

+



**SOLANO COUNTY GRAND JURY**  
2013-2014

**INTELLITIME IMPLEMENTATION**

# INTELLITIME IMPLEMENTATION

2013-2014 Solano County Grand Jury

## I. INTRODUCTION

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury was made aware of possible cost overrides and delays in the implementation of the Intellitime Systems Corporation (Intellitime) countywide timekeeping software. The Intellitime timekeeping program was originally acquired by the Sheriff's Office as a scheduling system for their Correctional Officers. Subsequently, Solano County determined that an automated timekeeping system was required to replace the paper system that they were previously utilizing. There were two systems operating within the County, both PeopleSoft and Intellitime that had a timekeeping module.

## II. METHODOLOGY

Reviewed:

- Court Order regarding the settlement between Solano County and the Sherriff's Custody Association Correctional Officer's Union.
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County of Solano and Unit #13 Correctional Officers represented by the Solano County Sheriff's Custody Association dated December 10, 2011 – September 28, 2015.
- Current Union contract between the Correctional Officer's union and Solano County.
- Request for Proposal (RFP) for Rules Based Scheduling Software (RFP D70-0314-08).
- Amendment 1 for RFP D70-0314-08.
- List of 16 companies to whom the RFP was sent.
- Cost Proposal Evaluation Format.
- Proposal Score Summary Matrix.
- Letter from a bidder that challenged the award to Intellitime.
- Response from the County to the challenging bidder.
- Agenda Submittal to the Solano County Board of Supervisors dated September 28, 2008 to *Approve a \$141,928 contract with Intellitime Systems Corporation for electronic scheduling and timekeeping software with a term of October 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009; authorize the Sheriff to approve amendments to the contract; and authorize the Sheriff to approve ongoing maintenance contracts.*

- Agenda Submittal to the Solano County Board of Supervisors dated December 14, 2010 to *Approve a contract with Intellitime Systems Corporation in the amount of \$368,640 for the period from January 3, 2011 through December 31, 2011 for a countywide automated time entry system; Authorize the County Administrator to execute the contract and any amendments to the contract, provided the cumulative total of the amendments does not exceed 10% (\$36,864) of the initial contract amount; and Authorize the County Administrator to execute ongoing maintenance contracts for the duration this software is in use by the County.*
- Agenda Submittal to the Solano County Board of Supervisors dated April 26, 2011 to *Approve an Appropriation Transfer Request of \$481,720 to transfer appropriations in Consulting Services to Intangible Assets in Progress to cover the cost of professional services, software licenses and project contingencies for the Intellitime implementation project.*
- Agenda Submittal to the Solano County Board of Supervisors dated January 15, 2013 to *Approve a contract change order with Intellitime Systems Corporation for \$93,360 through September 30, 2013 for a total contract amount not to exceed \$639,960, of which \$151,800 is for software licenses and maintenance and \$488,160 is for project management, professional support services and training; and Approve an Appropriation Transfer Request for \$93,360 from Consulting Services to Intangible Assets in Progress.*
- Agenda Submittal to the Solano County Board of Supervisors dated January 28, 2014 *Approve two contract change orders with Intellitime Systems Corporation totaling \$103,950 for a total contract amount not to exceed \$743,910, of which \$188,430 is for software licenses and maintenance and \$555,480 is for project management, professional support services and training, and extending the contact term thru September 30, 2014 (4/5 vote required); and Authorize the County Administrator to execute the change orders.*
- Tentative countywide departmental roll out schedule of Intellitime.
- Training Parallel and Go-Live Schedule.
- Active Training session.
- Intellitime Systems Corporation Solano 9/80 Quick Reference Guide.
- Various email correspondence regarding Intellitime.
- Presentation to the Board of Supervisors by the Auditor/Controller Department on February 7, 2012.

Interviewed Solano County:

- Sherriff's Department personnel.
- Health and Social Services personnel.
- Human Resources personnel.
- Auditor/Controller personnel.
- Information Technology personnel.

### III. STATEMENT OF FACTS

In 2008 the Sheriff's Correctional Officers staff determined that an automated scheduling system was required to replace their extremely time consuming hard copy paper system. RFP D70-0314-08 was developed and sent to 16 companies that were determined to have the wherewithal to develop a *Rules Based Scheduling* software that would satisfy the requirement.

After review and scoring of the responses to the RFP, the County decided on awarding the contract to Intellitime Systems Corporation.

On September 28, 2008 the Solano County Board of Supervisors approved a contract with Intellitime Systems Corporation to obtain the Intellitime software as an automated scheduling system for the Sheriff's Office at a cost of \$141,928.

A lawsuit brought against Solano County by Unit #13 Correctional Officers concerning inaccurate payroll accounting resulted in a settlement for a total cost to the County of \$1,425,000 (which included \$531,482.19 for attorneys' fees). To comply with the court order, an accurate timekeeping system was required.

The Auditor-Controller's Department then determined the County required an automated timekeeping system for all personnel throughout the County to ensure that the cause of the suit does not recur. This system would eliminate not only the cause of the lawsuit but would provide complete timekeeping automation for all County personnel.

It was discovered that the county had the licenses for two systems, Intellitime and the County's primary payroll software, PeopleSoft, which included timekeeping modules. Therefore, it was determined that an additional RFP procedure was not required. After reviewing both systems the County concluded that PeopleSoft, although it had a timekeeping component, was insufficient for the County's needs and that Intellitime could provide the necessary timekeeping automation.

On December 14, 2010, the Solano County Board of Supervisors approved a second contract with Intellitime Systems Corporation at a cost of \$368,640 to provide a countywide automated timekeeping system.

The system's initial full implementation date was targeted for September 30, 2011. This was not accomplished due to continuous delays as a result of:

- There are 23 bargaining units, with their respective MOU's (contractual agreements), that individually need to be accommodated.
- Programming rules had to be defined for each characteristic within the MOU's.
- The definition of each characteristic had to be interpreted by Human Resources as they were the negotiating agency with the individual bargaining units.

- Human Resources failed to provide the necessary personnel to accomplish this task within the established time frame. The Human Resources Department explanation for this was that due to the budget crisis drawdown they had to eliminate positions. However, they determined not to advertise and fill the position of Assistant Director of Human Resources, although the position had been funded.
- Until the rules were defined by Human Resources, to include variables such as differential time, vacation time, family leave and bereavement leave to name just a few, the system could not be fully implemented.

Countywide implementation is expected to be September 27, 2014.

Funding requests for the Intellitime system on separate Agenda Submittals to the Board of Supervisors for the Intellitime Systems Corporation countywide timekeeping system are:

• December 14, 2010	\$368,640	Contract with Intellitime Systems Corporation
• April 26, 2011	\$481,720*	Appropriation Transfer Request
• January 15, 2013	\$ 93,360*	Contract Change Order
• January 28, 2014	<u>\$103,950*</u>	Two Contract Change Orders
	Total	\$1,047,670

\* Represents additional funds that were subsequent to the originally scheduled implementation date of September 30, 2011. The above amounts do not include the original Sheriff's Office scheduling software request.

There are numerous ancillary staff time costs that are difficult to quantify, but amount to substantial costs to the County. The staff time expended by the Implementation Committee, for lack of a better definition, the time required to attempt the training of the entire County, operating parallel systems since the date of the initial contract, etc., are examples of these costs.

There is no designated training team for this system to train all of the various departments. The training is currently being conducted by a part-time "loaner" from the Sheriff's Office who is scheduled to go back to the Sheriff's Office on a full time basis. The Grand Jury was advised that the training of new employees would be handled by each department.

During the interviewing process with the various departments, the Grand Jury received several complaints. They included, but were not limited to:

- Insufficient training
- Difficult to enter time on the computer
- Required too much supervisory time to approve time sheets
- Resistance to change by employees and management
- Necessity of dual tracking of timesheets
- Delay in establishing the necessary requirements for alternate shifts
- Levels of computer literacy required
- Attempting to take on too many levels for approval
- Lack of awareness of an Intellitime information resource in each department

The 2013-2014 Grand Jury observed a training session in the Sheriff's Office for their Correctional Officers. At that time the Grand Jury was provided with a quick reference manual that instructed the individuals how to enter their time to include such variables as their differentials due to shift changes, etc. The training and manual appeared to be complete in each aspect of the department's requirements. The Grand Jury was advised that the training manuals provided to the employees are specific to each department.

During this training session it was pointed out exactly what had to be done in the event of errors in the time entry. Each error resulted in an on screen explanation of what the error was and how to correct it in the form of a drop down table that allowed the individual to select the proper entry.

During the interview with the staff of the Auditor-Controller's department, the Grand Jury requested to know what procedures were required of the individual departments to get time sheets approved. It was explained that each department head/supervisor should approve only those time sheets for his/her direct reports. Each supervisory/management level is to designate three individuals to approve the time sheets in the event of his/her absence. In the event that the approval authority is the only individual at his/her level, the approval of his/her time sheet goes to another department head.

There is a definite lack of commonality in the language definition and implementation pertaining to the same event, e.g. Family Leave, Jury Duty, Bereavement Leave, etc. throughout the various MOU's. Due to this, the MOU's are unnecessarily complex and have been subject to arbitrary misinterpretation on many levels. Employees, management and union personnel have spent a great deal of time attempting to clarify what is meant by each different section of the individual MOU's.

#### **IV. SUMMARY**

The Intellitime Systems Corporation, while providing the automated system that would satisfy the timekeeping requirements of the County, has escalated from the original amount of \$368,640 to its current level of \$1,047,670 due to the extended delays in implementation. The three year delay in implementation was primarily caused by the need to accommodate the differences in language in the large numbers of Memoranda of Understanding, and the need to develop the payroll rules for each. The delays were further exacerbated by the lack of the negotiating personnel in the Human Resources Department providing these rules in a timely manner.

As previously stated, there are numerous ancillary staff time costs that are difficult to quantify, but amount to substantial cost to the County. The staff time expended by the Implementation Committee, for lack of a better definition, the time required to attempt the training of the entire County, operating parallel systems since the date of the initial contract, etc., are examples of these costs.

## **V. FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

### **Finding 1**

The Intellitime timekeeping system cost increased from \$368,640 to \$1,047,670, an increase of 184%.

### **Recommendation 1**

Sufficient personnel from each department be assigned to the implementation process on a full time basis to ensure that no further delays occur.

### **Finding 2**

There are 23 bargaining units within the County that have separate Memorandum of Understanding negotiated, each with its own unique language that unnecessarily complicates payroll.

### **Recommendation 2**

Prior to and during negotiations with each bargaining unit, common definitions be determined by the Human Resources Department for each section in the Memorandum of Understanding that is common to all departments, e.g. what constitutes Family Leave, Jury Duty, Bereavement Leave, Sick Leave etc.

### **Finding 3**

There is no designated training component for this system to train all County employees.

### **Recommendation 3**

Establish schedules for the training of new County employees and refresher training for all current County employees.

### **Finding 4**

The Intellitime timekeeping system was secured without a Request for Proposal process.

### **Recommendation 4**

Prior to implementation of any new countywide projects, a Request for Proposal be referred out for a competitive bidding process.

### **Finding 5**

The Intellitime project was obtained without anticipating the different requirements of various departments in the large number of Memoranda of Understanding, all of which created unnecessary time delays and additional costs.

### **Recommendation 5**

Ensure that all departments are surveyed to determine their specific needs prior to implementing any future countywide projects

### **Finding 6**

Future program maintenance by Intellitime Systems Corporation is funded through September 30, 2014.

### **Recommendation 6**

Steps be taken to determine if the County can save future funding by revising the contract with Intellitime Systems Corporation that states, *execute ongoing maintenance contracts for the duration this software is in use by the County*, and assigning members of the Solano County Department of Information Technology to be responsible for future maintenance versus external contractors.

### **Finding 7**

Human Resources failed to provide the necessary personnel to accomplish the task of interpreting the definitions of the various rules within the established time frame.

### **Recommendation 7**

Provide the Intellitime Systems Maintenance Task Force a dedicated individual to interpret the rule changes as the result of future MOU negotiations.

### **COMMENTS**

To date, the implementation of the Intellitime project countywide timekeeping system, has been mismanaged.

### **REQUIRED RESPONSES**

Solano County Administrator's Office (Finding 1, 5, and 6)  
Solano County Auditor/Controller Office (Finding 3, 4, and 5)  
Solano County Human Resources Department (Finding 2, 5 and 7)  
Solano County Department of Information Technology (Finding 5 and 6)

**COURTESY COPIES**

Clerk, Solano County Board of Supervisors  
Solano County Sheriff's Office