensions and interconnection of the current systems.

Desktops, Laptops, and general purpose microcomputer applications. The case for standardizing hardware models and software versions is not as compelling as it once was. However, the IT Directors may still wish to make a case, if for no other reason than simplified maintenance and administration. There may, therefore, be some JAS involvement.

Duplication Equipment. Copiers, fax machines, scanners, printers, projectors, and multifunction machines are generally department and location specific. No involvement is foreseen.

Data Lines, Switches, Routers, Servers, and Network Interfaces. The IT departments have cooperated to establish a robust infrastructure based on common standards. Future JAS involvement here is likely, however, when the term of use for certain data lines expires, or if it is determined to be advantageous to virtualize applications on shared servers, or consolidate internet service providers.

Enterprise (cross-agency) data or application. In cases where multiple agencies are maintaining the same data, or where multiple agencies are utilizing multiple vendor applications designed for the same purpose, there would be involvement. This is the case with the budget proposal for the ERP system. Other examples would be citizen alert systems, work order systems, email systems, calendaring

systems, facility scheduling systems, etc.

Specialized (single agency) data and application. In cases where there is no data or application overlap, there would be no involvement by the JAS Board. This would include instructional software, 911 call system, voting machine software, etc.

Information Technology Security. Anti-Virus software, spam blockers, intrusion detection, firewalls, and data backup software may be suitable for the involvement of JAS, subject to the advice of the IT Directors.

Website development and maintenance. Like "specialized data and application", above, there would appear to be no reason for JAS involvement at this time.

Document Management. The Government Finance Officers Association study highlighted the large volumes of paper documents across the Government and Schools, and the need for a system to organize and permit rapid retrieval of these documents. Such systems would especially benefit Pupil Personnel, Board Clerks, Social Services, and the Courts. It is likely to be in the County's best interest that the JAS Board become involved in planning a joint solution.

PLAN OF WORK

Should the governance structure be approved, the Joint Administrative Services would move forward as follows:

Cooperative Agreements with Quasi-independent Agencies. In addition to the Schools, Government, and Treasurer, who are represented on the Board itself, formal recognition of the IT governance authority of the JAS Board would be sought of the remaining Constitutional Officers (Circuit Court Clerk, Sheriff, Commissioner of the Revenue, Commonwealth's Attorney) as well as the Social Services Department, and the General Registrar. These agreements would require acceptance of the policies, standards, and decisions of the Joint Administrative Services Board, within the scope of activity outlined above, in exchange for inclusion of these agencies' technology needs in the planning, implementation, and funding recommendations of the Joint Administrative Services Board. For those who agree, the goal will be to ensure that better service is provided through this coordinated effort, than could be possible for these agencies working alone.

Refinement of Business Processes Based On Best Practices. As a prelude to the implementation of an ERP system, or for efficiency alone should the ERP request not be approved, the JAS Board should seek out the best business processes, and create policies that standardize these processes. Some examples:

1. Should leave be accounted for by the half-day, the hour, the half-hour, or the quarter hour?
2. Should pay be accounted for to the nearest hour, or half hour, or rounded up?
3. If job applications are to be accepted through the World Wide Web, should this be required?
4. Will payments of taxes, fees, and charges be accepted through the World Wide Web?

ERP Procurement. There has been a statewide effort to assist local governments in the highly technical task of designing a request for proposals for an ERP system that provides a maximum value solution. Studies of the subject were approved by the General Assembly in HB130 and HB645. The Virginia Association of Counties, the Virginia Municipal League, and the Governor's Office itself have been providing leadership in this area. Efforts are underway in the current session to provide tangible assistance to local governments. Should the ERP budget request be approved in Clarke the JAS Board will begin work on the development of the RFP, and the phasing of the implementation. A preliminary timeline would be as follows:

Task	Date
April 2012	ERP Budget Approved
August 2012	ERP Request for Proposals Released
December 2012	Contract for ERP System
December 2013	Financial Modules, Procurement, Assessment, Treasury, Utilities implemented
June 2014	Applicant Tracking, Time and Attendance, Personnel implemented
December 2014	GIS, Building Permits, Document Management, Work Orders implemented

REQUEST FOR ADOPTION OF MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

The Joint Administrative Services Board requests approval of the following:

“Be it resolved that the Memorandum of Agreement signed in December 1993 between the Clarke County Board of Supervisors and the Clarke County School Board be amended in its entirety to update the document to conform to current practice, and to assign a new responsibility for information technology governance, as outlined in the attachment”.

Attachments:

Memorandum of Agreement Amendment

GFOA Study

ERP Budget Request

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
between
CLARKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
and
CLARKE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
Amending in its Entirety
A Similar Agreement Dated 12/22/1993

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Memorandum of Agreement is to detail the terms, conditions, responsibilities, and processes, to be agreed upon by the Clarke County Board of Supervisors and the Clarke County School Board that provide for the establishment, funding, direction and control of an Administrative Services office and the support staff and facilities necessary to provide services to the Board of Supervisors, the School Board, and any subordinate agencies or offices hereafter included.

DIRECTION AND CONTROL:

There is hereby established a **Joint Administrative Services Board** consisting of the following five persons:

1. A member of the Clarke County Board of Supervisors appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.
2. A member of the Clarke County School Board appointed by the Chairman of the School Board.
3. The Clarke County Administrator.
4. The Superintendent of Schools.
5. The Treasurer of Clarke County.

The Joint Administrative Services Board shall meet as needed. The Board shall perform the following functions:

1. Employ and regularly evaluate a Director.
2. Establish policy and procedure.
3. Take action on matters brought before the Board.
4. Develop and recommend any revisions and additions to this agreement determined to be necessary to ensure the continued fairness and viability of this office.
5. Perform the dispute resolution function established in the Consolidated Maintenance Management Agreement.
6. Provide Information Technology Governance, where determined to be in the best interests of the County, by adopting standards and best practices, approving plans and procurements, and making investment recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board.

Decisions of the Joint Administrative Services Board shall be subject to review by the Clarke County Board of Supervisors and the Clarke County School Board. If a majority of members of either board votes an objection to an action within forty (40) days of the meeting during which the action is reported, the Joint Administrative Services Board will reconsider the action. Otherwise, if both boards affirmatively approve such action at such time as it is reported or decline to vote an objection to the action within forty (40) days, the action will stand.

Administrative supervision of the Director shall be provided jointly by the County Administrator and the Division Superintendent, who shall consult on a regular basis to ensure that the needs of the participants are met. Should the County Administrator and the Division Superintendent be unable to resolve any conflict in the various needs of the participants, the Joint Administrative Services Board shall decide upon the resolution of any such conflict.

Employees of the office shall operate under the personnel policies of the Clarke County Public Schools.

SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES:

The Joint Administrative Services office shall be responsible for providing services in the following areas:

- Budgets; budget analysis; forecasting
- Financial Accounting
- Accounts Payable
- Purchasing
- Payroll and Benefits
- Grants Management
- Insurance
- Information Technology Governance Coordination
- Clarke County Sanitary Authority Administrative Support
- Fiscal Agency Services, as assigned
- Duties of School Board Clerk, as assigned

In addition, the office shall provide financial management and advice to such other agencies as may hereafter be included in this agreement.

The Director shall maintain a close working relationship with the County Treasurer and Commissioner of the Revenue, and shall upon request of either, offer such advice and assistance as may be appropriate, as determined by the Director or the Joint Administrative Services Board.

SEPARATION OF DATA – CONFIDENTIALITY

Information generated or compiled on behalf of a participating agency shall be maintained separate and apart from that of other participating agencies. All requests for internal information of an agency shall be directed to that agency's chief administrative officer and shall not be released without the knowledge and permission of the agency.

FUNDING:

Funding for the office shall be determined mutually by the Board of Supervisors and the School Board and shall be in such amounts and in such proportion as may be agreed. Funding levels will be agreed upon annually and shall run concurrently with the fiscal year.

LOCATION OF OFFICES:

The Board of Supervisors and the School Board agree to provide such space as can be made available for purposes of this agreement, consistent with any changes recommended by the Director and adopted by the Joint Administrative Services Board. The Board of Supervisors agrees to provide permanent quarters for the office.

TERM OF AGREEMENT:

This agreement shall remain in full force and effect until superseded, or rescinded by either party. The Board of Supervisors and the School Board agree that any decision to terminate this agreement will be communicated in writing prior to adoption of the annual budget and that any termination will coincide with the end of the fiscal year.

This Memorandum of Agreement has been reviewed and is recommended for approval:

David L. Ash
County Administrator

Dr. Michael L. Murphy
Division Superintendent

Date: _____

Date: _____

Approved:

J. Michael Hobert, Chairman
Board of Supervisors

Janet Alger, Chairman
School Board

Date: _____

Date: _____

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
between
CLARKE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
and
CLARKE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD
Amending in its Entirety
A Similar Agreement Dated 12/22/1993

PURPOSE:

The purpose of this Memorandum of Agreement is to detail the terms, conditions, responsibilities, and processes, to be agreed upon by the Clarke County Board of Supervisors and the Clarke County School Board that provide for the establishment, funding, direction and control of an Administrative Financial Services Office and the support staff and facilities necessary to provide ~~comprehensive accounting and financial management services~~ to the Board of Supervisors, the School Board, and any subordinate agencies or offices hereafter included.

DIRECTION AND CONTROL:

There is hereby established a **Joint Financial Administrative Services Board** consisting of the following five persons:

1. A member of the Clarke County Board of Supervisors appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Supervisors.
2. A member of the Clarke County School Board appointed by the Chairman of the School Board.
3. The Clarke County Administrator.
4. The Superintendent of Schools.
5. The Treasurer of Clarke County.

The Joint Financial Administrative Services Board shall meet ~~at least monthly, and as often as may be required in order to effect the establishment of this joint service office as needed.~~ The Board shall perform the following functions: ~~interview and~~

1. Employ and regularly evaluate a Financial Services Officer, Director and thereafter shall
2. Establish and review policy and procedure;
3. review and forward recommendations of the Financial Services Officer; Take action on matters brought before the Board.
- 4.
5. ~~approve the establishment of support positions and the Financial Services Officer's recommendations for employees;~~ Develop and recommend any revisions and additions to this agreement determined to be necessary to ensure the continued fairness and

- viability of this office.
6. Perform the dispute resolution function established in the Consolidated Maintenance Management Agreement.
 7. Provide Information Technology Governance, where determined to be in the best interests of the County, by adopting standards and best practices, approving plans and procurements, and making investment recommendations to the Board of Supervisors and the School Board.

Decisions of the Joint Administrative Services Board shall be subject to review by the Clarke County Board of Supervisors and the Clarke County School Board. If a majority of members of either board votes an objection to an action within forty (40) days of the meeting during which the action is reported, the Joint Administrative Services Board will reconsider the action. Otherwise, if both boards affirmatively approve such action at such time as it is reported or decline to vote an objection to the action within forty (40) days, the action will stand.

Administrative supervision of the ~~Financial Services Officer~~ Director shall be provided jointly by the County Administrator and the Division Superintendent, who shall consult on a regular weekly basis to ensure that the ~~financial~~ needs of the participants are met. Should the County Administrator and the Division Superintendent be unable to resolve any conflict in the various needs of the participants, the Joint ~~Administrative Financial~~ Services Board shall ~~rule~~ decide upon the resolution of any such conflict.

Employees of the office shall operate under the personnel policies of the Clarke County Public Schools.

SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES:

The Joint ~~Administrative Financial~~ Services office shall be responsible for providing ~~accounting and financial management~~ services in the following areas:

- Budgets; budget analysis; forecasting
- Financial Accounting
- Accounts Payable/~~Receivable~~
- Purchasing
- Payroll and Benefits
- Grants Management
- Insurance
- EDP Hardware/Software Information Technology Governance
- selection and operation Coordination
- Clarke County Sanitary Authority Administrative Support
- Fiscal Agency Services, as assigned
- Duties of School Board Clerk, as assigned

In addition, the office shall provide financial management and advice to such other agencies as may hereafter be included in this agreement.

The ~~Director Financial Services Officer~~ shall maintain a close working relationship with the

County Treasurer and Commissioner of the Revenue, and shall upon request of either the Treasurer, offer such advice and assistance as may be appropriated desired, as determined by the Director or the Joint Administrative Services Board.

PRIORITIES:

~~It is understood and agreed that both the County and the School Board have or anticipate vacancies in one or more positions currently assigned accounting/financial responsibilities. The highest priority of the Financial Services Officer shall be to support and maintain ongoing services and provide such assistance as is necessary to ensure continued operations and compliance with the law.~~

~~The Financial Services Officer shall review all current financial policies, practices and positions to ensure compliance with all regulations and laws. The Financial Services Officer shall develop and recommend adoption of policies and procedures or revisions to same when necessary for compliance.~~

~~The Financial Services Officer shall review all current data processing systems, programs, and personnel and shall recommend those enhancements, improvements, combinations and reassignments as may be needed to most effectively and efficiently manage the financial and accounting needs of the participants in this agreement.~~

SEPARATION OF DATA – CONFIDENTIALITY

It is the intent of this agreement to provide the most efficient and effective accounting and financial management system possible and acknowledged that combination of the various offices, equipment, and personnel may be required. However, ~~the the extent possible,~~ information generated or compiled on behalf of a participating agency shall be maintained separate and apart from that of other participating agencies. All requests for internal information of an agency shall be directed to that agency's chief administrative officer and shall not be released without the knowledge and permission of the agency.

FUNDING:

~~The Board of Supervisors and the School Board agree to fund the initial operations of this office equally between the two Boards. A fiscal agent shall be mutually agreed upon by the Board of Supervisors and the School Board and the Financial Services Officer and new employees of that office shall be considered employees of the fiscal agent for purposes of employment reporting, fringe benefits, etc. It is expected that a common pay scale and personnel policies, acceptable to both the School Board and the Board of Supervisors, will be developed for employees of this office.~~

Future ~~f~~unding for the office shall be determined mutually by the Board of Supervisors and the School Board and shall be in such amounts and in such proportion as may be agreed. Funding levels will be agreed upon annually and shall run concurrently with the fiscal year.

LOCATION OF OFFICES:

The Board of Supervisors and the School Board agree to provide such space as can be made available for purposes of this agreement, consistent with any changes recommended by the ~~Financial Services Director~~ ~~Officer~~ and adopted by the Joint ~~Administrative~~ ~~Financial~~ Services Board. The ~~School Board~~ agrees to provide office space, furnishings, and equipment for the office from start-up through ~~June 30, 1994~~. The Board of Supervisors agrees to provide permanent quarters for the office, as soon thereafter as possible. It is agreed that the office will require the acquisition of space in order to effectively function.

TERM OF AGREEMENT:

This agreement shall remain in full force and effect until ~~supereeded~~ ~~superseded~~, or rescinded by either party. The Board of Supervisors and the School Board agree that any decision to terminate this agreement will be communicated in writing prior to adoption of the annual budget and that any termination will coincide with the end of the fiscal year.

This Memorandum of Agreement has been reviewed and is recommended for approval:

David L. Ash
County Administrator

Dr. Michael L. Murphy ~~Dennis W. Kellisen~~
Division Superintendent

Date: _____

Date: _____

Approved:

J. Michael Hobert ~~John D. Hardesty~~, Chairman
~~Janet Alger, Chairman~~ Chairman
Board of Supervisors

~~Dr. William A. Houek~~, _____
School Board

Date: _____

Date: _____

Table of Contents

Service Level Agreement.....	1
Responsibilities - Commissioner of Revenue.....	4
Appendix A.....	6
Appendix B.....	7
Approvals.....	8

Service Level Agreement

October 21, 2005 – Draft by Mike Correa February 28, 2011

Between the City of Hampton Commissioner of The Revenue and the Department of Information Technology

The Information Technology (IT) Department provides the following services for the Commissioner of Revenue in accordance with standard operating procedures and policy. The following services are billed once per year in July at a rate of \$35,400. By entering into this agreement, IT guarantees the following services will be provided and at the specific levels:

1. **Staffing.** IT will provide a minimum of one staff member to be physically located at the Commissioner of Revenue's Office to provide onsite support and operation of the tax-billing system.
 - a) IT will provide onsite staff with appropriate furniture, PC, network, software and other resources to effectively manage Commissioner of Revenue's office applications.
 - b) The Commissioner of Revenue's Office will provide office space and other-related facilities to support on site staff.

2. **Network.** IT will provide all necessary network infrastructure and network management including hubs, routers, communication interface units and other related hardware, software, and technical services in order to:
 - a) Successfully connect all computer systems to the City's network the data center server and storage environment as is normally expected in operation of a standard City data center and network services.
 - b) To interconnect where necessary for sharing of information between constitutional and city offices, including but not limited to the Treasurer and Finance Offices.
 - c) To interconnect to the Internet, e-mail systems, financial systems and other enterprise systems generally available to departments through the wide area network.

Additions and moves will incur an additional charge for

1. Work performed by contractors for additional wiring
 2. Additional equipment necessary to support new or moved connections
 3. Any other third-party charges related to new or moved equipment.
- 3. E-Mail/Internet.** E-mail accounts will be provided to Commissioner of Revenue's office staff as part of the City's centralized system, currently Microsoft Exchange. Internet access (web browser) and tech support services will be provided at a rate of \$184 per user per year. These costs will be budgeted in Service Code 02 and billed in accordance with general City of Hampton tech support and e-mail processes. IT will supply e-mail and Internet access to IT employees supporting the Commissioner of Revenue's Office both on site and remotely.
- 4. End User Hardware and Software.** IT will supply its staff with the necessary end user hardware, software and services to perform their duties in support of the City and the Commissioner of Revenue's Office. Hardware and software licenses and maintenance will be kept up to date in order to support and enhance the Commissioner of Revenue's systems.
- 5. Software Maintenance.** IT will provide essential programming, analysis and related activities for maintenance of the purchased systems and products which may include, Microsoft Access, SQL Database, interfaces and other systems including but not limited to the Personal Property and Real Estate application systems. IT will also pay maintenance for system, network and server software related applications as required to keep licensing and support current.
- 6. Hardware Maintenance.** IT will pay necessary hardware maintenance and support fees for the data center environment including server and storage capacity required for the Commissioner of Revenue. On occasion, upgrade or replace data center hardware or add additional capacity as necessary to maintain appropriate service quality to the Commissioner of Revenue's Office and citizens accessing the system.
- 7. Website Support.** The IT Department will be responsible for providing network services and application/data access to the Commissioner of Revenue's Office website. Marketing INC will be responsible for providing the web page services on Hampton.gov and other related content. Requests for public website changes should be directed to Marketing Inc.
- 8. Disaster Recovery.** The IT Department will provide a disaster recovery plan for the restoral of applications and their associated servers, storage, data and network services for the Commissioner of Revenue's Office. The Commissioner of Revenue's Office will participate in any disaster recovery tests scheduled by the IT department. The Commissioner of Revenue's Office will be responsible for developing a continuity of operations plan which will identify an alternative work location that the IT department can include in their disaster recovery plan.

It will be the responsibility of the IT department to ensure systems are backed-up for disaster recovery purposes in accordance with IT's back up procedures. IT will

provide daily incremental back-ups and weekly full back ups. Weekly back-ups will be stored at a secure location outside of the flood zone.

- 9. Project Management.** IT will assign a project manager who will coordinate scheduling of implementations, upgrades, updates, fixes or other work performed on soft or hard system components. The project manager will recommend policy and procedure development, training, system replacements and other items or activities that will improve effectiveness.
- 10. Desktop PC Support.** IT will provide PC and desktop support to the Commissioner of Revenue's Office as is standard for all City of Hampton departments.
- 11. Engineering Support.** IT will provide engineering support to manage the server and networks. The engineers will ensure the server(s) are configured appropriately and provide administration assistance to others requiring assistance in setting up access rights/privileges.
- 12. Authorizations & Security.** Only the Commissioner of Revenue's office will authorize access to data. Departments requesting access to the Commissioner of Revenue's information or data will have to seek written authorization from the Commissioner of Revenue. IT will provide such access in accordance with standard operation procedures once authorization has been granted. Commissioner of Revenue's Office employees will be responsible for adhering to the City's security policies and procedures.

IT will be responsible for managing security on all City computer systems, and serve as the primary Agency Security Officer for the City in dealing with the Commonwealth of Virginia Department of Information Technology (DIT) for access to Commonwealth computer systems. The Commissioner of Revenue or his designee will be required to submit authorization requests to IT for changes, additions or deletions to system security. IT will be reasonably responsive in this duty and turn around requests within 8 business hours. All security rights are ultimately at the full discretion of the Commissioner of Revenue.

- 13. Response Times.** IT will provide a response within 2 hours of initial call during business hours) to all application, system and desktop PC support requests. IT will make every effort to resolve system and PC support issues within 12 hours however; there will be instances where this may not be possible.
- 14. Service Desk Application.** IT will provide an online, self service help desk application to report all application and IT requests and problems. This will be the official problem and request system that should be used by the Commissioner of Revenue's Office and IT staff. Requests and problems reported through other means, relieves IT of its response time obligations as identified in this agreement.
- 15. Problem Resolution.** In the event it is necessary for IT to contact an outside vendor to resolve an issue, the cost will be solely absorbed by IT if the item is identified as part of the infrastructure or applications supported by IT. A list of items outside of the scope of IT services is seen below but is not limited to this list:

- a) End user hardware and software
- b) Printers and other ancillary devices provided by the Commissioner of Revenue's Office
- c) Facilities supporting hardware, software and networks
- d) Commonwealth of Virginia applications and software

16. Changes to Systems. Changes to software systems can only be performed as requested through a change request mechanism as administered by IT. A review committee will generally review requests for software changes for impact analysis purposes and then submit the change request to the project manager for execution. Changes that carry a cost will require approval by an executive board who will also make a determination as to how the change will be funded.

17. Software Feature Changes or New Requests. New requests for feature additions, feature changes and upgrades on the HITS/Integrity system and other currently supported systems will be negotiated outside of this agreement. Costs will be assessed based on the time available of onsite assigned resources, the skill set required to perform the function, the priority of the feature and the time requested to complete the desired new features or functions. Requests for new features and functions will be communicated to the Project Manager or IT Director.

Responsibilities - Commissioner of Revenue

The Commissioner of Revenue's Office staff will work in good faith and cooperate fully in team-based activities designed to accomplish objectives and desired outcomes. The Commissioner of Revenue's Office staff will use proper procedures and forms as required for processes outlined above. IT will be notified when changes occur in staffing so that impact analysis may be performed and licensing requirements properly met.

The IT project manager or director will be notified should there be a problem with responsiveness or within any of the other areas listed in this agreement in order to provide adequate resolution. The Commissioner of Revenue and staff will work to the best of their ability to protect system security and treat security interactions with appropriate care and diligence. The Commissioner of Revenue and staff will adhere to the City's IT Security Policy. The Commissioner of Revenue's Office will be responsible for funding and supplying PC software, hardware, printers and other devices and licenses to adequately operate end user devices to adequately utilize the applications developed and provided by IT. The Commissioner of Revenue's Office will refresh hardware and software on a schedule that is adequate to keep up with deployed and supported software.

1. The Commissioner of Revenue's Office will pay for end user software licenses and keep licenses and maintenance current on devices and software.
2. It will be the responsibility of the Commissioner of Revenue to perform those processes necessary for the operation of the system such as batch postings, bill runs, extracts, etc.
3. However; IT will continue to perform operational processes such as postings and bill runs where such processes have not been fully developed and

explained to end users. At such time these processes are developed and end users receive appropriate training the Commissioner of Revenue will assume responsibility for completing these processes. IT will provide technical support for these processes and be available to assist with problems.

Addendums. Changes to this agreement will be incorporated by addendums and duly signed and authorized as required.

Modifications, Review, and Termination of the Agreement

- a) An annual review of the agreement will take place between the Commissioner of Revenue's Office and IT to determine any changes or updates in services or the agreement.
- b) If the IT department realizes unexpected Reductions In Force or other major reductions in infrastructure budget which supports the Commissioner of Revenue's Office both parties will renegotiate the agreement at the time the reductions are known or as soon as possible thereafter.
- c) Should IT or the Commissioner of Revenue decide to terminate the arrangement negotiations will take place to determine the funding amount and position changes to support onsite support and operation of the tax billing system and infrastructure. The IT annual bill will also be adjusted accordingly to account for the staff resources transferred to the Commissioner of Revenue's office.

Appendix A

Itemized Annual Support and Maintenance fees

\$81,640 original SLA services billed

- \$41,640 former position funding

\$40,000 Adjusted Annual Total

\$4,600 IT Services (\$ 184 / # of users (25))

\$35,400 New Annual Total

Appendix B

List of Customized and Supported Applications and Projects

Application	System Description
Business License/Excise Tax (BLETS)	Access app used by the Commissioner of Revenue to track licenses for all businesses in the City and to assess and collect business license fees and excise taxes
State Income and Estimated Taxes	Used by the Treasurer to track estimated and regular payments on State Income Tax Returns
PPTRA_Transfer.mdb	Make 2005andPriorStillOwing_DoNotDelete Table most important one. A table of all the delinquent bills that had there PPTRA transferred
PPBillingSupp.mdb	Creates the Supplement Bills Inhouse
BillingSchedule	Displays the billing tasks with due dates. Users have limited access.
ValueChecker	Access program provides capability to analyze valuation data.
ValueChecker Setup	Setup to install ValueChecker MS Access program
BPP_MT Returns App	Query and generate Crystal Reports for Business Personal Property and Machinery and Tools Returns.
INTEGRITY Access	
HITS Portal	Portal that holds Datagrids.
Permits Plus	The COR uses datagrids that pull building permit and RE data from the permits database.
Decal App	Deletes decal fees.

Projects

- **BLETS Web App**
- **Enterprise Zone Reporting (including Pen Town Center)**

Approvals

Signed: Mary Bunting
City Manager

_____ Date: _____

Leslie Fuentes
Director, Information Technology

_____ Date: _____

Ross Mugler
Commissioner of Revenue

_____ Date: _____

JAS FY 13 BUDGET PROPOSAL

1/16/2012

	<u>FY 10 ACTUAL</u>	<u>FY 11 ACTUAL</u>	<u>FY 12 ADOPTED</u>	<u>FY 13 REQUEST</u>	<u>VARIANCE</u>	<u>NOTES</u>
FUNC 12240 INDEPENDENT AUDITOR						
3120 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	30,630	30,650	33,500	33,500	-	
FUNC 12510 DATA PROCESSING						
3100 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	-	1,600			-	
3320 MAINTENANCE SERVICE CONTRACT	23,052	23,092	23,595	24,500	905	
5540 TRAVEL CONVENTION & EDUCATION					-	
6001 OFFICE SUPPLIES		53			-	
8207 EDP EQUIPMENT	155				-	
12510 DATA PROCESSING	23,207	24,745	23,595	24,500	905	
FUNC 12530 FINANCE & PURCHASING						
1100 SALARIES - REGULAR	342,808	348,570	346,491	343,959	(2,532)	
1300 SALARIES - PART TIME					-	
2100 FICA BENEFITS	25,418	26,203	26,507	26,313	(194)	
2210 VSRS BENEFITS	42,457	33,030	44,212	61,122	16,910	Rate increase
2300 HEALTH INSURANCE BENEFITS	26,446	27,670	26,805	29,419	2,614	Rate increase
2400 LIFE INSURANCE	2,031	970	970	4,093	3,123	Rate increase
2800 OTHER BENEFITS	30	4,562	-	-	-	
3000 PURCHASED SERVICES		643	-	-	-	
3320 MAINTENANCE SERVICE CONTRACTS	158	143	200	175	(25)	
3500 PRINTING AND BINDING					-	
3600 ADVERTISING					-	
4300 CENTRAL PURCHASING/STORE	(106)	(1,360)			-	
5210 POSTAL SERVICES	2,688	2,837	2,800	2,850	50	
5230 TELECOMMUNICATIONS	1,276	1,228	1,300	1,300	-	
5510 TRAVEL MILEAGE	69	174	100	100	-	
5540 TRAVEL CONVENTION & EDUCATION	479	821	500	800	300	
5810 DUES & MEMBERSHIPS	605	544	600	600	-	
6001 OFFICE SUPPLIES	3,989	8,484	3,000	3,000	-	
6012 BOOKS AND SUBSCRIPTIONS		220	230	230	-	
6014 OTHER OPERATING SUPPLIES		13			-	
8201 MACHINERY AND EQUIPMENT	3,797				-	
12530 FINANCE & PURCHASING	452,144	454,751	453,715	473,961	20,246	
TOTAL	505,981	510,146	510,810	531,961	21,151	

Proposed FY 13 Staffing Configuration

<u>POSITION</u>	<u>CURRENT TOTAL</u>	<u>NEW SALARY</u>	<u>PERCENT INCREASE</u>	<u>CCSA PORTION</u>	<u>JAS PORTION</u>
Director	99,734	99,734	0.00%		99,734
Accountant	58,127	58,127	0.00%		58,127
Accountant	51,200	51,200	0.00%		51,200
Purchasing Manager	50,156	50,156	0.00%	20,062	30,094
Accounts Payable Specialist	35,456	35,456	0.00%		35,456
Payroll and Benefits Coordinator	41,500	41,500	0.00%		41,500
Administrative Assistant	37,132	37,132	0.00%	9,283	27,849
	373,305	373,305	0.00%	29,345	343,959
BENEFITS RATES					
Health	Varies			3,160	29,419
FICA	7.65%			2,245	26,313
VRS	17.77%			5,215	61,122
Life	1.19%			349	4,093

MEMORANDUM

TO: Clarke County Board of Supervisors Finance Committee

FR: Thomas Judge, Director of Joint Administrative Services

DT: January 31, 2012

RE: *ERP System Budget Request*

Over the past eighteen months the Joint Administrative Services Board has researched a long term plan for the replacement of aging computer applications. Many of these systems were originally implemented, some as far back as the 1980's, as the automation of paper processes for specific functions of the Government and School. These systems are inadequate because: 1. their electronic data is available only to persons associated with that function; 2. these applications have not kept pace with widely available technology advances; and 3. Maintenance of the variety of applications, associated operating systems, and associated hardware is not the best use of the time of Information Technology personnel. The Joint Administrative Services Board has concluded that an Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System should be procured, and a governance structure established to make decisions regarding the implementation of this system.

The purpose of the ERP System is to replace diverse systems and business processes with a single database and standardized business processes. Implementation would require several years. The following research led the JAS to make this recommendation:

Chronology

April 2010	Board of Supervisors appropriate \$50,000 for software integration.
May 2010	JAS begins discussion on solutions to administrative data system problems.
August 2010	RDA, Financial Systems vendor, presents their new system OpenRDA. It supports only modules that interface with General Ledger. RDA agrees to perform study of Clarke systems. JAS research begins into communities using ERP systems. Clarke Technology Directors state that infrastructure is currently in place to support ERP.
November 2010	Report on ERP systems used by Gloucester and Isle of Wight. List of current Government and School applications developed.
January 2011	RDA presents Best Practices Report calling for further implementation of RDA software. JAS Director delivers response. JAS Board selects GFOA to provide "business process analysis" and "business case development" at a cost of \$24,100.
February 2011	Nine Gov/School Focus Groups meet to discuss business processes and automation.
March 2011	GFOA Study states business case, recommends ERP System implementation. Cost range \$383K-\$1,078K. Return on investment in 3.8 to 6.6 years through recapture of \$250K to \$350K per year in lost productivity with current systems.
April 2011	Supervisors appropriate additional \$50K for software integration, leaving 7/11 balance of \$75,900. Finance Committee directs JAS to schedule an opportunity to pose questions to a similarly sized community that has implemented an ERP system

	(Staunton).
May 2011	Update on communities implementing ERP: Loudoun, Winchester, Prince George.
July 2011	Phone conference with City of Staunton on their ERP experience. JAS directs that a draft proposal for ERP System be developed for the FY 13 budget process. Work begins on revising Government and School business processes related to personnel.
August 2011	Commonwealth HJ130 study determined that local government business practices too dissimilar for single software specification. HJ645 study is underway to create central database of local government software implementations to assist with local government procurement. Includes input from VACO, VML, and VALGITE.

Options

Status Quo. The County (Government and Schools) could continue upgrading its current systems. This involves the least cash outlay in the next few years, but the highest cost over the mid and long term. Vendors will force upgrades, and certain systems will continue to fall behind on the latest technology developments. IT staff will continue to overextend in supporting disparate systems. Agencies will continue performing processes that could be automated. Example 1: the building permit system contains building value information that is printed out then rekeyed into the real estate assessment system. Example 2: the Treasury system prints out revenue information that is rekeyed into the Finance system.

Share ERP with another community. Communities sharing ERP computer applications is increasingly common. It saves money, provides offsite data backup, and permits communities to share best practices. Thus far attempts to find such a partnership for Clarke County have been unsuccessful. The primary reason is the complexity of trying to coordinate an ERP implementation with another community or communities.

ERP Software as a Service. ERP vendors will run their application on their own computer for multiple communities. They provide hardware, software updates, operating system updates, and data backup. The communities connect through a communication link. This solution has been frequently mentioned as superior by IT Directors because highly trained IT staff working for the vendors are ensuring the integrity of the data and application. In addition, the initial investment is reduced. The problems raised include concerns about the security and consistent availability of public data held on the computers of a private company.

ERP Local Server. Providing the ERP application on a local server would require the largest near term investment. It would also require a greater maintenance effort by IT staff. However, it would provide autonomy over the security and availability of the data. The cost estimates and return on investment periods provided in the GFOA report are premised on implementation of this option.

Best of Breed. Each application could be replaced with the best application available at the time the current application needs replacement. This would gradually improve the quality of computer applications, but would not resolve integration, hardware, and IT staff workload issues. Nevertheless, the GFOA study did recommend continued use of certain systems like Parks and Recreation program management, and maintenance work order management because the cost savings associated with

integrating these modules were not offset by savings at the current time.

Requested Option

The Joint Administrative Services Board recommends that the Clarke County Board of Supervisors include \$650K in its 2013 budget for implementation of an ERP system, whether shared, service, or on a local server. This is the mid-point of the cost estimate provided by GFOA, less the \$75,900 already budgeted. This would be used to convert as many current applications as possible to the new ERP system. First priority would implement Treasury, Property Assessment, General Ledger, Accounts Payable, Payroll, and Purchasing, and Utilities. Second priority is for Document Management and Human Resources (including Applicant Tracking, Time and Attendance, and Leave Management). The third priority would integrate GIS, building inspections, and schools.

Advantages of Requested Option

Staff Availability. The economic slowdown has reduced workload in many operations, providing an opportunity to devote staff time to the ERP implementation in advance of an economic recovery.

Intercepts needed software upgrades and extensions. The Treasury system is in need of immediate upgrade, and the vendor of the finance system has stated that they will soon require an upgrade. Other applications face similar needs. Funding the ERP now will intercept the need for these expenditures by creating a clear upgrade path for most applications.

Advanced Technology. Capabilities such as on-line bill paying, electronic document management, and on-line job applications will be possible in the future with implementation of the ERP system now. It is not clear whether our current systems will evolve to embrace these new technologies.

Risks of Requested Option

Partial implementation. If an ERP implementation stops part way, due to lack of funding or staff support, or a lack of employee willingness to modify business processes, the result can be worse than if no implementation had occurred at all. This is because the costs have been incurred, but the benefits have not been realized. The GFOA report states that this is the single most important source of risk for this option.

Weak Governance. Local government structure is made up of many independent and quasi-independent boards and agencies. For the system to work, all will need to agree up front to utilize the ERP system, and abide by policy decisions associated with it. This may require modification of agency business processes to conform to the best practices inherent in the software design. A governance structure must be established to enforce decisions made with respect to the system in order to ensure the greater good, and agencies must subscribe to it.

ERP System Implementation

Source: Joint Administrative Services

ROI

01/16/12

Assumptions:

- 1 Costs are the average of low and high from page 34 of the GFOA Report. Assumes applications on local server.
- 2 Total hours estimated to be saved from ERP implementation is 4500 annually (mid range GFOA Study, pg. 35)
- 3 4160 hours have been eliminated through Treasurer and Commissioner, leaving an additional 350 still to be saved.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	Total
<u>DIRECT COST OF NEW ERP</u>							
Software License (HR, GL, Revenue, Documents)	165,065						
Professional Services	265,282						
Project Contingency	63,078						
Maintenance and Support	32,777	32,777	32,777	32,777	32,777	32,777	32,777
Travel	82,532						
TOTAL	608,734	32,777	32,777	32,777	32,777	32,777	772,620
<u>COST AVOIDANCE (costs incurred if no ERP)</u>							
Commissioner Position*	42,195	42,195	42,195	42,195	42,195	42,195	42,195
Treasurer Position*	36,810	36,810	36,810	36,810	36,810	36,810	36,810
Additional Hours Estimated in GFOA Study	13,713	13,713	13,713	13,713	13,713	13,713	13,713
Bright and XPERT Maintenance	18,250	18,250	36,500	36,500	36,500	36,500	36,500
Revenue Modules to XPERT	60,000						
Forced XPERT Front-End Upgrade	15,000	15,000					
XPERT Module to Archive Finance Documents							
Personnel Module Training and Applicant Tracking	30,000						
TOTAL	182,718	125,968	144,218	129,218	129,218	129,218	840,560

ROI in approximately 5.5 years.

Notes:

- *These positions have been eliminated, but would need to be replaced when activity increases, unless technology is introduced that offers productivity improvements. XPERT offers some productivity improvement, but is not sufficient, and requires greater training and internal technical support.
- **It should also be noted that extension of XPERT does not include the breadth of modules, or technical capabilities (such as on-line payments, and time and attendance) available from the ERP System.
- ***There is much debate about how much Software as a Service, aka SaaS or Cloud, would save. Studies reviewed indicate that over 5 years the costs of SaaS are approximately 75% of maintaining the software locally. This factor is expected to continue to decline, making SaaS progressively cheaper relative to local server operations. However, it has yet to be determined whether this option is feasible for Clarke County.

PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

Employee:

Job title:

Time in present position:

Date of evaluation:

Date of last review:

Instructions

1. Conduct a comprehensive review of the employee's performance. Avoid basing judgment on isolated events only, but rate one factor at a time.
2. Review the employee based on how well the requirements of the job are fulfilled.
3. Insert additional comments to validate your rating.

Part 1: Check the appropriate box and enter comments to support the rating directly below.

Superior – consistently exceeds job requirements.

Excellent – often exceeds job requirements.

Good – all job requirements are met.

Average – minimum job requirements are met.

Unsatisfactory – is not meeting minimum requirements.

Job Knowledge. Employee's understanding of job requirements, as well as of related functions, and the need to keep skills current.

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Quality of Work. The neatness, thoroughness, and accuracy of employee output.

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Quantity. Typical volume of work employee produces under normal circumstances.

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Cooperation. Employee's ability and willingness to work with those around him/her.

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Initiative. How well does the employee generate ideas and follow through on them?

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Dependability/Reliability. Employee's willingness to accept responsibility and meet deadlines.

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Attendance/Punctuality. How conscientious is the employee when it comes to attendance, punctuality, lunch periods, etc.?

Superior Excellent Good Average Unsatisfactory

Comments:

Part 2: ACHIEVEMENT OF PREVIOUS GOALS (Complete only if employee has had a prior appraisal.)

Compare each goal to prior appraisal. List the goals that were set and indicate whether employee accomplished, failed to reach, or surpassed the goal. Note any situations or circumstances that may have affected success.

Goal #1:

Goal #2:

Goal #3.

Part 3: OVERALL ANALYSIS

Give an overall assessment and a direction for future action.

1. Employee's strong points:

2. Employee's weak points:

3. Could training be applied to further develop employee's skills? What kind?

Part 4: NEW GOALS

List goals to be achieved by the employee before the next review. Indicate any preparation or training necessary to achieve goals and projected completion date(s).

Goals	Preparation/Training Necessary To Achieve	Projected Completion Date
1.		
2.		
3.		

MANAGER: All items reviewed on this form have been discussed with the named employee.

Manager's Signature:

Date:

EMPLOYEE'S COMMENTS: Please describe any reactions to ratings, thoughts about current position, future plans, or steps being taken to reach specific goals.

I have seen and reviewed the appraisal. All items covered have been discussed fully with me. I realize that my signature does not imply that I am in agreement with the appraisal.

Employee's Signature:

Date:

Department Head's Signature:

Date: