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1. OVERVIEW:

The Shared Services Committee was formed in December 2015 in response to the Board of Education’s Efficiency Study being released in mid-November 2015, and the State of Connecticut Public Act 13-60, which mandated that Boards of Education evaluate the consolidation of non-educational services with their town’s General Government operations in an effort to achieve greater efficiency and cost savings. Among the recommendations of the efficiency study was a recommendation to look into the possibility of increasing the sharing of services with the Town’s General Government to see what further efficiencies may be derived.

It was decided that one way of achieving further efficiencies was for the Town and the Board of Education to explore the possibility of increasing shared services, in order to create an economy of scale in purchasing and supplies, as well as rendered services. Toward this end, a committee was formed by the Board of Selectmen with membership culled from concerned stakeholders. General Government was represented by two members of the Board of Selectmen and there were two members of the Board of Education and one from the Board of Finance as well as the Superintendent of Schools. Additionally, there were two representatives from the community at large.

The goal of the committee was to identify efficiencies that could be obtained by sharing services between the General Government and the Board of Education.

This study is envisioned to be of assistance to the Boards of Finance, Education and Selectmen as they chart the Town’s course in the coming years.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Rick Granger, Chair (Member at Large)  
Jim Hayden (First Selectman)  
John Ziobro (Board of Selectmen)  
Jim Feeney (Board of Education)  
Tim Butler (Member at Large)  
Bob Ravens-Seger (Board of Education)  
Dr. Christine Mahoney (Superintendent)  
Dave McNally (Board of Finance)
2. METHODOLOGY OF STUDY:

The initial phase of the committee inquiry focused on gathering information from regional governmental and educational organizations as well as neighboring towns in an effort to understand how municipalities and boards of education are currently employing efforts to find economies and efficiencies by sharing services.

The committee then began to identify functions where our BOS and ROF currently do/or could benefit from collaboration. Data was collected on current and past expenditures, capabilities and capacities in order to evaluate if collaboration would be beneficial, not beneficial or impractical, or if the topic warranted further investigation.

In the process of evaluating the merits of sharing services, the committee developed the following criteria to evaluate if a proposed change would:

1. Meet the needs and goals of the town and the schools in a timely, efficient and effective manner.
2. Be economical to the bottom line.
3. Be simple to administer, i.e., there is a clear understanding as to who does what, when and where.

Recognizing the significant level of expenditures that the General Government Budget expends to support the schools in areas of facilities management, field maintenance, town treasurer services, property & liability insurance, equipment and minor construction, etc., the Committee looked to determine whether this level of General Government support should be increased to result in additional cost savings or efficiency for the town. The Committee also reviewed what services the Board of Education could provide to the general government operations to enhance their efficiencies. The First Selectman and the Superintendent of Schools responded to guiding questions that led to the compilation of data to inform the discussion about shared resources.

In the course of this study the committee:

- Explored the so called “condo approach” whereby school management concentrates solely on education and town management concentrates on the physical plant. In this vein the town of Enfield was contacted to evaluate its experience with a modified version of this concept.
- Identified/evaluated all non-educational expenses (operational and capital) incurred by school management. The committee discussed how school management utilized revenue generated from invoices to other districts for contracted services rendered.
- Reviewed the schools’ organizational chart and assessed how maintenance requests are handled by school and town personnel.
• Reviewed several years of historical data on the cost of all utilities used by the schools and the town.
• Reviewed a list of all vendors used by the schools and the town to determine whether there were any opportunities for cost saving resulting in consolidation.
• Reviewed the town’s historical expenditures (operational & capital) dealing with building maintenance.
• Evaluated the pros and cons of the current system and outline/evaluated possible options for doing things differently.

Attached at the end of this report are the following appendices utilized in our exploratory phase of information gathering.

Appendix A – Titled “Shared Services between Municipal Government and Board of Education” — contains data compiled by the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM). The CCM Survey results from member towns providing insight on various services/functions where cooperation between the two entities exists.

Appendix B – Titled “Town of Granby Intra-Board Advisory Committee Final Report

Appendix C is a document prepared by the Greenwich Board of Education intended to guide them through a planning process as they evaluated the feasibility of combining town and school facility maintenance functions.

Appendix D is a “Shared Service Whitepaper prepared by the Connecticut Association of School Business Officials (CASBO)

Appendix E is miscellaneous information regarding shared services from neighboring towns.

Appendix F – Copy of Canton, CT Municipal and School District Finance and Payroll Consolidation Feasibility Study.

Appendix G – Town Provided Services to the School District - 2017 ED001 Information
3. Current Collaboration:

The General Government (Town/Board of Selectmen) and the School District (Board of Education) are currently collaborating in the following areas:

- The General Government budget funds the building maintenance supervisor whose job is to oversee the maintenance of all town buildings, including schools and recreational areas. The school’s maintenance budget is not managed or developed by the maintenance supervisor.
- The DPW currently maintains all town lawns and park fields as well as the school athletic fields. In FY17, the DPW assumed responsibility for all of the school ground lawns.
- The value of services provided to the school district and paid for by the town’s general government budget totaled $263,291 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 2017 (See Appendix G).
- Currently both boards use many of the same vendors for facility maintenance, such as plumbing, electrical, environmental services, HVAC etc. but under separate purchase orders and contracts. The same holds true for custodial and office supplies. Leveraging the commonality of these services may provide a cost savings benefit.
- Effective in the fall of 2018, the Board of Education and General Government will participate in the Capital Region Council of Government Reverse electric auction. The town currently participates in the reverse auction and the additional consumption used by the school buildings will position the town and schools to receive even more competitive rates.
- Students benefit from the services and programs provided by the East Granby Youth Services and participate in programs offered by the Parks & Rec Department.
- The intra-board cooperation and collaboration to provide services to families in East Granby is efficient and highly valued. The town’s Youth Services Commission (YSC) provides leadership activities for middle and high school students through the Youth Action Council. The YSC also provides up to 300 hours annually of counseling for students referred to the counselor by the schools and parents. Additionally, the YSC provides substance abuse counseling and programing for teenagers.
- The town and school district currently utilize non-instructional spaces such as commons, gymnasiums, auditorium, exterior athletic facilities and meeting rooms in a cooperative manner. The Parks & Rec Department does reimburse the school district for gymnasium custodial cost.
- School personnel utilize town meeting spaces for special programs such as Board of Education meetings, Community Forum and student activities such as STAR Reader luncheons, performances and social events for students.
- Students at Carl D. Allgrove School frequently utilize the services of the East Granby Public Library.
• The town and school library personnel work cooperatively to support both academic and recreational use of the resources in the town and school libraries. The school libraries are purposely designed and resourced, through the Board of Education budget, with age appropriate reading and technology that support the instructional program.

• School safety services and consulting are provided by the town public safety departments (police, fire, ambulance, fire marshal) as needed and requested. The BOE Safety Committee includes both the schools and the town departments and the consultant/facilitator is paid for by the school district.

• The schools benefit from and contribute to regional joint ventures and opportunities. The district is a member of the Capital Region Education Council (CREC), which shares resources with towns in a wide geographic area. School personnel participate in professional learning opportunities and take advantage of joint purchasing and leverage the power of the Educational Resources Collaborative (ERC) in establishing joint contracts. Regional cooperation has allowed the district to be more efficient by reducing cost of services for students with special needs and defraying the cost of some training for faculty and staff. The town has established a relationship with CREC and is using CREC resources for favorable pricing.
4. Areas of Collaboration Not Deemed Feasible:

The following item was ruled out by the Committee as not being economically viable and/or efficient:

- Town Department of Public Works snow removal at schools – currently an outside vendor is used to plow the school driveways and parking lots. The East Granby Department of Public Works currently maintains 37 miles of roads and does not have the personnel and equipment to plow neighborhood streets and the schools simultaneously. DPW does salt the school properties.
5. Challenges to Collaboration:

There are many factors that can influence the practicality of collaboration between entities. Our inquiry, specifically collaboration between the Boards of Education and Selectmen, introduces not only personality interactions but institutional ones as well. Given that the personalities on these elected boards will come and go over time it is important to ensure that any collaborations are structured to survive this inevitable evolution insuring their sustainability over time.

As we delve into the various operational areas looking for ways to increase efficiencies it is not unexpected to encounter challenges and impediments. These challenges might best be broken into two classifications – attitudinal and structural.

Attitudinal - The attitudinal hurdles tend to relate to a closed-mindedness exemplified by the mindset that “this is how it’s always been done”. The fact that this committee was formed is hopefully a sign that the attitudinal hurdles can easily be overcome.

Structural – The structural challenges, while specific and real are surmountable if the benefits to be realized are worthwhile.

Structural Challenges can arise for the following reasons:

- State statute stipulates how the school district should proceed in developing its budget and acquiring and using funds in the operating budget. Some consolidations would restrict the operational prerogative of the Board of Education as stipulated by statute.
- There are procedures allowed in the school funding process that would not be feasible in the town operations. For example, only the education department would be able to determine and invoice another school district for additional services rendered in the process of educating a student with exceptional needs.
- In addition, many grants are purpose and recipient specific. The grants are awarded to the school for the specific purpose of providing educational materials, services or resources – or funding may be for specific training for educators associated with the implementation of important initiatives to meet the needs of students.
- The Board of Education budget can be more vulnerable than the General Government budget to financial stressors caused by State of Connecticut education mandates.
- There are limited resources in each entity and personnel serve in job specific roles in bargaining units governed by negotiated contracts. Roles, responsibilities, tasks and schedules vary. This may be something that could be overcome thru negotiation.
- Combining custodial/maintenance personnel would require a different management structure than currently is in place. The demand for services is also not sufficient in some areas to indicate the hiring of full-time or part-time maintenance personnel for both the town and school (i.e. plumbing, electrical, mechanical). These services are currently outsourced.
• The schools and towns share business insurance providers. Other coverage lines for each entity are of a different scope i.e. educator liability policy, student accident insurance and other liabilities related to the many facets of operations.

• Merging maintenance currently under the control of two separate entities with two separate operating officers, budgets and boards may be challenging, but the ultimate outcome is for the benefit of one town. An open mind will be needed by all involved.

• A realistic budget is needed to properly maintain the town's investment in its infrastructure. While increased expenditures in this area may be difficult for the public to approve, the benefit of spending a little more at first can lead to efficiencies and savings for the future.

• The Town has a contingency fund which it can access with BOF approval in times of emergencies (i.e. heavy snow expenses, volatile insurance rates, one-time emergency repairs etc.). By state statute, the BOE is not able to maintain a contingency fund which could make it reluctant to give up access to any of its funding in case it had an emergency unplanned expense.
6. Areas of Collaboration Which Warrant Future Investigation:

The Committee suggests that the following warrants future investigation:

I. **Facilities Management** – evaluate the costs / benefits of bringing the maintenance of all town facilities under one umbrella. Relative to the school buildings, this could take the form of:

- A “Condo” arrangement where the town “owns” the building envelope taking full responsibility for the maintenance and protection of the structure, roof, doors, windows walls, siding etc. The schools would be responsible for the interiors of the buildings. The Committee recognizes that there are challenges to such an arrangement, especially in its early onset.
  
  a. The first challenge would be assessing the current condition of school buildings, and appropriate value/cost of any/such maintenance/repair line items based on the current school buildings.
  
  b. Another consideration is the town side ability to provide management and maintenance (i.e. would additional staffing be required?).
  
  c. As part of this Committee’s charge of studying possible shared services resulting in greater efficiencies, at this time, no conclusion can be determined if such a “Condo” arrangement would result in greater efficiencies but the Committee recommends this to be an area of collaboration that warrants future investigation.

- **School Interiors** – Further investigation by the governing boards may show it worthwhile for the town to also be responsible for the school interiors but that position may evolve through board and resident dialogue, research and a financial analysis.

II. **Business Offices** – Presently both the town and the schools run separate business offices. State education reporting mandates are very specialized and detailed and a high level of knowledge is needed. At this time a study would need to be completed to fully evaluate the numerous functions of the education and town sides of the business.

  a. Operational audits in the past have identified that key position cross training in both the school and town accounting departments could be developed more fully.

  b. While a consolidation may not provide cost savings there may be an opportunity for greater efficiencies and needed redundancy that a combined office could achieve.
A study should be completed to fully evaluate the numerous functions and different software used on both sides to see if there is opportunity here to consolidate the departments. The Town of Canton recently consolidated back offices and they could should be contacted for input. (See Appendix F)

III. **Informational and Technology Services** – The town and school district have need for information technology services. Currently, each entity has separate providers—the town has a consultant and the school district has certified and non-certified employees serving vital roles in this area. This is an area where the town’s need could be supported by school district personnel under the appropriate arrangement. The Committee is aware that the town and schools do not have the same management software packages and programs. This may be a challenge for a shared IT specialist to maintain two different systems but this is not an impossible task and the possibility exists that over time a single shared system may be the end result.

IV. **Health Insurance** – Prior to the Town joining the State of Connecticut Partnership 2.0 Program, the schools and the town looked at common health insurance programs. It was determined that combining programs would have caused an increase in rates due to different employee risk pools. However, there now may be an opportunity for the school district to join the State of Connecticut Partnership 2.0 program similar to the town.
7. Closing Observations

- **Sharing services** can manifest itself in the following ways:
  
  a. One entity funding a service for the benefit of the other (i.e. General Government operating budget funding school field maintenance and the entirety of the facilities manager expense or the BOE budget partially funding janitorial services that benefit Park & Rec programs).
  
  b. Economizing thru the exploitation of under-utilized capacity of existing resources (i.e. current work performed by DPW at schools).
  
  c. Joint procurement efforts from combined entities to leverage purchasing power for goods & services.
  
  d. Whether the ultimate decision by the operating boards and the residents is a “condo arrangement” or an assumption of all maintenance duties by the town, the identification of current costs, expenditures and proper funding sources going forward is essential for success.
  
  e. Business Office Consolidation – The three operating boards may want to consider consolidating the General Government and School District Business Offices. While this may not result in significant cost savings it may help with needed position redundancy / cross training and efficiency.

- **Timeline** – It is the recommendation of this Committee that the Boards of Selectmen, Education and Finance consider, analyze and decide on the committee recommendations during FY19. Actual changes in operations could be funded and implemented with the FY20 budget.

- **Capital Plan** – The committee also recommends the operating boards consider the following:
  
  a. **Study of Joint Capital Requests** – Evaluate whether joint capital budget requests on building related items would be beneficial (i.e. parking lot paving, exterior building work). It may be worthwhile to create three capital request centers (Town, School, Shared Facilities).
  
  b. **Increased Funding for Capital Budgets** – The BOF currently allocates $650,000 annually into the Capital Non-Recurring Fund which is a $200,000 increase over funding levels in 2014. The Committee recommends that the BOF consider further
c. **Business Office Consolidation Study** - The three operating boards may want to consider capital funding for a Municipal and School District Business Office Feasibility Study, similar to the Town of Canton Model. This business office consolidation study could be completed by the Capital Region Education Council (CREC), Capital Region Council of Government (CRCOG) or a similar consultant. *(See Appendix F)*

d. **Facilities Management Study** – The three operating boards may also want to consider capital funding for a facilities management study of the following approaches:

   1. **“Condo Approach”** – What are the benefits and problems with such an approach? How would such an approach be structured and operated?
   2. **“Interior / Exterior Approach”** - The study would evaluate the merits of the town being responsible for the entire interior and exterior envelope of the schools and to recommend how that should be structured and operated.

- **Metrics and Measurement** – Recognizing that a large portion of the cooperative efforts relate to the maintenance and operation of the town’s physical plant – and recognizing that the proper maintenance of these assets will over time provide the greatest economy - and further recognizing that fiscal constraints, funding priorities and budgetary practices can at times work in opposition to properly budgeting & potentially funding the physical plant maintenance needs - systems should be in place to monitor and insure maintenance measures are given appropriate prioritization and funding.

- **Leadership** – The importance of the leadership from both the BOS and the BOE engaging in an on-going process to continually identify opportunities for collaboration which will insure any / all economies can be recognized & implemented into operations is crucial.

- **Ongoing Meetings** - The BOS and BOE should establish consistent, regularly scheduled “Shared Services Meetings” to see if services could be combined as they come up for renewal.
8. Appendix

Appendix A – Titled “Shared Services between Municipal Government and Board of Education” – contains data compiled by the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM). The CCM Survey results from member towns providing insight on various services/functions where cooperation between the two entities exists.

Appendix B – Titled “Town of Granby Intra-Board Advisory Committee Final Report

Appendix C is a document prepared by the Greenwich Board of Education intended to guide them through a planning process as they evaluated the feasibility of combining town and school facility maintenance functions.

Appendix D is a “Shared Service Whitepaper prepared by the Connecticut Association of School Business Officials (CASBO)

Appendix E is miscellaneous information regarding shared services from neighboring towns.

Appendix F – Copy of Canton, CT Municipal and School District Finance and Payroll Consolidation Feasibility Study.

Appendix G – Town Provided Services to the School District - 2017 ED001 Information
APPENDIX A
## Shared Services Between Municipal Government and Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Pop</th>
<th>Finances</th>
<th>IT</th>
<th>Ground/Facility</th>
<th>Human Resources</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethel</td>
<td>19,161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>36,187</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>12,425</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampton</td>
<td>12,940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>44,660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>22,403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>9,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killingly</td>
<td>17,269</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>18,291</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>58,289</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>25,648</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>9,794</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>44,379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>24,033</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainville</td>
<td>17,819</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>25,045</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simsbury</td>
<td>23,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Windsor</td>
<td>25,835</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford</td>
<td>19,543</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Hartford</td>
<td>53,274</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willington</td>
<td>5,994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham</td>
<td>25,091</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Shared Services between Municipal Government and Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>2007 Population</th>
<th>Office Space</th>
<th>Business Manager</th>
<th>Payroll Manager</th>
<th>Purchasing Operations</th>
<th>Legal Counsel</th>
<th>Facilities Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ashford</td>
<td>4,453</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avon</td>
<td>17,333</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barkhamsted</td>
<td>3,685</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bozrah</td>
<td>2,844</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Branford</td>
<td>26,984</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookfield</td>
<td>16,413</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>7,898</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canton</td>
<td>10,086</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chaplin</td>
<td>2,628</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester</td>
<td>3,834</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colchester</td>
<td>15,495</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>20,246</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Derby</td>
<td>12,434</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Granby</td>
<td>6,122</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haddam</td>
<td>8,852</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampton</td>
<td>12,598</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Lyme</td>
<td>18,650</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastford</td>
<td>7,759</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>7,368</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellington</td>
<td>14,727</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>6,793</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>57,548</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>25,084</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>3,991</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>3,169</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby</td>
<td>11,213</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>22,373</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanover</td>
<td>4,554</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron</td>
<td>9,232</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2,952</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>55,557</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>24,934</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>5,351</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>47,778</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milford</td>
<td>55,445</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montville</td>
<td>10,724</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Canaan</td>
<td>19,890</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>26,790</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>23,025</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Branford</td>
<td>14,406</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>24,107</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Stonington</td>
<td>5,212</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwalk</td>
<td>38,456</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>36,432</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Lyme</td>
<td>7,384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Saybrook</td>
<td>10,539</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orange</td>
<td>23,818</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainfield</td>
<td>14,440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plainville</td>
<td>17,149</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland</td>
<td>8,537</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preston</td>
<td>4,902</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospect</td>
<td>8,027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>23,872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roxbury</td>
<td>23,192</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somers</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprague</td>
<td>2,981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>14,798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sterling</td>
<td>3,725</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolland</td>
<td>14,633</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrington</td>
<td>35,451</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vernon</td>
<td>29,620</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westport</td>
<td>28,508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willington</td>
<td>22,138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilton</td>
<td>17,715</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>28,755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor Locks</td>
<td>12,491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodbridge</td>
<td>19,201</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CCM Research and Information Services
April 2009
## Shared Accounting Software

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Accounting Software Used</th>
<th>Shared Between Town and</th>
<th>Board of Education</th>
<th>Est. Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5,116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>QuickBooks (Town and School)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep River</td>
<td>BMSI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,673</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Granby</td>
<td>Alden, Novack &amp; Dodd</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,122</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>Munis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,366</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goshen</td>
<td>BMSI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwinton</td>
<td>Alden, Novack &amp; Dodd</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>5,564</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killingworth</td>
<td>QuickBooks</td>
<td>No, but Town cannot access Board of Ed. Information and vice versa.</td>
<td>6,443</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>80 $ Profund, Sequel</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7,354</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisbon</td>
<td>QuickBooks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td>Munis</td>
<td>In the process of linking the two</td>
<td>6,351</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>Quickbooks</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>4,248</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hartford</td>
<td>Budget Sense thru Unit Fund</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6,736</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>Quickbooks</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,165</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem</td>
<td>R. Walsh</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherman</td>
<td>Phoenix Sunguard</td>
<td>Yes, but Town cannot access Board of Ed. Information and vice versa.</td>
<td>4,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomaston</td>
<td>Edmonds and Associates, MCSI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>7,818</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Torrington</td>
<td>BMSI</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>6,714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willington</td>
<td>Phoenix Sunguard</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6,138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 2009 - CCM Survey of 19 Municipalities
## Shared Services Between Municipal Government and Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Shared IT Department</th>
<th>Shared Facilities/Maintenance</th>
<th>Revenue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>60,327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>48,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>22,961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haven</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simsbury</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>23,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Windsor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>72,569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>34,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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# Shared Services Between Municipal Government and Board of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Shared Finance Department</th>
<th>Shared HR Department</th>
<th>Est Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>80,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Danbury</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>79,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darien</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20,377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southington</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>44,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>33,263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middletown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>48,030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newtown</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>26,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Haven</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>36,388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ridgefield</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>24,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simsbury</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>23,615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Windsor</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>25,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>34,688</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Finance Director
Town of East Hampton

Nature of Work
This is professional, administrative work supervising all fiscal activities of the Town government. The Finance Director is responsible for developing and administering the financial control management programs for the Town in accordance with policies and objectives established by Charter and the general direction of the Town Manager. The work involves the keeping of accounts and financial records, the assessment and collection of taxes, special assessments and other revenues, the custody and disbursement of Town funds and money, the control over expenditures and such other powers and duties as may be required by ordinance. Other responsibilities include supervision of the Office of the Assessor, Finance and Accounting and the Office of the Collector of Revenue. Work is performed under the direction, control and supervision of the Town Manager and is reviewed through conferences, meetings and reports. The position also includes duties and responsibilities relating to the fiscal management of the public school system working with, assisting and reporting to the Superintendent of Schools on financial matters relating to education expenses.

Examples of Work
• Supervises Assessing, Finance and Accounting and Revenue Office.
• Prepares financial statements, surveys and reports.
• Performs duties of town treasurer, including investment of town funds and debt management.
• Assists in the preparation of the annual town budget under direction of the Town Manager.
• Assists the Superintendent and Board of Education in the preparation of the school department budget.
• Coordinates the annual and five year capital improvement program under the direction of the Town Manager.
• Assists the Town Manager and Superintendent of Schools in administering town wide purchasing, insurance programs, employee benefits, pension risk management and grant programs.
• Assists town, state and federal auditors.
• Prepares and maintains a general fixed asset inventory.
• Prepares and annually updates 5 year revenue/expense projections.
• Administers grants, both town and education and handles reporting on same.
• Attends meetings of boards/committees including Board of Finance as directed by Town Manager.
• Performs all other duties and related tasks as required.
Desirable Knowledge, Abilities and Skills

- Thorough knowledge of municipal finance, including accounting, budgeting and investment.
- Thorough knowledge of municipal bonding procedures
- Thorough knowledge of modern business and office practices
- Considerable knowledge of purchasing
- Considerable knowledge of the theory and applications of automatic data processing methods, procedures and techniques
- Considerable knowledge of the theories and methods of developing and installing planning and performance budgeting systems
- Considerable knowledge of inventory control
- Ability to work with subordinates; Town Officials and Boards and Commissions

Desirable Experience and Training
Possession of a bachelor's degree or higher in Business Administration with a major in Accounting, or a bachelor's degree or higher in an appropriate allied field. At least five (5) years experience in accounting, budgeting and financial control and experience or training in relating municipal finance procedures and systems to electronic data processing. Must be bondable and have a valid Connecticut motor vehicle operator’s license.

Physical Demands
The physical demands described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions. While performing the duties of this job, the employee is frequently required to sit and talk or hear. The employee is occasionally required to walk; use hands to fingers, handle, or operate objects, tools, or controls; and reach with hands and arms. The employee must occasionally lift and/or move up to 25 pounds. Specific vision abilities required by this job include close vision and the ability to adjust focus.
TOWN OF MADISON
DIRECTOR OF FINANCE

BASIC FUNCTION

Serves as the Financial Director for the Madison Public Schools and the Town of Madison.
Directs accounting and reporting, financial planning and analysis, budgeting and debt service.
Manages departmental personnel.

PRINCIPLE RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

Under the general direction of the Superintendent of Schools and the First Selectman, assumes responsibility for the following:

Administers and develops improvements to the financial management systems of the Town of Madison and the Madison Public Schools to include budget preparation and management, cash management and the development of procedures and systems.

Supervises Town and Education accounting and payroll departments and staff.


Maintains accounts in sufficient detail to produce financial and statistical data for management purposes required to meet auditing and statutory requirements.

Prepares financial statements, cost reports and statements of revenues and expenditures on a regular basis.

Develops budget guidelines, coordinates preparation, assists in the budget review and analyses for the Board of Education and the Town of Madison.

Supervises the preparation of various state reports.

Develops and prepares all necessary information for bonding purposes and acts as a liaison with outside financial consultants.

Oversees building projects and grant applications. Maintains financial oversight of transportation and food service contracts.

Serves as a financial consultant to negotiation committees.
Manages the flow of financial information between the Board of Education, Board of Selectmen, Board of Finance, department heads and various boards and commissions.

Performs other duties as assigned.

**KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS AND ABILITIES**

Through knowledge of municipal and educational accounting principles and procedures.

Through knowledge of GASB fund accounting and encumbrance accounting, as well as, various other Federal and State laws regarding finance.

Ability to manage and effectively work with people on improving and maintain financial procedures.

Ability to maintain detailed financial reports and prepare specific related reports.

Knowledge of various computers systems and ability to recognize and utilize new technology.

Ability to maintain harmonious working relationships with other employees, officials, auditors, and the public.

Strong oral and written communication skills.

**QUALIFICATIONS (Minimum):**

B.S./B.B.A. degree in Accounting, Finance, Business Administration or Public Administration and at least ten (10) years of financial, town, school or business management and administration, or equivalent. Masters Degree desirable.

Familiarity with State of Connecticut reporting requirements for Board of Education.
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TOWN OF MANSFIELD
POSITION DESCRIPTION

Class Title: Director of Finance
Group: Town Administrators
Pay Grade: Town Administrators Grade 32
FLSA: Exempt
Effective Date: July 1, 2009

General Description/Definition of Work
This position performs complex professional and administrative work in planning, organizing and directing the financial activities of the Town as well as related work as required. Duties include planning, organizing, directing and supervising the Assessor's Office, Revenue Collection Office, and Controller/Treasurer's office (accounting, disbursements and investments). Provides centralized financial management services and reports for the Town of Mansfield and the Mansfield Board of Education. By Special agreement the Finance Department through its director provides financial management services and reports for: Eastern Highlands Health District, Mansfield Discovery Depot (daycare center), Regional School District 19 and Mansfield Downtown Partnership. Director coordinates work with Town Manager, Superintendent of Schools, other agencies as indicated and other departments. Work is performed under general supervision. Supervision is exercised over all department personnel. Position reports to the Town Manager.

Essential Job Functions/Typical Tasks
- Directs the operations of the Finance Department and evaluates and administers financial management programs such as accounting and financial reporting, budgeting, information technology, cash management, grant applications, tax collection, assessment, audits and reporting.
- Drafts and recommends policy to the Town Manager and plans for the implementation of financial goals and objectives; researches, analyzes and reports on a variety of administrative projects.
- Coordinates preparation of annual Town, Health District, Region 19 and school and various other operating budgets; reviews all department submissions; prepares budgets for various funds such as capital fund, health insurance fund and management services fund; drafts budget policy positions; attends Town Council budget sessions and provides financial and technical assistance as requested; analyzes impact of budget and tax rate and service levels and recommends strategies to mitigate impact.
- Directs and controls the expenditure of Town, Region 19 and School fund allocations within the constraints of approved budgets; reviews budgets on a monthly basis and prepares budget adjustments for Town Council approval.
- Analyzes financial markets and supervises the investment of Town funds in appropriate instruments.
- Prepares and submits a variety of complex financial reports; assists in the preparation of grant applications and oversees financial reporting; coordinates the efforts of external auditors in their review of Town financial management for Town, Region 19, Health District, Schools and various other small agencies.
- Serves as Town purchasing agent; staffs Town Council's Finance Committee.
- Coordinates, assigns and oversees workload for assigned staff; motivates, evaluates, counsels and disciplines staff in accordance with union contract and personnel policies; directs training of departmental personnel; ensures safe work practices.
- Performs related tasks as required.

Knowledge, Skills and Abilities:
- Comprehensive knowledge of general laws and administrative policies governing municipal and school financial practices and procedures.
- Comprehensive knowledge of the principles and practices of accounting and budgeting in government.
Director of Finance (cont'd.)

- Ability to evaluate complex financial systems and efficiently formulate and install accounting methods, procedures, forms and records; ability to prepare informative financial reports; ability to formulate long-range fiscal planning.
- Ability to plan, organize, direct and evaluate work of subordinate employees in the specialized field of accounting.
- Ability to establish and maintain effective working relationships with associates, state and regional governmental officials and the general public.

Education and Experience:
Graduation from an accredited college or university with major course work in accounting or related field supplemented by a master's degree in business administration or related field and extensive experience in public finance administration. Consideration may be given to equivalent experience and training. Should have or ability to obtain within a year of employment and maintain School Business Manager Certification SDE 85.

Physical Demands and Work Environment:
(The physical demands and work environment characteristics described here are representative of those that must be met by an employee to successfully perform the essential functions of this job. The list is not all-inclusive and may be supplemented as necessary. Reasonable accommodations may be made to enable individuals with disabilities to perform the essential functions.)

- Sedentary work requiring the exertion of up to 10 pounds of force occasionally, and a negligible amount of force frequently or constantly to move objects.
- Work requires fingeriking, grasping, and repetitive motions.
- Vocal communication is required for expressing or exchanging ideas by means of the spoken word.
- Hearing is required to perceive information at normal spoken word levels.
- Visual acuity is required for preparing and analyzing written or computer data, operation of machines, determining the accuracy and thoroughness of work, and observing general surroundings and activities.
- Worker is not subject to adverse environmental conditions.

Special Requirements:
None.

The above description is illustrative of tasks and responsibilities. It is not meant to be all-inclusive of every task or responsibility. The description does not constitute an employment agreement between the Town of Mansfield and the employee and is subject to change by the Town as the needs of the Town and requirements of the job change.

Approved by:_________________________ Date:______________
Matthew W. Hart, Town Manager
## Consolidated PW Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Shared PW between Munl and Board of Education?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td>44,635</td>
<td>Yes, limited to custodial and grounds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glastonbury</td>
<td>34,467</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groton</td>
<td>40,125</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naugatuck</td>
<td>31,880</td>
<td>No, in discussions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newington</td>
<td>30,599</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>40,605</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelton</td>
<td>39,580</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southington</td>
<td>43,130</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>36,062</td>
<td>No, in discussions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B
INTRA-BOARD ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Final Report

December 10, 2015

Dear Board of Selectmen, Board of Education, and Board of Finance Members:

In the spring of 2014, the Granby Board of Selectman, in collaboration with the Board of Education, established an "Intra-Board Advisory Committee" (IBAC). The committee's charge was as follows:

- To explore opportunities and methods to improve Town and School District services.
- The Committee membership would consist of seven members. One member each shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, the chairman of the Board of Education, and the Chairman of the Board of Finance. The First Selectman and the Chairman of the Board of Education shall serve as ex-officio members. The Town Manager and Superintendent of Schools shall serve as ex-officio non-voting members.
- Meetings would convene on the call of the First Selectman in conjunction with the BOE Chairman.
- Committee findings and any recommendations shall be reviewed by the represented boards to be presented for discussion at the annual Three Board meeting. A formal report documenting findings and recommendations would be subsequently submitted to the Board of Selectman.

Committee membership consists of seven members; one member each from the Board of Selectmen, Board of Education, and Board of Finance. The First Selectman and the Chairman of the Board of Education serve as ex-officio members. The Town Manager and Superintendent of Schools serve as ex-officio non-voting members.

During the intervening months since being chartered, the committee has conducted research into the following Town/District activities:

- Information Technology
- BOE maintenance activity
- Town building and grounds activity
- Finance and Accounting
- Solar power opportunities
- Human Resources Organizations
- Retirement Benefits
The Committee has concluded that further value will be realized through institutionalizing the Town and BOE commitment to operational coordination, collaboration, and integration as opportunities arise, and that this can best be accomplished at this time through a formal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the three governing Boards. The committee further recommends that the respective boards direct the actions of the Town Manager and Superintendent in relation to the action items as outlined in this report. A summary report of these activities is attached.

If the Board of Selectmen / Education / Finance agree, a VOTE to adopt the findings of this committee is recommended.

Very truly yours,

IBAC Co-Chairs
B. Scott Kuhnly, First Selectman
Ronal Walther, Board of Education Chairman
IBAC's Review of Information Technology

Background

The Intra-Board Advisory Committee conducted a review of the Information Technologies departments of both the Town and School operations. The Town utilizes the services of a part time consultant, as well as support staff throughout town hall for administrative IT tasks. The School has a full time Director of Technology, with 4 support staff to provided technology services district wide.

Our Research

The IBAC review consisted of interviews and presentations by both Technology professionals with assistance of the Town Manager and Superintendent of Schools. Some of the opportunities explored included:

1) Cost effective procurement of hardware, software and contracted support services
2) Reduced risk of disruption of service through increased redundancy in staff support
3) Improved support to users in identifying, selecting, and implementing new systems and software support (e.g. Tax and assessment software; public/guest wireless access in all community facilities; building and public security systems; facility HVAC and environmental controls)
4) Enhanced recognition and containment of cyber risk threats;
5) Increased identification and securing of potential alternative revenue sources, such as state, federal, or non-profit foundation grants; and
6) Continued responsiveness to ever-increasing user needs.

The committee's review established that regular informal meetings and collaboration do currently exist between both agencies IT professionals. The Committee found there is no formal process mandate for this to occur.

Conclusions

The ongoing threat of cyber risk, staff or operational changes, and increased changes in technology services offered, warrants the collaboration on a more formal basis. IBAC recommends that the Town Manager and Superintendent develop a plan of collaboration and formalized integration of IT which may include developing a single department structure formalized through a three-board Memorandum of Understanding, and enhancing the job description and responsibilities of the Information and technology personnel.
This suggested pilot program recognizes the school and town IT departments as one system working on school and town needs and formal integration of the two agencies may offer more responsiveness to all business constituents.
IBAC’s Review of Town and School Buildings and Grounds Maintenance Operations

Background

The question of whether buildings and grounds maintenance activities required for effective Town and School operations might achieve greater efficiencies through increased coordination or integration between Public Works (Town) and Facilities (BOE) arose early in the 2014-15 IBAC process. Results of the 2004 final report of the predecessor committee included the following: “Future effectiveness and efficiency opportunities that would also increase service levels are to be found in... Gradual shift of fields and grounds maintenance from Education to Municipal with the attendant redeployment of resources (begin implementation of the collaborative plan for high school/middle school fields and grounds).” (Final Report to Board of Selectmen, December 2, 2004)

Research

Mr. Smith reported that tests of the 2004 recommendation were conducted -- specifically, the mowing of field hockey playing fields by Town personnel -- and were found “unbeneficial.” Since then, much has changed, suggesting it was time to revisit this issue.

The Committee requested overviews from both Facilities and Public Works, in an effort to identify opportunities for greater efficiency or effectiveness in the deployment of personnel or equipment, in bidding and purchasing, and in responsiveness to community needs. Written reports accompanied the presentations, and minutes from the October 22, 2014 IBAC meeting summarize the discussion.

Of note is the fact that total facilities, and use by the public of those facilities, has continued to increase over the years. For example, the Town has assuming responsibility for maintenance of its Holcomb Farm buildings, and has added Ahrens Park and the new Recreation Center building at Salon Broom Park. The new turf fields and stadium at the High School sees substantially increased usage, not just by sports teams but by the community as a whole, and new school security protocols, require increased maintenance. Resources at both Facilities and Public Works are described as “overloaded.”

One change over the recent past is increased ad hoc collaboration between Facilities and Public Works, as needed: shared use of some subcontractor resources, shared use of some equipment and staff in response to storms, and for special projects (e.g. school tennis court resurfacing).

Conclusions

IBAC has concluded that the overall buildings and grounds maintenance service, provided through Facilities and Public Works, has efficiently assumed increased responsibilities commensurate with increased community resources. We encourage continued ad hoc collaboration, and identify no other immediate changes to further improve efficiency or enhance service to the Granby community.
IBAC's Review of Financial Operations

Background

The review of financial operations centered on the roles and responsibilities of Town and BOE staff with a background thesis that the potential consolidation of all or portions of the Town and BOE finance functions would further strengthen operational cooperation, provide in-house back-up support and prepare for the continued growth in future responsibilities and additional services required by town residents.

Research

The IBAC review consisted of meetings and presentations by town staff including the Town Manager and Superintendent of Schools. All areas of both finance operations were reviewed in lengthy sessions which included follow-up assignments. In addition, IBAC met with a representative of a regional accounting firm's consulting practice to discuss potential integration scenarios and review how other towns approached the integration financial operations.

On the surface, combining one or all financial operations seemed possible and reasonable. However, our review revealed several distinct attributes of Granby's financial operations. Both the Town and BOE manage financial responsibilities with small and highly experienced staffs. In addition, individual employees may perform several interrelated tasks that in larger town or city organizations would be handled by task specific employees. Collaboration between Town and BOE does occur at all levels.

Conclusion

Based on IBAC's review, the potential benefit gained by combining financial operations is minimal.

However, as we face the potential loss of experienced staff, the potential to combine operations to deepen cross functionality and provide backup in times of staff shortage becomes important. We should continue to review potential combinations in the financial area as warranted in situations of staffing changes, budget implications and technology upgrades.
IBAC's Consideration of Increased Energy Efficiency through Solar

Background

When reporting on the BOE business operations, the Business Manager encouraged further exploration of solar energy as a way to reduce the roughly $750,000 annual electric bill funded through the operating budgets of the Town and BOE. A no-cost leasing option had been briefly considered by the BOS the prior year, but issues related to the location of the array and use of the land, as well as changing economic projections, made full consideration of the deal premature.

Research

In order to begin to learn more, the IBAC invited C-Tec Solar to present at a meeting, and additional investigation was conducted by both Town and School administrations. The range of options appears to include variations on the following:

1) A Granby-owned "solar farm" that would generate electricity to offset our costs; this would require a major up-front capital investment, and the use of land for siting the facility, but likely offer the greatest long term payoff;

2) Entering into a “net metering” arrangement in which a solar array is located and built by an agricultural owner, with Granby contractually obligated to “purchase” the electricity produced by the facility, at a cost below retail; or

3) A leasing arrangement whereby a vendor builds and owns a facility on Town land, and provides a discount to the Town on its energy usage as a result of the deal.

Conclusions

The options for solar are evolving quickly, and the optimal solution for Granby appears to the IBAC to require independent expertise. Whether through up-front capital investment, or long term contractual agreements, there appears to be real opportunity to materially impact the annual cost to taxpayers of our electric usage - above and beyond the significant energy efficiency actions already taken. The IBAC recommends the resources such as CCM be explored to learn about program options that may be appropriate for Granby. Ultimately, if necessary, the BOS and BOE should jointly engage an independent expert resource to assess the options and recommend the way forward.
IBAC’s Review of Human Resources Organizations

Background

Human resources (HR) services for Granby Town employees and Granby School District employees are provided by separate organizations, governed by the Town manager and Superintendent of Schools, respectively. The Town HR function services a much smaller population (xx members) than the School District (xxx members) and utilizes a model where HR rules are distributed among several staff members. The School District centralizes this function in one department with a single, focused HR Coordinator servicing their larger member population.

Research

Per its charter, the committee conducted a review of HR services across Town/School employee population to determine if employees could be better served under an alternate organization model. This review consisted of interviews with the Town manager and School District Finance Director, who supervises the HR coordinator, describing organization and responsibilities. The committee determined there is an opportunity to improve HR focus for the smaller Town employee population through consolidation of services under the School District coordinator. This transfer of responsibilities would, however, likely require additional manpower resources on the School District to handle the additional Town employee population. Concerns regarding HR responsiveness and priority to the management of each organization was highlighted and needed to be addressed in any consolidation plan.

Conclusions

The committee supported an initiative to actively pursue a consolidation of Town HR services under the School District HR department. This notional consolidation initially requires a detail study of each of the two HR organizations to determine scope of responsibilities, appropriate staffing and transition planning. Subsequent School District staffing changes and programmatic priorities (i.e. school reconfiguration), however, required this planning initiative be delayed indefinitely.
IBAC's Review of Retirement Benefits

Background

Over the past 10-20 years there has been a broad shift in market place regarding the types of retirement plans offered in both the corporate and municipal sectors. Driven by changes in regulations, employee tenure, and economic conditions the retirement industry has shifted from the traditional employer funded defined benefit plans structure which provides employees with a guaranteed income stream in retirement to a defined contribution structure where employees have contributory individual retirement accounts that can be rolled over to a new employers plan or take as a lump sum or annuity at termination or retirement.

For both the Town and Board of Education staff, retirement benefits are determined through the negotiation process. The Board of Education cannot open up negotiations on retirement plan benefits without the direction of the Town Manager.

Research

We reviewed the various retirement plan programs currently available for both the Town and the Board of Education employees. The Town offers both defined benefit and defined contributions plans and in some situations the employee has the ability to elect which plan they go into. On the Board of Education side, the plan is a defined benefit plan with a contributory requirement. For purposes of this research, the teacher’s program was out of scope given that it’s driven by the state.

To get a competitive assessment of Granby’s retirement plan benefits we invited the town’s retirement plan Consultant Actuary to speak to the group. She reiterated how the retirement industry as a whole is moving away from an employer pay all type of structure to a shared pay defined contribution/hybrid structure. With the defined contribution and hybrid structures, the employee makes a contribution which the employer may contribute a match or defined amount.

She discussed the competitive landscape for towns of similar size to Granby. In some areas Granby’s benefits were higher and in others they were on par. She also shared a growing list of the other towns that have moved towards a defined contribution only or hybrid approach.

Conclusions

The Committee recommends both the Board of Selectmen and Board of Education adopt policies to migrate away from defined benefit plans to a defined contribution or hybrid retirement plan structure. With the appropriate support of the Town Manager this should occur immediately so that 2015 negotiations can be opened up to include retirement benefits.
APPENDIX C
GREENWICH PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Greenwich, Connecticut

Date of Meeting: April 23, 2009

Title of Item: Limitations for Transition of Maintenance Services

Agenda No.

REQUEST FOR BOARD ACTION OR PRESENTATION OF INFORMATIONAL ITEM

[ ] Action Requested: [ ] Informational Only

Submitted By: Leslie Moriarty & Susan Wallerstein

Position: BOE & Assistant Superintendent

We will be present at Board meeting to explain if called upon:

[ ] Yes [ ] No

Synopsis:
The purpose of the attached Ends and Limitations is to guide the planning process for consolidating Board of Education and Town of Greenwich facilities maintenance services as of July 2010.

Recommended Action

Approve the planning limitations as presented.
The Board of Education (BOE) and the Town of Greenwich (TOG) believe there are quality improvement opportunities to be gained by sharing resources related to facilities maintenance. The BOE and the TOG are appointing a committee that will be charged with developing a plan based on a common understanding of the roles, expectations and standards for this shared resource. The Commissioner of Public Works and the Assistant Superintendent for Business Operations will lead the planning process.

Ends
1. The objective is to identify an operating structure that will be responsible for the high quality maintenance of school and Town facilities in a proactive and systematized manner, is flexible to meet the needs of diverse buildings and user groups, can respond to emergencies as effectively as routine items, operates in a transparent manner to all groups, integrates and develops reporting and tracking systems as well as communication flows, systematizes preventative maintenance and other regularly occurring activities to maximize the lifespan of building systems, uses cross-training and scale to leverage expertise.

2. A detailed plan (short and long term) for the consolidation of Town and Board of Education facilities maintenance services which includes timeline for July 1, 2010 start-up, with consideration given to the possibility of phased implementation. The plan should include defined roles, identified lines of responsibility, specific reporting and measurement systems for accountability, two-way communication flows, and established mechanisms for handling unexpected situations.

Limitations
The plan shall not fail to consider
1. The need to align accountability with responsibility against defined standards and expectations.
2. Operating definitions of custodial services, maintenance (including preventive) and capital projects.
3. Definition of success as it relates to the plan’s implementation.
4. Detailed information about resources required including funding, leadership, staffing.
5. The unique characteristics and needs of schools and Town facilities.
6. Identification of efficiencies in the area of preventive maintenance, annual inspections, etc.
7. The need for a common, easy and accessible work order system to serve as an integral source of accountability and performance data.
8. Lessons learned from current shared services relationships.
9. The application of the proposed model to selected case studies based on day to day situations.
10. How best to address the "under $25,000 capital projects."
11. The need for instrumentation and maintenance mechanics with skills, knowledge and experience specific to Greenwich High School facilities needs, including but not limited to maintaining the swimming pool.
12. The relationships between and among custodial services, preventive and routine maintenance, and capital planning.
13. The need to develop and maintain an interdepartmental leadership team responsible for
   a. monitoring the implementation of the plan (using predetermined data points),
   b. Making any adjustments identified in the process.
   c. communicating internally (school and Town personnel) and externally (elected officials, policymakers)

March 26, 2009
14. The relationship between maintenance and school-specific requirements and procedures including but not limited to a) "Tools for Schools" (state required protocol related to indoor air quality), b) ED051 report to the State Department of Education, c) radon inspections, and c) triennial and annual asbestos inspections and management plans.

15. Efforts to monitor and improve energy efficiency including utility budgeting, forecasting, use, etc...

16. The increasing demand for instrumentation and maintenance mechanics with heating, ventilation and air conditioning (HVAC) expertise.

17. The potential to extend and expand the shared services relationship to capital planning and school construction projects.

18. The seven-day per week operation of facilities.

19. The time sensitivity of facilities issues with regard to school communities.

20. The impact on budgets and costs for the delivery of maintenance services with the expectation that a combined facilities maintenance operation will not cost more to the BOE and Town than separate operations.

21. Communication flows that will keep users of building apprised of current situations and involve users (clients, customers) in decision-making, as appropriate.

22. The importance of high quality and proactive maintenance operation to support Town and school investment in facilities.
## Town of Greenwich & Board of Education Facilities Maintenance Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Comparison</th>
<th>Board of Education</th>
<th>Town of Greenwich</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of facilities</strong></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of square feet</strong></td>
<td>~1,500,000</td>
<td>~600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of maintenance work orders per year</strong></td>
<td>~2,700</td>
<td>~700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work order system</strong></td>
<td>Work Order Direct (web based application) with on-line work orders filed by lead custodians, maintenance mechanics, principals, district facilities leaders</td>
<td>Telephone hot line with manual entry into legacy custom application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Method for assessing overall facility condition</strong></td>
<td>• ED050 report to Connecticut State Dept. of Education min. every 2 years &lt;br&gt; • Comprehensive facilities audit every 5 years &lt;br&gt; • Success System, includes Harris Survey data &lt;br&gt; • Tools for Schools walk throughs</td>
<td>Scale score based on 3 pt. scale across 9 components with 15 of 27 being acceptable standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary customer(s)</strong></td>
<td>School communities</td>
<td>Multiple Town departments and related municipal services including but not limited to Registrar of Voters, Public Safety, Parks &amp; Recreation, community centers, train stations, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of instrumentation/maintenance mechanics</strong></td>
<td>11 plus one foreman (Teamster)</td>
<td>14 plus one foreman (5 maintenance mech., 1 instrumentation mech., 3 carpenters, 4 painters, 1 utility worker),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special credentials or licenses required for positions</strong></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Special training required</strong></td>
<td>• Geothermal, photovoltaic, digitally controlled HVAC systems at Greenwich High School and other schools with new boilers, well water testing</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulation of custodial vs. maintenance roles &amp; responsibilities</strong></td>
<td>Teamsters contract; district facilities responsible for supervision and evaluation of all Teamsters</td>
<td>Teamsters’ contract; individual Town departments responsible for supervision and evaluation of custodians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Remote management capabilities</strong></td>
<td>HVAC (RCMS controls) and security in development</td>
<td>&quot;Don’t need&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preventative Maintenance Scheduling</strong></td>
<td>Individual tracking schedules; plan to roll out PM Direct, which along with Planning Direct and Facility Scheduling Direct integrates with Work Order Direct</td>
<td>Work order system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response to after hours/weekend alarms (heat, security, etc.)</strong></td>
<td>District maintenance mechanics rotate-standby for after hours calls per Teamsters’ contract</td>
<td>24 hour hotline forwards to beepers (foreman, Town Hall bldg. contact, A. Monelli)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*July 2008*
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Introduction to Shared Services

Connecticut has a long history of seeking ways to reduce costs through cooperation. The most visible results of this effort have been the creation of regional school districts (RSD) and Regional Education Service Centers (RESC), but there are many other ways communities and school districts can and have worked together to reduce costs. In a recent survey, 94% of responding districts participate in some type of shared services or purchasing with another district, RESC or town. Over 82% participate in at least 3 areas and 76% participate in 5 or more areas of shared services or purchasing.

There is also a long tradition in New England of not wanting to lose local control. Often, shared services and the concept of local control collide and sometimes savings get lost as a result.

CASBO’s first edition white paper on consolidation/shared services was published in 2004 and it is time to update that information. It was felt that more practical information was needed in terms of the pros and cons of different types of cooperation and case studies, copies of formal contracts and the like would serve community leaders and public officials better.

The paper is broken down into nine (9) major categories:
1. Health, Dental, Liability, Property and Worker’s Compensation Insurance
2. Maintenance of Parks, Athletic Fields, Buildings, Grounds and Vehicles
4. Shared Finance Office and Operations
5. Co-Operative Purchasing, Bidding and Purchasing Consortiums and Regional Education Service Centers (RESCs)
6. Human Resources and Negotiations with Certified Staff
7. Cafeteria Services and Director
8. Transportation Services
9. Safety and Security Operations

Executive Summary

There are opportunities to be gained in reviewing various aspects of consolidation or shared services. The challenge is to keep the process free of politics and those looking to protect “turf” and/or build an empire. It is clear from our interviews and experience from school business officials and municipal officials, that collaboration can be most effective when good planning takes place, egos are put aside, and the planners are united in their mindset of “Public Service First”.

As you will see, it is clear from the legal opinion that a board of education cannot be forced to consolidate financial services. It is just as clear that several towns in the state have consolidated some or all of the financial functions.

During the research phase for this paper it was clear that even the education statutes encourage school districts to work together. As the reader looks over the number and variety of consolidation efforts, one can readily see cooperation is alive and well from one corner of the state to another. We encourage districts to continue to explore efforts to share services.

As one reads the shared services examples outlined in Appendix A, it is important to recognize that there are, and have been, situations where the shared services has not been successful. Examples of some of the reasons are anticipated efficiencies not realized, cost-savings were not achieved, and in some districts, there were control and political issues. Some have reverted back to separation of services and/or hired additional staff. Few representatives were willing to publicly discuss unsuccessful situations.

The final measure that districts and towns should consider is the value such efforts contribute to the children and the taxpayers we serve.
Considerations of Consolidation

From the perspective of the taxpayer and the community, consolidation should be considered. From the perspective of the town and school officials, the actual consolidation of services may not be quite so simple.

When considering consolidation of services, there are several basic concepts that should be considered. They are as follows:

1. Does consolidation make sense operationally?
2. Does consolidation improve the effectiveness of the organizational functions for both entities?
3. Does consolidation improve the efficiencies of the organizational functions for both entities?
4. Does consolidation infringe or restrict in any way the operational prerogatives of any of the entities involved?

Limiting Operational Prerogatives

This area of assessment is the most difficult and complex when considering consolidation of services. What do we mean by "limiting" prerogatives? For clarification, a prerogative is according to the American Heritage Dictionary: "an exclusive right or privilege held by a person or group, especially a hereditary or official right." (The underscoring of "official" is emphasized by the author.)

Let us first look at the consolidation of benefits. Once a community and board of education consolidate benefits and realize savings from pooling employees, does this action limit the future prerogatives of the respective organizations?

Official rights of boards of education are laid out in Section 10-220 of the General Statutes, as follows:

"Duties of boards of education. (Each local or regional board of education shall maintain good public elementary and secondary schools, implement the educational interests of the state as defined in section 10-4a and provide such other educational activities as in its judgment will best serve the interest of the school district;)"

The Statute goes on in considerable detail to outline the rights and responsibilities of the board of education.

Could a board of education or a town withdraw from a cooperative effort? The answer is "yes!" However, the economic and political implications would probably be more than either organization would be willing to face.

Financial services is the most sensitive area of consolidation of services and cuts to the central issue regarding prerogatives. Thomas B. Mooney, Esq, and author of "Connecticut School Law" is quoted:

"Everyone has an opinion on how to run the schools, and local municipal officials are no exception. Towns have tried various ways to dictate how local boards of education should expend funds appropriated to them, but the principle that school boards may exercise their independent discretion in deciding upon school expenditures remains intact."
Shared Services Whitepaper

Important material from CASBO's original Consolidation of Services Whitepaper from 2003

Following is a legal opinion provided by a Connecticut law firm who requested to remain anonymous but is allowing for “liberal” quotes of their findings. In reading the opinion, keep in mind the concept of board prerogatives discussed previously.

“While the proposed consolidation is probably legally permissible, the Board cannot be required to accede to it.” The reasons for this conclusion follow. First, any such consolidation could impinge upon the authority of the Board of education to determine the specific purposes for which the board wishes to spend its appropriations. Second, we are concerned that any such arrangement might impermissibly restrict the Board’s right to hire, direct, supervise and discharge finance office employees. Finally, the Board would need to bargain with the affected union regarding the impact of the reorganization. While the Board generally has the managerial prerogative to make certain changes to its operations, that prerogative is not unfettered when those changes affect the working conditions of its unionized employees. Consolidation of the financial offices could affect the working conditions for bargaining unit members and would therefore necessitate impact bargaining. Therefore, the Board has a defensible basis for refusing to consolidate its financial operations with the Town. A detailed analysis follows:

Analysis:

1. The Statutory Scheme and Relevant Case Law.

The State of Connecticut has granted local boards of education broad authority to provide for local education within their districts. Folver v. Enfield, 138 Conn. 521, 530 (1952). Connecticut Gen. Stat. 10-220(a) delegates to local boards of education the responsibilities to "maintain good public elementary and secondary schools; implement the educational interests of the state as defined in 10-4a and provide such other educational activities as in its judgment will best serve the interest of the school district."

The discretion of local boards of education, however, is not unfettered. The Connecticut Supreme Court has made clear that municipal charter provisions may limit the broad powers delegated by statute to a board of education, so long as those charter provisions "are not inconsistent with or inimical to the efficient and proper operation of the educational system." Board of education v. New Haven, 169 Conn. 169, 181, 169 Conn. 169, 181 (1990) (quoting Cheshire v. McKenney, 182 Conn. 253, 255 (1990)). See also Local #118 AFSCME v. Board of Education, 182 Conn. 93 (1980). In Board of education v Ellington, 161 Conn. 1 (1980), the board of finance made its regular appropriation for the board of education, but then retained an additional $46,300 for educational expenditures in a general government fund, in order to monitor the purposes for which such additional funds could be spent. (The board of finance was, apparently concerned that the board of education would spend the monies on additional teaching positions, a curriculum coordinator and building maintenance without what the Board of Finance believed to be adequate justification). The Court held that the board of finance had no authority either to retain the funds for educational expenditures within the general government budget or to restrict the purposes for which such funds could be spent. The Court first pointed out that Section 10-222 of the Connecticut Gen-
eral Statutes expressly provides that "money appropriated by any municipality for the maintenance of public schools shall be expended by and in the discretion of the board of education." Id. (emphasis added)

In the New Haven case, decided in 1996, the Court had occasion to revisit the issue of control over educational expenditures. The Court noted that "traditionally, there has been a tension between local boards of education, which seek sufficient funds to fulfill their educational mission, and municipalities, which are concerned with their overall financial condition." New Haven, 237 Conn. at 176. The Court reiterated that a municipality has control over the "total annual operating appropriation" (i.e. the "bottom line") for the school district. The Court went on to explain, however, that once money is appropriated to the board of education for annual operating expenditures, the board has discretion to determine how the funds should be spent. In fact, "even if the board of education justifies an appropriation for its annual operating budget based upon an anticipated expenditure for a particular educational purpose, it has the discretion to expend operating funds for an alternative educational purpose." Id. at 180.

The Court has thus made clear that local boards of education have a great deal of discretion with regard to the operation of school districts, particularly with regard to the purposes for which appropriated funds are spent. That discretion, however, is not unlimited. As the case law makes clear, municipalities are permitted to restrict the authority of local boards of education, so long as they do not conflict with the board's statutory authority and do not adversely affect the efficient operation of the school district.

2. The Impact of Consolidation

The Board's Authority to Expend Its Funds

Against the legal background set forth above, we have concerns about requiring the consolidation of the town's financial offices and the financial offices of the board of education. Any such consolidation could likely impinge upon the authority of the board of education to determine the specific purposes for which the board wishes to spend its appropriations. If the board determines that it wishes to expend funds, within its appropriation, for a finance office, the town would likely be hard pressed to challenge the board of education's right to do so. Preventing the board of education from maintaining a finance office would seem to cut right at the heart of the authority of board of education to determine the specific purposes for which education appropriations should be spent.

Moreover, a conflict of interest arises if there is any interference with the Board's independent right to allocate its budget as well as perform other functions under Conn. Gen. Stat. 10-220. Consolidating financial offices and having town employees, under direction of the Town's supervisors, could adversely affect the ability of the board of education to make its own independent determinations over how its budget is prepared and allocated."
APPENDIX E
Areas of Collaboration or Shared Services: Town and Board of Education

Shared Public Works and Engineering Services

- Fleet Division maintenance of BOE vehicles
- Pavement rehabilitation and reconstruction of school parking lots-engineering services
- Storage of road salt for school facilities
- Sweep school parking lots in spring
- Designation of MHS as emergency shelter
- Town waiver of certain building permit fees
- Waiver of construction demolition fees
- Coordination and shared equipment use
- Assistance with leaf collection process – when possible
- Assistance with tree trimming and removal – when possible

Shared Facilities and Parks Services

- Field Services maintenance and preparation of the High School grounds and outdoor athletic areas and preparation and maintenance of certain BOE and Town athletic fields for school use
- Coordination of summer camp and summer school schedules
- Permitting and scheduling of outdoor athletic facilities
- Shared buildings and office space (maintenance employees, building and grounds supervisors, town recreation/BOE nutrition services)
- Town project management of school capital projects
- Use of school sites for summer camp programming
- Use of Bennet Academy as Bennet Leisure Center
- Sharing of Mahoney Recreation Center
- Use of Illing gyms week nights and some weekends during school year
- Funding and sharing of IOH pool located at the High School and shared use of the High School main pool
- Shared use of school gymnasiums
- Shared use of East Side Neighborhood Resource Center for Adult Education office and classroom space, neighborhood-based parent/teacher conferences, senior high art show and kindergarten registration

Shared Public Safety Services

- School Crossing Guards
- Representation on townwide safety committee
- School Resource Officers
Shared Public Information Services

- Customer Service citizen referrals
- Channel 16 funding and programming

Shared Sanitation Services

- Waste and recycling removal contracts for all schools
- Waiver of all landfill fees for BOE Building and Grounds

Shared Administrative Services

- Use of shared financial software system
- Administration of shared financial software
- Shared information technology infrastructure (fiber optic network, web server, web camera management, e-mail and calendar systems, backup operations, security)
- Group purchasing (ex. fuel)
- Town bids construction projects
- Administration of all property and casualty insurance (MSIP)
- Administration of all health benefits (TOMMIF)
- Administration of non-certified pension
- Information technology development and technical support/telephones
- Town Attorney services-expulsion hearings
- Specification and purchases of equipment and vehicles
- Shared printing services
- Joint auction of surplus equipment
- Senior Center and BOE nutrition services
- Cooperative grant applications and implementations

Shared Education Services

- Kindergarten registration
- Mentoring Program
- Early learning programming

7/23/14
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TOWN</th>
<th>Business Manager</th>
<th>Purchasing</th>
<th>Facilities Management</th>
<th>Shared Software</th>
<th>Consolidated Public Works</th>
<th>Exterior Only</th>
<th>Exterior &amp; Interior orders</th>
<th>Electronic</th>
<th>Plowing</th>
<th>Shared</th>
<th>IT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East Granby</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bolton</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easton</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marlborough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hartford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomaston</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westbrook</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willington</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenwich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simsbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harwinton</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shared Services Committee
January 20, 2016

Town of Enfield
Facility Manager – Mark Gahr – runs 2 departments Buildings & Grounds (B&G) and Custodial

- 100% responsibility for all town and school buildings
- 2006 – 2012 responsible for school grounds
- 2012-present do inside and out
- “Schools said we’ll teach and you take care of fixing things”
- Responsible for 1.6 million square feet.
- 56 FT and 10 PT workers all union. Include B&G and Custodians
- B&G has 22 employees including a person for HVAC and two electricians
- The schools used to do the outside but if a custodian got sick, they would pull the groundskeeper and grounds would suffer.
- Now that the town does the schools there’s more consistency in the product.
- Responsibilities include plowing 145 small roads in the center of town (small trucks instead of DPW large trucks)
- Got extra electrician by saying that they would take over the 2200 streetlights too
- Could be initial problems with two different unions (school custodian and town custodian)
- He’s department head, has two crew chiefs that report directly to him. Administrators identify problems in the building to custodian who reports to Mark. They are going on to an electronic work order system soon
- Quarterly they survey the schools to make sure that issues are being resolved and they get rated on how they are doing.
- Overall the feedback is that they are consistently in their product
- They assess capital needs also for the schools and town council
Jim Hayden

From: William F Smith <williamsmith@granby-ct.gov>
Sent: Thursday, December 17, 2015 9:49 AM
To: Jim Hayden
Cc: Pat Chieski
Subject: RE: Shared Services
Attachments: FINAL REPORT.DOCX; CASBO_Shared_Services_Whitep.pdf

Jim,
Granby used to plow all school lots and driveways, and we still sometimes do, but since town roads come first the school will contract out. They now also have purchased some pickup trucks to help plow. About 10 years ago we arranged to mow some of their fields, we found it saved a little, but was scraped in part due to the difficulty created with our needs and some union complaints. Other than that we jointly work together in several areas, but not in a formal way. These involve things like fuel dispensing, purchasing of some computer and IT items, purchasing and sharing of various other items like grass seed, road salt, etc.
Attached is a report, not yet fully approved, from a Committee that Granby created to work on Town and School stuff. Also enclosed is a rather lengthy “White Paper” from CT’s School Business Officials. It details things that are shared among a few CT Towns and Schools.
We’ve looked into these concepts several times. One thing I believe is that working together with ‘formal’ plans can be cumbersome and sometimes more costly. On the other hand, more formal detail arrangements present a public awareness that can be comforting to some residents.
Hope this is a little helpful.
BILL

Good Afternoon,

I am writing you today to see if your town or organization can assist me as East Granby studies the way it provides maintenance services to the schools. Currently the Town takes care of lawns and ball fields for the schools and provides a Maintenance Supervisor to oversee the interiors of school and town buildings. We also do a lot of in-kind services for the schools with our Public Works Department. Other than that, the schools take care of their own maintenance.

How do your communities provide maintenance services to the schools? Is there a separate department that handles both school and town maintenance or is everyone on their own? Do you have the “condo” approach where the town takes care of the outside and building envelope and the school is responsible for everything inside?

Thanks,
Jim

James M. Hayden
First Selectman
Town of East Granby CT
860-413-3301
www.eastgranbyct.org
Hi Jim

Here in Windsor the arrangement is essentially the following:

DPW crews snowplow drives and parking areas, sweep parking lots, maintain / mow grass areas, prepare all athletic fields for practice and games. Catch basin cleaning is contracted out via DPW.

BOE staff is responsible for interior cleaning / maintenance and repairs.

The BOE has a facilities supervisor as does the general government. We jointly manage the larger building projects (i.e. roof, HVAC, window replacement projects).

I hope this helps. Let me know if you have questions.

Peter

---

Would you like to answer this or should I give it to someone else? Helene

---

Good afternoon,

I am writing you today to see if your town or organization can assist me as East Granby studies the way it provides maintenance services to the schools. Currently the Town takes care of lawns and ball fields for the schools and provides a Maintenance Supervisor to oversee the interiors of school and town buildings. We also do a lot of in-kind services for the schools with our Public Works Department. Other than that, the schools take care of their own maintenance.

How do your communities provide maintenance services to the schools? Is there a separate department that handles both school and town maintenance or is everyone on their own? Do you have the “condo” approach where the town takes care of the outside and building envelope and the school is responsible for everything inside?
Hi Jim,

Here is what we have from Simsbury.

Best,
Lisa

Lisa L. Heavner
First Selectman
Town of Simsbury
933 Hopmeadow Street
Simsbury, CT 06070
Phone (860) 658-3230

Hi Lisa -

The following is a brief summary that you can use to respond to Jim. I've also attached some of the correspondence between Dave Holden and me that led up to the agreement.

Prior to 1998, the town's Board of Education was responsible for all school building and grounds maintenance. After ongoing concerns about the condition of the athletic fields, the Board of Education and Board of Selectmen reached an agreement that the town's Parks and Recreation Department would be responsible for all athletic field maintenance. In exchange, the Board of Education took on the funding of two Park Maintainers as well as all required materials, supplies, and contractual services that were incurred as part of the field maintenance.

Through ongoing discussions between the Parks and Recreation Director and Board of Education Business Manager, a number of capital improvement projects have been approved to help upgrade the field quality. Overall, the agreement has worked well for the town. The condition of the fields is now at a consistently high level and the Board of Education maintenance staff can instead focus on building maintenance. Please feel free to contact me or Parks and Recreation Director Gerry Toner for any further information on this agreement.

Please call me for any clarification on this, Lisa.
September 11, 1998

TO:    Jerry Toner, Director
       Culture, Parks and Recreation

FROM:  David P. Holden, Business Manager

RE:    Consolidation of Athletic Field Maintenance

As a follow-up to our conversation earlier today, we are in substantial agreement with your plan and allocation outlined in your September 2, 1998 memorandum regarding capital equipment replacement.

Initially, the Board of Education would be charged back 19% of the cost of routine equipment replacement for equipment used in the maintenance of the school/town athletic fields. This percentage allocation would be reviewed and agreed to on an annual basis by the Director of Culture Parks and Recreation and the Business Manager. Additionally, the Culture Parks and Recreation Director would advise my office of the planned equipment replacement proposed annually by the town for athletic field maintenance in the budget development process. January 15 of each year would be a good initial date for us to target so that it fits within the Board of Education budget development timeline. Any major new athletic field maintenance equipment would be reviewed with us in advance for input.

Thank you for your cooperation and we look forward to a smooth and successful transaction.

/mfm

c:    Joseph Townsley, Superintendent of Schools
       Mary Glassman, First Selectman
       Kevin Kane, Director of Finance
ATHLETIC FIELD MAINTENANCE - BD. OF EDUCATION

Proposed Services:

- routine maintenance of athletic fields at Simsbury High School, Henry James Jr. High School, and possibly Squadron Line School.

- responsible for equipment repair, ordering of materials and supplies, submitting proposed annual maintenance plans, minor facility repairs.

Issues to be Discussed:

- Irrigation systems at SHS and HJ will be operated for one year in their current condition before any recommendation for capital improvement is made. HJ irrigation repair - $25,000.

- If Squadron Line is to be included, softball field nearest school should be renovated, and irrigation should be installed on soccer field and softball field. Irrigation installation - $12,000.

- Electrical panel and irrigation control panel need to be re-installed at ground level at HJ - $2,560.

- Automatic irrigation must be installed at SHS football field - $12,000. Irrigation control panel re-installed outside at SHS - $2,557.

- Bd. of Bd. maintains responsibility for all tennis courts, paddle tennis court, playground areas, volleyball areas, fencing and bleachers.

- Determine how capital improvements are to be addressed.
December 23, 2015

The Honorable James Hayden  
First Selectman  
Town of East Granby  
9 Center Street  
P.O. Box 1858  
East Granby, CT 06026

Dear James,

The following is in response to your request for information regarding which towns share grounds maintenance with their boards of education (BOE).

CCM has conducted small surveys over the past couple of years, the results of which I have attached here. I don't know that you can say that there is any standard, it generally depends on the individual municipality. I have attached the following files which list whether towns have shared facilities and/or grounds maintenance with the BOE:

1) Shared Services Between Municipal Governments and Boards of Education

2) Shared Services 2 (p.4)

3) Consolidated PW Functions

4) Greenwich Shared Maintenance

5) Manchester BOE Shared Services

In addition, I have the following responses:

- Cheshire (pop. 29,261) – Not combined, separate
- East Haven (pop. 23,257) – Not combined, separate
- Groton (pop. 40,115) – Waiting for response
- Naugatuck (pop. 31,362) – Not combined, separate
- Newington (pop. 30,562) – Not combined, separate
- Norwich (pop. 40,493) - Not combined, separate
- Trumbull (pop. 36,018) – Yes, combined/shared
- Torrington (pop. 36,383) - Not combined, separate
- Shelton (pop. 39,555) – Waiting for response
- Southport (pop. 43,069) - Not combined, separate
- Vernon (pop. 29,179) – The Dir. Of Public Works is the head of both the Town and Board of Education facilities management. The employees for each are separate.

I hope that this information is helpful. Please feel free to contact me directly at (203) 498-3077 or by email at bwest@ccm-ct.org, should you have any further inquiries.

Regards,

Brian

Brian West
Senior Research Associate
Connecticut Conference of Municipalities
900 Chapel Street, 9th Floor
New Haven, CT 06510
W: 203-498-3077
F: 203-498-5836
bwest@ccm-ct.org

www.ccm-ct.org

CCM Research and Information Services does not provide legal advice, opinions or conclusions. Any information provided in response to a research request is for general reference purposes only. If you have questions about a legal issue, the application of the law to specific factual situations, or the interpretation of any statutes, ordinances or case law, CCM strongly recommends that you consult your municipal attorney or other relevant party. An electronic carbon copy of all research request responses is provided to the chief elected official of the requesting member municipality. This message (including any attachments) may contain confidential information intended for a specific individual and purpose, and is protected by law. If you are not the intended recipient, you should delete this message.
APPENDIX F
CREC

Town of Canton, CT
Municipal and School District
Finance and Payroll Consolidation
Feasibility Study

Submitted by:

Mary Glassman
Manager, Office for Regional Efficiencies

Sarah Vocca
Director, Division of Data Analysis, Research and Technology

Stephen Bordeau
Manager of Information Systems, Data Analysis, Research and Technology

Capitol Region Education Council
111 Charter Oak Avenue
Hartford, CT 06106
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overview:

The Town and the Board of Education in Canton, Connecticut are interested in exploring intratown shared services of back office functions as a way to improve efficiencies and to provide better accountability to boards and commissions and to Canton’s residents. As a result, the Chief Administrative Officer and Superintendent have engaged the assistance of the Capitol Region Education Council (CREC) to conduct an analysis of the feasibility of combining municipal and school district operations related to Finance, Accounts Payable, Payroll and Human Resources functions.

The Town of Canton has a population of about 10,330 residents. The Town form of government includes a part-time First Selectman, Chief Administrative Officer and Superintendent of Schools. Oversight is provided by a Board of Selectmen, Board of Education and Board of Finance. There are 60 full-time Town employees and 270 full-time Board of Education employees.

Project Management Process:

In conducting the Town of Canton feasibility study, CREC followed a three phase approach to meet the needs of the Town of Canton, and worked closely with the Chief Administrative Officer and the Superintendent to ensure the town’s goals were met.

The CREC team followed this process in working with the Town of Canton:
- Phase I - Research and Data Collection
- Phase II - Data Analysis and Review
- Phase III - Written Report and Presentation

Phase I - Research and Data Collection

Key administrative staff in the Town and the Board of Education finance departments were identified and interviewed. In order to conduct the analysis, the Town provided the following information:
- Town of Canton charter;
- Current job descriptions for all related staff;
- 2016-2017 budgets;
- Any information related to vendors performing finance services;
- Any other documents or information related to town and school finance, payroll and human resources functions; and
- Financial software details and costs.
Phase II: Data Analysis and Review

As part of the study, CREC worked with the Town and the Board of Education to evaluate existing operations; current positions and functions performed; tasks within the departments; and how the departments relate to the organization. CREC also performed the following:

- Interviewed the: First Selectman, Chief Administrative Officer, Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education chair and Board of Finance chair;
- For the Town, CREC interviewed the finance officer/treasurer; accountant; financial assistant, finance clerk (.6 position) and accounting clerk (.5 position);
- For the Board of Education, CREC interviewed the payroll and benefits coordinator; and two financial assistants (the Director of Finance Operations is vacant);
- Examined policies, procedures and protocols for managing the operations;
- Evaluated the physical location of town and school functions; and
- Evaluated current technology and software programs currently used by the town and school district including financial management systems, human resources management systems and school district software applications.

Phase III - Written Report and Recommendations

CREC has identified a list of findings and recommendations regarding the feasibility and cost of combining Town and Board of Education operations related to Finance, Accounts Payable, Payroll and Human Resources functions.

In summary, CREC recommends that a Shared Services Finance Department be implemented for the Town and Board of Education in Canton. The benefit of a combined department would be to provide back-up and cross-training support; more comprehensive financial reporting and analysis of data and the opportunity to take advantage of cooperative purchasing and bulk buying trends.

Implementation of a Shared Services Finance Department would require changes in the following areas:

SECTION I: FINANCIAL SOFTWARE

The Town and Board of Education operate different financial software systems for general ledger, payroll and accounts payable information, which results in duplication and makes it difficult to combine functions. The Town uses MUNIS and the Board of Education uses Infinite Visions (“IVisions”). Together, the Town and Board of Education will need to implement a shared financial software system before implementing shared staffing changes.

SECTION II: STAFFING

Under the Shared Services Finance Department, staff changes would be made by the Town and the Board of Education. For the Board of Education, the Director of Finance Operations position would be eliminated; job descriptions would be updated; and one existing position would be
reassigned to coordinate benefits administration for the Town and Board of Education. For the Town, job descriptions would be changed and functions reassigned.

The departments are fortunate in that current knowledgeable and dedicated employees could provide a stable transition to combining finance department functions.

Overview of Existing Town and Board of Education Finance Departments:

The Town of Canton Finance Department staff consists of five employees which are all non-union positions (including two full-time positions paid by the town; one full-time position split between the town and school) and two part-time positions. (Organizational chart provided):

- Finance Officer/Treasurer:
  i. 35 hours per week
  ii. Position reports to the Chief Administrative Officer and supports the Board of Finance, Board of Selectmen and Pension Committee; the position is listed in the Charter of the Town and is appointed by the Board of Selectmen
  iii. Duties include planning, directing and supervising the financial management of the town

- Town Accountant:
  i. 35 hours a week
  ii. Position shared by the town and school district and is funded equally
  iii. Responsible on the town side for state grants; cash requirements for town and board of education, recording board of education expenditure journal entries on town books; reconciliation of tax and sewer revenue; fixed asset reconciliation and maintenance for town and board of education assets over $5,000
  iv. Responsible on the school side for reconciliation of all bank accounts; reconciliation of cash, accounts receivable, accounts payable, accrual, revenue and expense accounts; review and sign off on accounts payable

- Financial Assistant:
  i. 35 hours a week
  ii. Position that reports to the Finance Officer/Treasurer and responsible for purchase orders and invoices; reviews all accounts payable; enters invoices into MUNIS; and prepares all accounts payable payments

- Accounting Clerk:
  i. Part-time position of 17.5 hours a week
  ii. Position reports to the Finance Officer/Treasurer
  iii. Responsible for bank deposits and manual bank reconciliation

- Finance Clerk:
  i. Part-time position of 21 hours a week
  ii. Position reports to the Finance Officer/Treasurer
iii. Responsible for preparing employee payroll; compiling hourly time and attendance data into automated payroll system; coordinates employee leave requests with the Chief Administrative Officer’s office.

**Town Human Resources Department:**
- The Chief Administrative Officer is responsible for administering all human resources functions.
- Personnel files and leave requests are processed on paper forms and are not administered electronically or stored electronically.
- The executive assistant to the Chief Administrative Officer assists in administering employee requests.
- The Town has an established Safety Committee.

**The Board of Education Finance Department staff** consists of four full-time employees which are all non-union positions (Organizational chart provided):
- Director of Finance Operations (currently vacant)
  - i. 40 hours per week
  - ii. A position that reports to the Superintendent
- Payroll and Benefits Coordinator
  - i. 40 hours per week
  - ii. Responsible for payroll, insurance inquiries, defined benefit plan and defined contribution plan questions.
- Financial Assistant
  - i. 35 hours per week
  - ii. Responsible for accounts payable and purchase orders; prepares deposits for school cafeterias and district office; maintains payroll information.
- Financial Assistant
  - i. 36.25 hours a week
  - ii. This position has taken on additional financial responsibilities in the absence of the Director of Finance Operations position.
  - iii. Responsible for budget preparation; management of central office staff; financial reporting; management of current year budget.

**Board of Education Human Resources functions:**
- The Superintendent is responsible for administering all hiring decisions.
- The assistant to the Superintendent is responsible for assisting with certified positions and the assistant to the Assistant Superintendent is responsible for assisting with non-certified
The hiring process is decentralized, with each of the four school principals responsible for coordinating hiring with the Superintendent.

Once a final hiring decision is made, the Superintendent’s office prepares new hiring packets.

The payroll and benefits administrator is responsible for administering the benefits and responding to benefit questions.

**Observations of Existing Town and Board of Education Finance Operations:**

- Town and Board of Education finance staff is very skilled, dedicated and flexible in working to accomplish their tasks.
- Town and Board of Education finance departments operate completely independent from each other and have separate financial software systems. As a result, there is duplication and limited ability for cross-training staff, back-up functions or integrating software.
- Recent staff changes in the Board of Education’s Director of Finance Operations position has led to a decentralized approach for many finance functions. During the transition, staff has assumed additional responsibilities to ensure that financial and administrative functions run smoothly.
- The Town has a strong financial system, accounting staff and established policies and procedures. As a result, over the last several years, the department has been able to assume many joint town-school functions. The Town provides the following joint functions:
  
  - administers health insurance and self-insurance billing;
  - provides fixed asset administration;
  - administers the retiree pension plan for the Board of Education;
  - administers OPEB (Other Post-Employment Benefits) and medical benefits;
  - administers Worker’s compensation and Property Casualty through CIRMA;
  - administers procurement for heating oil, diesel and gas; and
  - coordinates bank RFPs and financial institution selection.

- The Town and Board of Education have already taken steps to work together by creating a shared Accountant position
  
  - The position of Accountant was created 5 years ago which has been well-received and functions well.
  - The Accountant manually enters the Board of Education financial information from Infinite Visions into MUNIS in order to run reports and track financial information to be reconciled to the Town’s general ledger.
  - Because different financial software systems are used, the Accountant is trained on MUNIS and Infinite Visions systems and physically moves between the town and school offices to enter data.

- Job descriptions do not accurately reflect work currently being performed.
• Both the Town and Board of Education have manual and labor-intensive systems for entering employee accruals, time off and time entry.
• Working hours for town and school employees are different.

SECTION I: FINANCIAL SOFTWARE

The Town and Board of Education operate different financial software systems for general ledger, payroll and accounts payable information, which results in duplication and makes it difficult to combine functions. The Town uses MUNIS and the Board of Education uses Infinite Visions ("iVisions"). Together, the departments will need to find a way to share financial information before a shared initiative can be implemented.

Overview and Observations of Town and Board of Education Financial Software Systems:

The Town Finance Department currently uses MUNIS 10.5 for general ledger, accounting, budgeting, accounts payable, purchase orders and payroll (newer upgrades are available)

• Payroll Module is used to integrate payroll information into the financial management system
• Human Resources Management Module was purchased and is used to track employee time and attendance
• Hourly employees complete manual time sheets that are reviewed by department heads and entered into MUNIS; a time clock system is used for some departments which are then manually entered into MUNIS
• Purchase orders are processed through MUNIS (but requisitions are not used)
• Positive Pay is used to ensure check payment accuracy
• Quality Data Systems integrates tax and assessor functions into MUNIS
• On-line bill paying is not used
• Capital project budgeting is prepared on excel and entered into MUNIS
• The Fixed Assets module is used
• MUNIS office was purchased
• Bank reconciliations are performed manually
• Employees cannot access personnel information online

The annual cost for MUNIS is $35,820 (the annual cost for Quality Data is $5,000).

The Board of Education uses Infinite Visions (iVisions) for general ledger, accounting, budgeting, accounts payable, purchase orders and payroll
- Revenue and expenditure reporting is done through iVisions
- Bank reconciliations are done through iVisions
- Each of the four schools currently operate separate student activity accounts
- The shared Accountant maintains checking accounts for the school (general fund, cafeteria and grants)
- Hourly employees complete manual time sheets which are entered into the financial system by the payroll and benefits administrator (approximately 90 employees bi-weekly)
- An online web portal to allow employees to access personnel information online has been purchased and is scheduled to be implemented
- The Time Clock Plus module has been purchased and is scheduled to be implemented for Board of Education employees only
- Aesop is used for substitute teachers
- Applitracks is used for recruiting
- Protrackx is used for administrator tracking and certifications
- On-line bill paying is not used

The annual cost for iVisions is $23,930 a year.

**SHORT TERM FINANCIAL SOFTWARE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. The Town and Board of Education can continue to utilize separate financial systems but should implement the iVisions DataLink functionality to integrate school financials into the Town’s MUNIS system.
2. The Town and Board of Education should review existing software with Tyler software representatives for MUNIS and Infinite Visions to determine whether any functions in the two systems can be integrated and shared to reduce costs.
3. The Town and Board of Education should implement an on-line and fully integrated process for personnel management. An on-line system would reduce a tremendous amount of staff time currently spent on manually entering accrual, time off and time entry information and would provide a benefit to employees.
4. The Town and Board of Education staff should be encouraged to seek additional training on financial systems through user group meetings offered and locally through MUNIS and iVisions.

**LONG TERM FINANCIAL SOFTWARE RECOMMENDATIONS:**

1. Evaluate the functionality of current financial software systems by conducting an investment assessment analysis of MUNIS and iVisions to identify similarities and dissimilarities in functionality and determine if one product could meet the needs of both the Town and the Board of Education;
2. Conduct a Request for Proposals process to select a financial software system that meets the needs and functions of both the Town and Board of Education.
RECOMMENDATION DETAILS:

SHORT TERM:

1. The Town and Board of Education should review existing software with Tyler software representatives for MUNIS and Infinite Visions to determine whether any functions in the two systems can be integrated and shared to reduce costs.

   - Both MUNIS and iVisions are owned by Tyler Technologies which offers an iVisions DataLink functionality that allows the school district to integrate data into MUNIS.
   - This interface allows the school district running Infinite Visions to generate payroll demographic and wage files to be imported into the town’s Tyler MUNIS payroll, thereby enabling the town to produce the live payroll, while enabling the school to maintain current personnel records in Infinite Visions.
   - This interface allows the school district running Infinite Visions to generate journal entry files to be imported into the Town’s Tyler MUNIS General Ledger, thereby keeping the two General Ledger’s in sync without duplication of entry.
   - This interface allows the school districts running Infinite Visions to export Accounts Payable invoices to their town’s MUNIS accounting system to be processed in an accounts payable batch through MUNIS. The school district processes invoices through Accounts Payable in Infinite Visions as usual and instead of printing checks, uses this interface to create a file in the prescribed format to send to the Town to be imported into MUNIS.
   - The benefit is that all financial information would be consolidated and would provide more comprehensive financial reporting.
   - Under this system it would also allow three year financial summaries to be prepared for both the town and school.
   - There is no cost to implement the DataLink functionality and the implementation process would take between six to eight weeks.

2. The Town and Board of Education should review existing software with Tyler software representatives for MUNIS and Infinite Visions to determine whether any functions in the two systems can be integrated and shared to reduce costs.

These functions include:

   - DocStar (BOE only)
   - Time Clock Plus (BOE only)
   - Applitracks (BOE only)
   - iVisions Web Portal Functionality (BOE only but not implemented)
   - iVisions bank reconciliation module (BOE only)
3. The Town and Board of Education should implement an on-line and fully integrated process for personnel management. An on-line system which would reduce a tremendous amount of staff time currently spent on manually entering accrual, time off and time entry information and employees would be able to access information online.

- iVisions Web Portal Functionality should be implemented by the BOE.
- The Town should evaluate the Human Resource Management it currently owns to determine full utilization of the system, and should consider the purchase of the MUNIS Employee Self-Service Module which would provide employees with the ability to enter and review personnel information. (The cost to implement the Employee Self-Service system includes a one-time fee of $8,999 and an annual recurring fee of $1,500).
- A shared on-line management of personnel information would allow Town and Board of Education employees to monitor and maintain personal and employment information.
- A shared system would also reduce the labor intensive process of inputting data and would allow employee transactions, on-line job postings and performance evaluations to be done electronically.

4. The Town and Board of Education staff should be encouraged to seek additional training on financial systems through user group meetings offered locally and through MUNIS and iVisions.

- Tyler Technologies offers user group forums for both systems and staff should be encouraged to reach out to peers from other communities using similar systems.

LONG TERM:

1. Evaluate the functionality of current financial software systems by conducting an investment assessment analysis through MUNIS and iVisions to identify similarities and dissimilarities in functionality and determine if one product could meet the needs of both the Town and the Board of Education;

- Tyler Technologies offers assistance and consulting advice on what functions are currently being used under each system.
- The cost for MUNIS is $7,500 (which can be credited towards implementation of recommendations); the cost for iVisions is $1,650.
- Once staff has transitioned to a shared department, staff can assess the combined finance functions, review the integrated financial system processes and determine the software functions necessary to implement those functions.
- The process would require staff to understand the process for each of the Town and Board of Education functions and the ability of each system to perform the process. Staff would then evaluate which system provides the best functionality.
• The cost to migrate completely to the MUNIS system or the iVisions system should be compared and evaluated.
• The timeframe to migrate from two systems to one internal system is estimated to take between 6 and 12 months once the system is selected.

2. Conduct a Request for Proposals (RFP) process to select a financial software system that meets the needs and functions of both the Town and Board of Education.

• First, Town and Board of Education staff document each function and process, and determine the requirements to implement the function.
• Second, develop a Request for Proposals to solicit bids for software systems.
• Third, create a committee to evaluate software system RFP responses.
• Fourth, select, implement and train a software system.

The timeframe to develop an RFP, select a vendor and implement a new financial software system is estimated to take 12 to 18 months.

SECTION II: STAFFING

A Shared Services Finance Department in Canton can be implemented to improve efficiencies, allow for cross training and backup and provide an opportunity for long term savings. Under the new structure, the Director of Finance Operations would be eliminated and job descriptions would be updated to reflect shared services job duties. Both the Town and Board of Education have dedicated long-term employees who could provide a stable transition to combining finance department functions.

Overview and Observations of Town and Board of Education Finance Staffing:

• Benefits administration functions for both the Town and Board of Education are decentralized.
• The Town administers hiring through the Chief Administrative Officer’s office. The executive assistant to the Chief Administrator’s Office is responsible for job postings, scheduling interviews and preparing new employee packets. Once the hiring forms are completed in the CAO’s office, they are then forwarded to the Finance Department. Leave requests are entered into MUNIS by the Department heads.
• The Board of Education administers hiring through the Superintendent’s office with the executive assistant to the Superintendent coordinating certified staff hiring and the executive assistant to the assistant superintendent coordinating non-certified staff. Each of the four school principals coordinates the hiring process with the Superintendent for their school. Once a position is filled, the hiring information is sent to the Payroll and Benefits Coordinator who is responsible for entering the new employee’s payroll information, and handling insurance inquiries regarding the defined benefit plan and defined contribution plan and Section 125 – HCR/DCR accounts.
• In some cases, the current workflow system has resulted in new employees starting employment before employee information is entered into the system, resulting in a delay in payment.
• Both the Town and Board of Education would reduce manual entry by implementing a time clock module that is integrated with the financial software systems.
• Both Town and Board of Education employees are unable to access personnel information online.
• Both Town and Board of Education manually enter hourly time accrual into the financial systems. (The Board of Education payroll and benefits coordinator manually enters time sheet information into the payroll system for about 90 hourly employees biweekly.)
• With additional software upgrades, current staff could accommodate bi-weekly payroll processing for a total of 60 FTE and 40 hourly town employees and 140 FTE and 90 hourly school employees.
• A Safety Committee is currently in place for the Town but does not include the Board of Education.
• The Town and Board of Education have separate purchasing policies and procedures.
• The Town accounts payable and payroll processes are manually labor intensive.
• Both the Town and Board of Education use the same banking institution but do not coordinate functions.

STAFFING RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. A Shared Services Finance Department should be created to jointly provide financial, payroll and accounts payable functions between the Town and Board of Education.
2. A Board of Selectmen subcommittee including representatives from the Board of Education and Board of Finance should be created to assist in implementing the shared services department.
3. Officials from other municipalities with combined Town-Board of Education Finance Departments should be invited to meet with town officials and staff to discuss the benefits of a shared department.
4. The Director of Finance Operations position should not be filled.
5. Two current Board of Education Financial Assistant positions should remain with the school department but positions should be reclassified. A Financial Analyst position should be reclassified to the position of Assistant to the Superintendent for Financial Affairs and a Financial Analyst position should be reclassified as the Accounts Payable/Payroll Specialist.
6. The Board of Education Payroll and Benefits Coordinator position should be reclassified as a shared Benefits Coordinator position. The position would be responsible for implementing an online system to allow employees to enter and access personnel information online; coordinating hiring, health and other employee benefits, and developing shared policies and procedures.
7. The Town should reassign existing staff to new functions within the shared Finance Department. This will allow for standard policies, procedures and protocols to be developed that will support and provide services to support the Town and Board of Education.
8. The Benefits Coordinator position should be located within the Shared Services Finance Department in Town Hall.

RECOMMENDATION DETAILS:

1. A Shared Services Finance Department should be created to jointly provide financial, payroll and accounts payable functions between the Town and Board of Education.
   - A Shared Services Town and Board of Education Finance Department would provide backup and cross training capabilities.
   - The implementation of the DataLink functionality will enable staff to pool resources, share software and bring enhanced services to employees, town officials and residents.
   - Implementation of an on-line web portal for employees would allow the reallocation of staff time from manual data entry to other functions.
   - A joint department would allow staff to begin the integration process of two separate finance systems and reduce costs.
   - The Town and Board of Education will need to evaluate job descriptions and coordinate similar work hours and holiday schedules.

2. A Board of Selectmen subcommittee including representatives from the Board of Education and Board of Finance should be created to assist in implementing the shared services department.
   - The Town has historically faced challenges in sharing staff functions between the Town and Board of Education. The implementation of a joint Finance department will require a strong commitment and detailed transition process to pursue implementation. The Town should consider forming a joint task force with representatives from the boards of selectmen, education and finance to assist in providing guidance and support during the transition phase.
     - A shared technology position was previously tried but was discontinued (the Town uses a 60 hour per month consultant; the board of education has a full-time technology director).
     - A shared director of facilities position was also attempted and discontinued.
     - A joint committee would assist in ensuring success in implementing this initiative.

3. Officials from other municipalities with combined Town-Board of Education Finance Departments should be invited to meet with town officials and staff to discuss the benefits of a shared department.
Many towns throughout Connecticut have successfully combined Town and Board of Education back office functions and have been operating one department for many years. These include Madison, Mansfield, Plainville Portland and Willington.

- Shared departments have staff are eager to share their experiences and recommendations.
- Canton town officials and staff would benefit from hearing about successful examples of collaboration.
- The Town of Pittsfield, Massachusetts uses a MUNIS-iVisions integrated system.

4. The Director of Finance Operations position should not be filled.

- A vacancy in the Director position presents a unique opportunity for the town and school finance departments to be consolidated. Both town and school leaders are committed to exploring a shared department that could provide improved services to residents and employees.
  - State statute allows the town to have one Director of Finance/Business Manager position for both the town and the school board.
  - Several Connecticut towns employ one Finance Officer/Treasurer who serves both the town and the school board.
  - The joint position would not affect Board of Education finance decisions which remain separate by law.
  - The joint position would need state certification as a Business Manager under Connecticut law.
  - With implementation of the iVisions Data Link system, the Town can assume the financial reporting duties.

5. Two current Board of Education Financial Assistant positions should remain with the school department but positions should be reclassified. A Financial Analyst position should be reclassified to the position of Assistant to the Superintendent for Financial Affairs and a Financial Analyst position should be reclassified as the Accounts Payable/Payroll Clerk.

a. The Assistant to the Superintendent for Financial Affairs position would report to the Superintendent and act as a liaison to the Finance Officer/Treasurer.

- Duties would include responsibilities for finance, budget, transportation, facilities supervision and food service program; financial processes; financial reporting for the Board of Education and Board of Finance reports; review and approval of weekly payroll; assisting the Director of Facilities; assisting the Director of Nutrition Services.
- The job description should include a preference for a requirement to obtain and maintain the Connecticut School Business Administrator certification (085).
b. The Accounts Payable/Payroll Clerk for the Board of Education would process accounts payable; prepare bank deposits and manage facility rentals. The position would coordinate payroll information with the Town.

6. The Board of Education Payroll and Benefits Coordinator position should be reclassified as a shared Benefits Coordinator position. This person would implement an on-line web portal for employees; coordinate hiring, health and other employee benefits; and implement shared policies and procedures.

- The Board of Education Payroll and Benefits Coordinator position could be converted to this position once payroll begins to be processed by the Town.
- The position would provide streamlined coordination of benefit programs and improved communication with employees.
- The position would allow coordinated administration of health, dental, life and long term disability plans; centralization of new employee hiring processes; notification of employee rights regarding COBRA, HIPAA; and processing pay rate changes.
- The position would coordinate health and wellness initiatives and risk management.
- The position would be responsible for evaluating and implementing an on-line portal for school employees and working with the Town to implement an on-line portal for Town employees.
- The position would assist in developing joint hiring procedures and a joint Safety Committee.
- The health insurance provider is the same for the Town and Board of Education which will facilitate joint administration.

7. The Town should reassign existing staff to new functions within the shared Finance Department. This will allow for standard policies, procedures and protocols to be developed that will support and provide services to support the Town and Board of Education.

- The Finance Officer/Treasurer job description should be revised to provide oversight for both town and school financials once software systems are integrated.
  - The position would report to the Chief Administrative Officer but have a dotted line of reporting to the Superintendent for financial operations.
  - The job description should include a requirement to obtain and maintain the Connecticut School Business Administrator certification (085).
  - The Finance Officer/Treasurer should develop standard operating procedures for financial reporting, budgeting and budget management
  - The Town Charter requires the Finance Officer/Treasurer position to be approved by the Board of Selectman. In the future, the charter language could be reviewed to include input from the Superintendent.

- The joint Accountant position would continue as the Town Accountant shared between the Town and Board of Education.
  - The job description for the position would be modified to reflect duties required after the software implementation.
This position would be responsible for maintaining all financial ledgers for the Town and Board of Education and could assist managing the transition process.

- Access to both systems would eliminate the need for the Accountant to physically move between two departments.
- The position should be responsible for assisting in the DataLink implementation because of the familiarity of both systems.
- The position should oversee accounts payable, purchasing and grants functions.
- The position would allow standard policies to be created for requisitions, purchase orders, vendor management and accounts payable.
- The position should explore opportunities for cooperative purchasing between both departments to reduce costs.

- The Town Accounts Payable coordinator position should be revised to include responsibilities for the Town and Board of Education.

- The Board of Education Accounts Payable/Payroll Clerk would remain responsible for processing Board of Education invoices but would send the information to the Town for checks to be processed.
- Duties in the current job description that have since been reassigned to the Accountant position should be removed.
- The position should develop standard procedures such as credit card policies to assist in ease of administration.

- Town and Board of Education payroll processes should be processed by the Town with existing staff. (Portland has one full-time position for 75 town employees and 200 board of education employees and Plainville also has one full-time position for payroll.)

- Both the Accounting Clerk and the Finance Clerk positions should be revised to assist with payroll processing for the Town and Board of Education.
- The Accounting Clerk position (.5 FTE) should be revised to reassign the bank reconciliation process to the Accountant position and free up staff time to assist with payroll. (The Accountant position already performs bank reconciliation for the Board of Education.)
- The process to approve employee payroll should be reviewed with Department Heads in order to streamline internal procedures.
- The Finance Clerk position would be responsible for Town and Board of Education payroll with the additional assistance.

8. The Benefits Coordinator position should be located within the Shared Services Finance Department in Town Hall.
• The Canton Town Hall houses both Town and Board of Education offices. There is available space on the third floor of Town Hall in the Finance Department to accommodate the Benefits Coordinator position.

SECTION III: CONCLUSION

A review of Town and Board of Education back office functions supports the recommendation to pursue efforts to pool resources and share services to reduce costs, reduce duplication and enhance needed services such as a consolidation of human resources functions.

In the short term, the integration of separate financial software systems will enable the Town and Board of Education the opportunity to share existing software; integrate software systems to increase online capabilities; eliminate time consuming manual entry of data; assess job functions as a way to eliminate duplication of tasks; develop back-up systems; and increase cross training opportunities.

The consolidation of departments will also allow staff time to be reassigned to important human resources and personnel functions which are currently decentralized throughout both the Town and Board of Education.

The Town and Board of Education will need to determine the process to pay shared staff. Municipalities with shared departments often split costs evenly or allocate costs based on the amount of work performed by staff.

In the long term, the Shared Services Finance Department provides an opportunity to streamline functions, evaluate financial software systems needed to implement functions, and provide better information to employees, officials and residents of the Town of Canton.

The financial impact to implement a Shared Services Finance Department includes:

• Director of Operations vacancy savings - $113,000 plus benefits
• Reclassification of existing positions – to be determined
• Integration of MUNIS and iVisions software – no cost
• Increased software training through user group meetings – no cost
• Implementation of on-line employee portal for Board of Education – no cost through existing iVisions software.
• Implementation of on-line employee portal – to be determined by MUNIS. (MUNIS Human Resources module should be evaluated for functionality while MUNIS Employee Self-Service Module is available for a one-time fee of $8,999 and annual $1,500 fee)
• Opportunities to share additional functions with existing software at no cost – to be determined
In closing, we would like to thank the Town of Canton and the Board of Education for allowing CRBC to be of assistance in fostering intra-town collaboration. Special thanks to town staff and officials who were helpful in every way in taking the time to provide information and answer questions throughout the process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Dept. Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Director of Finance Operations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>113,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>29,579</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>51,230</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable Specialist</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>25,334</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll and Benefits Coordinator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>60,111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operational Expenses: 50,000

Total: 4.25, 279,254

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>Salary</th>
<th>Dept. Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance Officer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>94,965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>59,158</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Assistant</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46,223</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance Clerk</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>27,213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Account Clerk</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>20,485</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Operational Expenses: 38,926

Total: 3.6, 248,044

Total for Combined Departments: 7.85, 527,298, 88,926

### Staffing Comparisons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town / Population</th>
<th>FTE</th>
<th>FTE per 5,000 Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canton 10,300</td>
<td>7.85</td>
<td>3.810679612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison 18,297</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.912881893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield 25,774</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.551951579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampton 12,912</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.936183395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haddam 9,147</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>2.459822893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windham 25,268</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.9893937</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Town/Population

- Windham 25,268
- East Haddam 9,147
- East Hampton 12,912
- Mansfield 25,774
- Madison 18,297
- Canton 10,300

### BUDGET COMPARISONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town / Population</th>
<th>Budget</th>
<th>$ per resident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canton 10,300</td>
<td>616,224</td>
<td>59.82757282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison 18,297</td>
<td>852,410</td>
<td>33.07247614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mansfield 25,774</td>
<td>466,414</td>
<td>36.12252169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Hampton 12,912</td>
<td>536,774</td>
<td>58.68306549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Haddam 9,147</td>
<td>446,055</td>
<td>21.24323255</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G
To: Susan Greco – BOE Business Manager

From: Jim Hayden – First Selectman

Re: Estimated FY17 ED-001 Information

Date: July 22, 2017

Estimated FY 2016-2017 Town Provided Services:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>ED001 Amount</th>
<th>Fringes</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Town Salary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Supervisor</td>
<td>$ 55,223</td>
<td>$5,522</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>$ 69,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Sup. Vehicle/Fuel</td>
<td>$ 4,747</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Treasurer</td>
<td>$ 2,306</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$ 4,612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>$ 5,722</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>$ 17,340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DPW/School &amp; Grounds</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawn Contract, Fertilizer</td>
<td>$ 18,763</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt, Equipment, fuel</td>
<td>$ 31,008</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Services</strong></td>
<td><strong>$217,769</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fringes</td>
<td><strong>$ 45,522</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$263,291</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>