



*Research to drive informed decisions.
Expertise to create effective solutions.*

FEASIBILITY OF CREATING A CENTRAL BUSINESS OFFICE IN THE SCHUYLER-CHEMUNG- TIOGA BOCES REGION

Prepared for:
Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga BOCES

Donald E. Pryor
Charles Zettek Jr.
Project Directors

One South Washington Street
Suite 400
Rochester, NY 14614
Phone: (585) 325-6360
Fax: (585) 325-2612

100 State Street
Suite 930
Albany, NY 12207
Phone: (518) 432-9428
Fax: (518) 432-9489

www.cgr.org

January, 2005

© Copyright CGR Inc. 2005 All Rights Reserved

FEASIBILITY OF CREATING A CENTRAL BUSINESS OFFICE IN THE SCHUYLER-CHEMUNG-TIOGA BOCES REGION

January, 2005

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As costs of operating school districts continue to increase, and districts face increasing demands for more reports and accountability against new federal and state standards, it becomes increasingly incumbent on districts to operate as efficiently as possible, and to find ways to reduce costs to local taxpayers.

In this context, the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga (S-C-T) BOCES and its seven component districts have engaged in a joint project to explore the feasibility of achieving efficiencies and reduced local costs in the provision of business office functions across districts, while at the same time increasing the overall effectiveness, consistency and quality of these services. The BOCES and its component districts engaged CGR (Center for Governmental Research Inc.) to conduct an assessment of current business services and to determine whether they could be provided more efficiently and cost effectively in the short run and in future years.

Based on detailed analyses of the current services provided by the existing district business offices, and discussions with the Superintendents and head business officials of the seven districts, the study concluded:

There is clear justification for the creation of a Central Business Office within the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga BOCES district, and CGR strongly recommends its creation. It also recommends that all six districts which have expressed potential interest in participation should formally agree to do so, as each would experience financial benefits from being part of the

CBO, as well as enhanced services. Given its existing small business office staff, it makes sense for Waverly to opt out of participation at this point, but it should consider perhaps joining on a partial basis, for selected services, at some point in the future.

The CBO should offer the following core services to all member districts: purchasing, payroll, accounts payable, benefits, with clerical support and a full-time Director/Coordinator to provide oversight business management/administration/supervision. In addition to the Coordinator, the CBO would be staffed by 16.5 staff members with experience and skills in the core functional areas, and who would be transferred from the six participating districts. Once the CBO is fully implemented, districts can expect to experience the following direct benefits:

- ❖ Cumulative annual savings across all districts, once BOCES aid is factored in, of more than \$434,000 per year, a savings of at least 55% compared with current costs of the same staff housed in individual district business offices. Each district would experience net savings each year.
- ❖ Expanded internal controls and safeguards to protect against the potential for accounting problems, fraud and fiscal abuses such as those experienced in school districts in other parts of the state.
- ❖ Improved management and integrity of fiscal information presented to districts and prepared by an entity with a degree of independence from each district.
- ❖ Expanded access to higher levels of financial skills, business management oversight, and strategic and budget planning, especially for smaller districts.
- ❖ Greater efficiencies in the provision and staffing of services, thereby helping to free up the time of remaining staff in some districts to undertake other required tasks.

An implementation steering committee should be established as soon as possible to oversee the process of reviewing the recommendations in the report and developing specific implementation plans and timelines. It is recommended that the CBO be ready to open for business July 1, 2005.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	i
Table of Contents	iii
Acknowledgments	v
Staff Team.....	v
1. Background and Context	1
Hypothesis: Regional Solution May Be Needed	1
Issues Potentially Addressed by a CBO	2
Methodology	3
2. Findings: Current Configuration of Business Office Functions	6
Size of Current Business Office Staffs	6
Primary Time-Consuming Business Office Functions	8
3. Findings: Support for Potential Establishment of a CBO	10
Potential Benefits of a CBO.....	10
Support for Inclusion of Selected Business Office Functions	11
Initial Survey Support	12
Clarification and Confirmation of CBO and Functional Area Support	13
4. Creation of Proposed Model	15
Criteria and Assumptions for Model Building	15
Proposed Full-Staff Model.....	17
Staff Size Compared to Broome-Tioga CBO	19
Limited Disruption Likely for Non-CBO Business Functions Within Home Districts .	19
Critical Mass of Staff Available to Perform Core CBO Functions	20
Purchasing	20
Payroll	21
Accounts Payable	21
Secretarial/Clerical	22
Benefits	22
5. Implications of the Proposed Model	24
Calculating Costs and Savings.....	24
Cost-Benefit Implications	25

Added First-Year Costs	27
Annual Savings to Each District	28
Staffing Implications	28
Implications by District	29
Elmira	29
Elmira Heights	30
Horseheads	30
Odessa-Montour.....	30
Spencer-Van Etten	31
Watkins Glen	32
6. Conclusions and Recommendations	33
Suggested Implementation Timeline	34
Appendices.....	35

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CGR gratefully acknowledges the leadership of the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga BOCES and its component districts for undertaking this study. Despite different expectations about the project and its potential outcomes, the leadership of the BOCES and of each of the seven districts agreed to the study, and to “let the chips fall where they may,” despite the uncertainties of how the study might affect each district.

We are especially grateful for the leadership and guidance throughout the project of BOCES Superintendent Anthony Micha. He consistently provided helpful insights and support, along with constructive feedback, but without attempting to interfere with the objectivity of the background research and ultimate conclusions. Similarly, we received consistent cooperation, provision of requested information, valuable insights and suggestions, and feedback in response to draft materials from the district superintendents, who each expressed their understandable concerns about their own districts, but who each also consistently looked beyond parochial interests to determine what was best for the region as a whole.

We also appreciate the ideas and cooperation of the head business officials of each district, and the thoughtful survey responses provided by all staff members of the existing district business offices. Without their cooperation, the findings and conclusions of this report would not have been possible.

Finally, CGR is grateful for the extensive help we received from the following key BOCES leadership staff: Horst Graefe, Vince Moschetti, and Gayle Pritchard. Their assistance, and persistence, were invaluable in the determination of the costs and savings implications of the proposed CBO model.

Staff Team

As project co-directors, we gratefully express our appreciation for the contributions throughout this project of Kate McCloskey, whose help in formatting and analyzing data were invaluable.

1. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT

As costs of operating school districts continue to increase, and districts face increasing demands for more reports and accountability against new federal and state standards, it becomes increasingly incumbent on districts to operate as efficiently as possible, and to find ways to reduce costs to local taxpayers.

In this context, the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga (S-C-T) BOCES and its seven component districts have engaged in a joint project to explore the feasibility of achieving efficiencies and reduced local costs in the provision of business office functions across districts, while at the same time increasing the overall effectiveness, consistency and quality of these services. The BOCES and its component districts engaged CGR (Center for Governmental Research Inc.) to conduct an assessment of current business services and to determine whether they could be provided more efficiently and cost effectively in the short run and in future years.

The seven districts making up the S-C-T BOCES are widely diverse in size and rural-suburban-urban composition. They include two primarily rural/village-oriented districts in Schuyler County: Watkins Glen and Odessa-Montour; three primarily urban-suburban districts in Chemung County: Elmira City, Elmira Heights and Horseheads; and two primarily rural districts in Tioga County: Spencer-Van Etten and Waverly. They range in size from about 850 students and a budget of about \$11.3 million to an enrollment of about 7,100 students and a budget of about \$88.5 million. The number of staff involved in carrying out business office functions ranges from as few as three in one district to as many as 16, with a median of 4.75 full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions, and five of the seven districts having five or fewer FTEs engaged in business office tasks.

Hypothesis: Regional Solution May Be Needed

Districts with relatively small business office staffs typically are limited in the extent to which they can reduce costs of providing business functions, since the number of existing staff is typically small to begin with, and many are already responsible for performing multiple tasks. Some districts are concerned that some important tasks are already receiving insufficient attention, and

that further staff cuts would exacerbate those concerns. Certain core business office functions and paperwork/reporting requirements need to be carried out in each school district, regardless of district size, so districts, particularly the smaller ones, tend to have relatively little flexibility in reducing business office staff below the numbers of core positions that currently exist.

The study hypothesis is that a central business office is the most efficient, cost effective approach to providing selected required business office functions.

Rather than pursuing further staff reductions or efficiencies within individual districts, the S-C-T BOCES and its seven component districts have chosen to explore the potential of a regional, cross-district solution. The hypothesis is that selected business functions that are required and must be conducted on behalf of all districts can be provided more efficiently, more consistently, and ultimately with fewer staff, at less costs to each district and collectively across the region, by providing them in a regional, central business office (CBO). This report summarizes the results of the test of that hypothesis.

Issues Potentially Addressed by a CBO

In addition to cost and efficiency considerations, district officials within the region cited a number of other factors that contributed to their desire to undertake this study, and that they hope would be at least partially addressed by a potential CBO. Those issues include, in no particular order:

- ❖ There have been several recent personnel changes in business offices throughout several of the region's districts, with other changes anticipated in the near future. Thus the timing was viewed as being right for undertaking an objective assessment of possible options that might benefit the region and its individual districts in the future.
- ❖ Some districts recognized that their Superintendents and school boards have not always placed primary emphasis on strategic approaches to budgeting and long-range financial planning, and/or some districts have not had the resources to hire a high-level administrator with financial planning skills and experience. A CBO is seen by some as providing an opportunity to offer improved fiscal management and financial planning for districts in the future.
- ❖ With the recent revelation of accounting scandals in two Long Island school districts, some local school district officials see the potential value of having in place a more consistent approach to

accounting practices, with oversight and an accountability process offered at “arms length” from individual districts. Some believe that such an approach would help ensure that best practices and effective control and monitoring mechanisms are in place, thereby helping protect taxpayers against financial problems occurring within individual districts.

- ❖ Some districts have little critical mass in their business office functions, and little backup available in particular skills areas. A CBO is viewed by some as an opportunity to provide better sharing of expertise and cross-training across staff, and to ensure that business functions are provided at consistently high levels of skills, with less potential for services “falling through the cracks” or being provided in an inferior manner.

Methodology

To address these issues and test the hypothesis of whether a Central Business Office would be feasible and able to provide business functions more efficiently, consistently and at less costs to districts than now occurs in the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga region, CGR carried out the following tasks, beginning in mid-August:

- ❖ Initial meetings with the BOCES Superintendent and key staff, and with the Superintendent and head business official of each district. These meetings were designed to determine their expectations of the project; any concerns they may have had about the project; an assessment of current business office operations and staffing in each district; reactions to the possibility of a central business office; functions they would or would not like to see included within a potential CBO; functions and positions they would or would not like to see shifted from their district to a CBO; potential implications of any such shifts for their district; and potential implementation issues that may need to be addressed if a CBO were to be established.
- ❖ Followup survey of Superintendents and head business officials of each district. That survey, a copy of which is included in the Appendix of this report, asked in greater detail which of a series of specific functions the respondents felt should be included in a possible CBO, and which of the functions they would want to retain within their district, either completely or on a partial, shared basis with a CBO. Analysis of the results from that survey enabled us to determine how consistently districts (and even different

respondents within the same district) felt about the CBO and what functions should be considered for inclusion if a CBO were to be established.

- ❖ Followup Business Office Staff Survey (copy included in the Appendix). This survey was administered to all staff members who were identified by the Superintendent and head business office official in each district as providing at least some business office functions as part of their responsibilities. A total of 47 staff members were identified across the seven districts as spending all or part of their time carrying out functions considered to be a part of their district's business office operations. CGR received completed surveys from each of those individuals. The surveys provided an indication of how many staff in each district, and throughout the region, are involved in the provision of specific business functions, and how much time is spent by each person, and collectively, in each function. Analysis of the survey results, supplemented by occasional followup discussions to clarify issues raised by selected surveys, was instrumental in determining the nature and infrastructure of the current provision of business office functions across the seven districts. Survey findings were also instrumental in helping to shape the configuration of potential regional CBO models for the future.
- ❖ Presentation of initial findings and preliminary options. Midway through the project, CGR met with the BOCES Superintendent and key staff, and with the Superintendents of the seven component districts, to present initial findings and a preliminary mockup of what a CBO model might look like, both in terms of potential functions and potential staff makeup, including shifts of staff from each district to the CBO. This meeting, along with followup information provided by district Superintendents, provided support for the initial findings and the preliminary concept and outline of a model CBO, and provided useful specific feedback which helped guide the remainder of the project, including fleshing out and costing of the model.
- ❖ Determination of costs and benefits. Based on input from the Superintendents, a potential CBO staffing model was constructed to provide specific business office functions. The staffing implications and potential costs and benefits for each district, and for the region as a whole, were calculated and analyzed, based on

certain sets of assumptions and cost information provided by the individual districts and by BOCES.

- ❖ Completion and presentation of final report. This report, with its overview of findings, conclusions and recommendations, was drafted for review and discussion with the Superintendents. Feedback from the Superintendents was subsequently incorporated into this final report.

2. FINDINGS: CURRENT CONFIGURATION OF BUSINESS OFFICE FUNCTIONS

According to the surveys completed by staff in each district, a total of about 45 full-time-equivalent (FTE) staff members in the seven districts (representing a total of 47 separate individuals) now spend at least some portion of their time carrying out a wide range of functions considered to be related to their district's business office operations. An additional position is expected to be added as the Horseheads district fills a position which was vacant at the time of the survey. As indicated in Table 1 on the next page, the number of staff involved in business office operations ranges from as few as three in the Waverly district to 16 in the Elmira City district.

Size of Current Business Office Staffs

Not surprisingly, the two largest districts in the region have the largest number of business office staff. As the size of the districts increases beyond a certain point, the number of business office support staff also increase to meet the needs associated with increased staff, increased numbers of facilities, increased numbers of purchases, etc. Nonetheless, there appears to be a core number of business office staff needed to carry out basic functions, regardless of the size of the district.

The four districts with the smallest enrollments each have between four and five FTE positions within their business offices (including a few staff who spend some portion of their time providing non-business office functions). The next largest district, Waverly, provides its business support services with a core staff of only three positions. Since CGR was not asked to conduct an evaluation of the quality or effectiveness with which the tasks are carried out within the various districts, it is not possible to determine (1) whether the Waverly staff are simply extremely efficient in how they carry out their tasks, or (2) whether some tasks may receive less attention than in other districts and/or be carried out by staff outside the business office (e.g., note that negligible or no time was recorded by staff on important tasks such as purchasing, business management and supervision, strategic fiscal planning, etc.), or (3) some combination of both.

Table 1

Summary of FTEs by District by Functional Area

	Elmira CSD	Elmira Heights	Horseheads	Odessa-Montour	Spencer-Van Etten	Watkins Glen CSD	Waverly	Total Districts
Payroll	3.150	0.410	1.450	0.450	0.600	0.910	0.650	7.620
Purchasing	2.065	0.400	0.630	0.650	0.150	0.320	0.070	4.285
General Accounting	1.125	0.645	0.300	0.200	0.750	0.150	0.000	3.170
Accounts Payable	2.225	0.400	1.180	0.400	0.250	0.470	0.570	5.495
Accounts Receivable	0.105	0.000	0.220	0.050	0.080	0.170	0.100	0.725
Cash Management	0.210	0.305	0.100	0.050	0.220	0.100	0.050	1.035
Benefits	0.350	0.110	1.380	0.400	0.120	0.010	0.100	2.470
Budget Development	0.900	0.160	0.350	0.100	0.180	0.100	0.250	2.040
Budget Monitoring	0.070	0.100	0.300	0.100	0.170	0.100	0.300	1.140
Billing	0.005	0.010	0.050	0.000	0.050	0.120	0.030	0.265
Insurance	0.580	0.070	0.100	0.000	0.100	0.030	0.000	0.880
Capital Projects	0.650	0.020	0.150	0.050	0.150	0.050	0.000	1.070
Internal Claims	0.003	0.050	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.053
Tax Collection	0.151	0.110	0.520	0.050	0.100	0.170	0.160	1.261
Treasurer	0.650	0.010	0.100	0.000	0.150	0.100	0.020	1.030
State Reports	0.380	0.128	0.245	0.100	0.150	0.240	0.150	1.393
Federal Reports	0.110	0.075	0.085	0.100	0.250	0.040	0.010	0.670
Business management/admin/super.	0.670	0.500	0.000	0.100	0.140	0.100	0.000	1.510
Strategic fiscal planning	0.020	0.050	0.000	0.050	0.000	0.050	0.000	0.170
Records management	0.125	0.110	0.000	0.050	0.100	0.020	0.010	0.415
Inventory/fixed assets	0.101	0.000	0.100	0.025	0.010	0.000	0.010	0.246
Personnel/HR	0.130	0.080	0.000	0.300	0.170	0.000	0.000	0.680
Contract Administration	0.020	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.040
Secretarial/clerical	1.554	0.875	0.290	0.300	0.100	0.200	0.000	3.319
Census maintenance	0.001	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.200	0.060	0.271
Grant-writing	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.010	0.011
School lunch program	0.110	0.000	0.000	0.050	0.070	0.020	0.010	0.260
Transportation	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.050	0.000	0.020	0.010	0.090
Operations & maintenance	0.010	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.030
Buildings & grounds	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.020	0.000	0.020
Internal Audit	0.051	0.050	0.050	0.075	0.060	0.040	0.000	0.326
Other (Specify)	0.200	0.063	0.400	0.000	0.130	0.200	0.050	1.043
Other (Specify)	0.020	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.150	0.000	0.000	0.170
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.200	0.000	0.000	0.800	0.600	0.000	0.320	1.920
Totals FTE	16.0	4.75	8	4.5	5	4.04	3.0	45.29
Approx. District Enrollment	7100	1100	4250	850	1150	1350	1800	17600

It is difficult for a school district to conduct its business office functions with fewer than three to five staff.

Primary Time-Consuming Business Office Functions

Five core tasks account for 53% of the total time spent by business office staff.

Whatever the interpretation, it seems reasonable to conclude from the data on the five smallest districts in the region (with enrollments between about 850 and 1,800) that it would be very difficult for any district, no matter how efficiently it carries out its core business support functions, to operate a business office with fewer than three to five staff, given core business functions and the paperwork and reporting requirements that are mandated regardless of a district's size.

The staff in business offices within the seven districts spend more than 95% of their time on the specific tasks listed in the staff survey under business support functions/tasks. That is, out of the 45.29 FTE business office positions, the time of the equivalent of only 1.92 of those FTE positions (4.2%) is spent on "non-business office functions" (see last line of the functions listed in Table 1). Thus, as discussed in more detail in Chapter 5, staff who might in the future be shifted from a district to a central business office would, for the most part, not leave behind significant gaps in important functions outside the business office that other remaining staff would need to fill.

Out of the 31 specific possible business office functions/tasks listed in the survey, five core tasks each currently absorb the time of three or more FTE positions across the seven districts (the equivalent of an average of at least two person days per week per district). Together, these five tasks account for 53% of the total 45.29 FTE business office staff time:

- Payroll – 7.62 FTE positions across the seven districts (an average of more than one full-time person per district);
- Accounts payable – 5.495 FTE positions (the equivalent of spending about four person days per week per district);
- Purchasing – 4.335 FTE positions (about three days per week per district);
- Secretarial/clerical support – 3.319 FTE positions (about 2.5 person days per week per district);
- General accounting – 3.17 FTE positions (just over two days per week per district).

On three additional functions, business office staff across the districts currently spend a cumulative total of between 1.5 and 2.5 FTE time (the equivalent of between one and 1.5 person days per week per district). With these included, the eight most time-consuming business functions together account for about two-thirds of the total time spent by business office staff. The three functions absorbing between 1.5 and 2.5 FTE time are:

- Benefits – 2.47 FTE positions across the seven districts;
- Budget development – 2.04 FTE positions;
- Business management/administration/supervision – 1.51 FTE positions.

The above eight primary functions are discussed in more detail in subsequent chapters concerning potential CBO models. The various other business office functions were generally viewed as not having sufficient critical mass and/or not consuming sufficient time to justify incorporating into a central office, at least initially. In 17 of the 31 listed business office functions, less than the equivalent of one FTE was devoted to the task across all seven districts (or about a half day a week or less per week per district).

As seen in Table 1, the bulk of the staff time spent on most of the business functions is spent by staff in the Elmira City and Horseheads districts (about 53% of the overall FTEs across all seven districts involve staff from the two largest districts). And in five of the eight major functions, more than 60% of the FTE time spent across the region is spent by staff in those two districts.

Fortunately for model development purposes, most of the major time-consuming functions are carried out entirely, or in large part, by one or two staff members in each district. That is, typically the conduct of specific tasks is concentrated within a small number of staff, rather than being spread among several staff in small quantities of time. As will be seen in Chapter 4, this has significant implications for the determination of the most appropriate staff members to be considered for possible redeployment from districts to the potential CBO. Tables in the Appendix indicate the breakdown of tasks by individual staff position within each district.

3. FINDINGS: SUPPORT FOR POTENTIAL ESTABLISHMENT OF A CBO

In our interviews and surveys, all seven districts have indicated at least some support for the creation of a central business office. Waverly has indicated mixed support for the idea, with acceptance of the concept, but reluctance to become a formal part of such an office, at least initially.

Potential Benefits of a CBO

During CGR's research for this project and our discussions with district officials, the following were the primary benefits most often associated with the potential creation of a central business office:

- ❖ Financial benefits to the districts, hopefully in the form of actual reductions in total costs, at least in the long run, but at the minimum in the form of reduced net costs to districts due to savings resulting from eligibility for BOCES aid.
- ❖ Reductions in staff in the districts' tables of organization in the short run, as positions are shifted to the CBO. In the long run, it is assumed that additional reductions may be possible in the number of CBO staff needed, as efficiencies become more apparent and fewer staff are needed in future years, at further reduction in costs. The assumption is that any future reductions in staff would occur through attrition, with no current staff losing jobs as a result of the possible creation of a CBO. It is also possible that over time additional business office functions could subsequently be integrated within a CBO, with the resulting potential for additional future shifts of selected staff from district business offices to the central office.
- ❖ Potential efficiencies resulting from such factors as:
 - the concentration of staff and high-level skills in functional areas;
 - cross-training of staff, with resulting greater consistency of professional services;
 - expanded professional development through reduced isolation of staff and the resulting backup coverage available; and

A CBO is viewed as offering a number of potential benefits to individual districts and the region as a whole, including reduced net costs, increased efficiencies, more consistent approaches, and greater accountability and internal controls.

- identification of opportunities to leverage common purchases and practices.
- ❖ Improved and more consistent procedures and internal controls, to help guard against the potential for the kinds of accounting scandals that have occurred recently in two Long Island school districts.
- ❖ Access to higher levels of financial skills, business management oversight, and strategic fiscal and budget planning, particularly for some of the smaller districts.
- ❖ Better management of information, with more complete and consistent information available to school boards and Superintendents.

Some concerns have been raised about the potential under a CBO for reduced access within a district to business office persons with knowledge of issues and the ability to respond immediately to questions and concerns as they are raised. However, experience in the neighboring Broome-Tioga CBO suggests that this issue can be resolved in a combination of ways, through such things as: frequent interaction and on-site visits to each district by CBO representatives familiar with and assigned to particular districts, easy phone and email access, and district business office staff who remain on-site and available to provide backup support and information as needed to employees with questions or concerns.

Districts retain ultimate control over fiscal policy decisions and key business functions, and can assure appropriate access to services and staff, even with an off-site CBO in place.

Other concerns have been raised concerning the potential for districts to lose control of particular functions, but the experience in the Broome-Tioga CBO suggests that districts retain the ultimate control over what happens, as they can opt out of the CBO at any time, and/or request that their needs be addressed in certain ways. Districts also retain the ultimate control over decisions affecting the financial and budgetary oversight and management of district affairs.

Support for Inclusion of Selected Business Office Functions

Table 2 on the next page outlines the results of a survey of Superintendents and head business officials of each district. The table indicates, for each of the eight business office functions/tasks involving at least 1.5 FTE staff across the seven districts, how many districts expressed initial interest in including the function in a possible CBO, at least in part.

Table 2

S-C-T Functional Areas with High Levels of Possible CBO Interest + Significant Current FTE Involvement *

Districts	4 + Districts Expressed Initial Interest						< 4 Districts Expressed Initial Interest	
	Purchasing	Payroll	Accounts Payable	Benefits	Business Mgmt	Secretarial/Clerical	General Accounting	Budget Development
Elmira	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	N/A	☑	☑
Elmira Heights	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	N/A	☑	☑
Watkins Glen	☑	☑	☑	☑	☑	N/A	☒	☒
Odessa-Montour	☑	☒	☑	☑	☑	N/A	☒	☒
Spencer-Van Etten	☑	☑	☑	☒	☑	N/A	☑	☑
Waverly	➔	➔	☒	☑	☒	N/A	☒	☒
Horseheads	☑	☒	☒	☒	☒	N/A	☒	☒

KEY	
☑	District initially indicated potential interest in including that function in CBO, at least in part.
➔	District provided two survey responses, with one person saying yes and the other no to including the function in CBO.
☒	District initially indicated it does not want that function in CBO, at least at this point.
N/A	Districts were not asked about possible interest in including clerical support function in CBO, but devoted significant clerical support to business functions.

* NOTE: Significant Involvement = at least 1.5 cumulative FTEs devoted to the function across the seven S-C-T districts.

Initial Survey Support

As indicated in the table, all districts indicated potential interest in including the Purchasing function within a potential central business office (including Waverly, where the two surveys returned from the district expressed opposing views on the subject). Different combinations of five districts expressed potential interest in including the following functions: Accounts Payable, Benefits, and Business Management/Administration/Supervision. Either four or five districts were interested in including Payroll (the Waverly surveys were also divided on this issue).

Only three of the seven districts expressed possible interest in including General Accounting tasks and Budget Development

Clarification and Confirmation of CBO and Functional Area Support

The S-C-T districts have expressed general support for the creation of a CBO, subject to details being beneficial to each district, with inclusion of purchasing, payroll, accounts payable, benefits, management and supervision, and clerical support functions.

among the potential functions to be carried out by a CBO. The initial survey had not included a question about the possible inclusion of a secretarial/clerical function within the CBO.

Using the results of the separate surveys as summarized in Tables 1 and 2, CGR met with the Superintendents from BOCES and the seven districts in late October to discuss their reactions to the findings and to the potential outline of what a CBO might look like. The following decisions and directions resulted from that discussion:

- ❖ There was a group consensus that the CBO model should continue to be pursued.
- ❖ The model should initially be based on provision of a relatively small number of core functions. It was agreed that the following functions should be included in any initial model to be presented for further consideration: purchasing, payroll, accounts payable, and benefits. It was also agreed that secretarial/clerical support would also be needed, and that an oversight business management/administration/supervision component was also important to the future success of such a model.
- ❖ Waverly expressed support for the model, but indicated that it was not likely to participate directly in its operations, at least initially. With only three staff currently involved in provision of business office functions, Waverly expressed reservations about transferring any of those staff to a potential CBO, due to concerns about disrupting the small critical mass of staff with their overlapping and interrelated responsibilities within the district.
- ❖ Horseheads, which in the survey expressed doubts about the inclusion of functional areas other than purchasing, indicated that, based on the outline of a potential model being presented and discussed at the meeting, it was supportive of the concept and of the inclusion of the functions noted above. Similarly, Odessa-Montour and Spencer-Van Etten, which had each expressed initial reservations about inclusion of separate core functions, agreed that the core model outline being presented made sense, and that they were comfortable proceeding with inclusion of all of the core functions noted above.

- ❖ Obviously, no districts were willing to give their *ultimate* approval in the October meeting to any CBO model, pending approval of their respective boards once the details and implications for each district are spelled out. But the general consensus from the meeting was that if a final model could be developed which is able to effectively incorporate the above components, in a way that results in savings to each district and the ability of all districts to take advantage of all core services, the districts would be likely to look favorably on creation of a CBO and—with the previously-noted exception of Waverly—their active participation in it, including transfer of selected business office staff from the districts to make up the core of the new central office staff.
- ❖ A very preliminary staffing model, including specific positions for consideration for transfer to a new CBO, was presented for discussion at the October meeting of the Superintendents. The preliminary staffing model was generally viewed as being on target, subject to subsequent review and comment by each district. Subsequent discussions between CGR and district officials confirmed most of the preliminary thinking about staffing transfers to the CBO, but also led to suggestions by two or three districts for substitutions and proposed additional positions for inclusion in the CBO staffing model. Those suggestions have been incorporated into the model presented in the next chapter.

4. CREATION OF PROPOSED MODEL

Based on the data and discussions summarized in Chapters 2 and 3, CGR proceeded to outline a potential model that could be used to implement a central business office. The model incorporates various assumptions about staffing, management/supervision oversight, and services to be performed for member districts.

Criteria and Assumptions for Model Building

With input from BOCES and school district officials, CGR developed and used the following assumptions and criteria in the process of creating a potential CBO model for consideration by the S-C-T BOCES and its component districts. Some of the criteria and assumptions have been previously referenced in earlier chapters, but they are summarized below, along with some additional factors not previously discussed.

- ❖ Only a core set of business office functions will be included in any initial CBO model. Based on our initial analyses and input from district Superintendents, only functions currently staffed by at least 1.5 FTE positions across the seven districts were considered for inclusion. This emphasis on a relatively small set of core services should help ensure that the central office, should it be created, will not overreach or take on more than it can reasonably handle initially. Starting with a relatively compact set of services should also help increase the odds of being successful. If success is documented through the initial implementation of core services, the potential exists to expand to additional services and functions in the future, should the demand exist at that time. Accordingly, the districts have agreed to start with the following core functions as part of the CBO: purchasing, payroll, accounts payable, and benefits, along with secretarial/clerical support.
- ❖ It has also been agreed that any model must have strong leadership, as represented by a full-time Director/Coordinator responsible for business management/administration/supervision. As opposed to all other positions in a new CBO—which we anticipate would initially be staffed solely through persons responsible for certain functions being transferred from existing district business offices—this Director/Coordinator would be a newly-created position. The position could ultimately be filled by a person currently serving in one of the seven districts, or it could

be filled by an outside applicant, but either way, the *position* would be a new one, and not simply a transfer of a position from a district to the CBO.

- ❖ The Director/Coordinator should also have the capability of providing enhanced strategic fiscal and budget planning and consultation to individual districts, particularly some of the smaller ones, upon request.
- ❖ For the most part, the functions selected, and the staff selected to fill the positions in a new CBO, are ones in which a relatively small number of staff are currently focused in their respective districts mostly on those functions. That is, responsibilities for the core functions are typically concentrated within a few staff, rather than being split into small pieces of the functions conducted by a wide range of different people.
- ❖ There must currently be a “critical mass” of employees with the right combination of skills and experience in the selected functional areas to be able to achieve economies of scale and justify creating a separate functioning CBO unit as a BOCES service.
- ❖ No one would lose his or her job as a result of creating a CBO. Any positions created within the CBO, other than the Director/Coordinator, would be staffed through transfers of employees currently carrying out similar functions within existing district business offices. Over time, efficiencies created within the CBO might lead to an ability to ultimately function with fewer staff than the number of positions created initially, thereby potentially resulting in greater longer-term cost reductions. Any such future reductions in CBO positions would be implemented through attrition.
- ❖ In developing a possible CBO staffing model, it is important to consider the existing patterns of responsibilities and workloads within districts of those to be transferred to a CBO (including their current responsibilities for core potential CBO functions as well as any other responsibilities they might have)—making sure that any transfers will leave behind a critical mass of employees needed to perform remaining functions and minimize disruptions to other services within the home districts.

- ❖ Any model must show cost savings for the affected districts (addressed in Chapter 5).

Given those criteria and assumptions, a basic CBO model has been developed for consideration by the S-C-T BOCES and its component districts. The model was developed consistent with the criteria and assumptions as outlined. It would include six of the seven S-C-T districts, with Waverly a non-participant, at least in the CBO's first year.

Proposed Full-Staff Model

The suggested full-staffing model would include a Director plus 16.5 staff positions transferred from the six participating districts.

The proposed model would include a Director/Coordinator plus 16.5 additional staff members transferred from the six participating districts. These represent 16 full-time positions and one half-time staff member. As shown in Table 3 on the next page, 13 of the 16.5 positions (79%) would be transferred into the CBO from the two largest districts: nine from Elmira City and four from Horseheads. One each would be transferred from Elmira Heights, Spencer-Van Etten and Watkins Glen, and a .5 FTE position would be transferred to the CBO from Odessa-Montour.

The transfers of single staff members/positions from each of the four smallest districts in the S-C-T region would leave most of the current business office staff still in place within those districts. Each of those four districts currently has between four and five FTE positions within their business offices (see earlier Table 1), so the transfer of one person from each district would still leave a core of between three and four existing positions remaining within each home district business office.

Significant numbers of district business office staff positions would also remain within the Horseheads and Elmira City districts, though higher proportions of their current business office staff would be transferred to the CBO. Under this model, of the current 16 staff of the Elmira business office, just under half (seven) would remain within the district, following the proposed transfer of nine to the CBO, and half of the current staff of eight would remain in Horseheads (five once a vacant position is filled), following the proposed transfer of four to the central office.

Table 3

**Amount of FTEs Currently Devoted by Potential CBO Staff in Each District to Potential CBO
Functional Areas- Full-Staffing Model**

District	Purchasing # of FTEs	Payroll # of FTEs	Accounts Payable # of FTEs	Benefits # of FTEs	Secretarial/clerical # of FTEs	TOTAL CBO # of FTEs per Person	TOTAL Non CBO # of FTEs per Person	Total FTEs Worked per week
Ehmera								
Secretary II					1	1	0	1
Chief Payroll Clerk		1				1	0	1
Sr. Account Clerk		0.93				0.93	0.07	1
Account Clerk Typist		0.95				0.95	0.05	1
Account Clerk			0.95			0.95	0.05	1
Purchasing Manager	1					1	0	1
Sr. Account Clerk/Typist	1					1	0	1
Sr. Account Clerk (AP)			0.75		0.05	0.8	0.2	1
Sr. Account Clerk/Typist	0.05		0.4			0.45	0.55	1
Total	2.05	2.88	2.1	0	1.05	8.08	0.92	9
Ehmera Heights								
Account Clerk Typist	0.4		0.4		0.02	0.82	0.18	1
Total	0.4	0	0.4	0	0.02	0.82	0.18	1
Watkins Glen								
Payroll Clerk		0.9		0.01		0.91	0.09	1
Total	0	0.9	0	0.01	0	0.91	0.09	1
Odessa-Montour								
Account Clerk			0.4		0.05	0.45	0.06	0.51
Total	0	0	0.4	0	0.05	0.45	0.06	0.51
Spencer-Van Etten								
Account Clerk/Payroll		0.55			0.05	0.6	0.4	1
Total	0	0.55	0	0	0.05	0.6	0.4	1
Horseheads								
Payroll Clerk		0.75		0.2	0.01	0.96	0.04	1
Accounts Payable	0.01		0.97		0.02	1	0	1
Payroll		0.7		0.2	0.01	0.91	0.1	1.01
Purchasing	0.62		0.01			0.63	0.37	1
Total	0.63	1.45	0.98	0.4	0.04	3.5	0.51	4.01
Total	3.08	5.78	3.88	0.41	1.21	14.36	2.16	16.52
Total with Waverly	4.29	7.62	5.50	2.47	3.32	23.19	21.93	68.31
Total W/out Waverly	4.22	6.97	4.93	2.37	3.32	21.80	20.37	63.97

Table 3 indicates the specific positions to be transferred from each district to the CBO, along with the proportion of the time of each which is currently devoted to specific functions (expressed as FTEs). Designation of the specific positions to be included was based on CGR analysis of the staff time allocation surveys, supplemented by additional information and preferences offered by district officials.

Staff Size Compared to Broome-Tioga CBO

It should be noted that the proposed staff size for the S-C-T CBO model is similar to the CBO model which started in 1997 and has grown and evolved since then in the Broome-Tioga (B-T) BOCES region. That central business office currently provides a menu of services to eight different districts, with each district choosing which specific services it wishes to obtain via the CBO. Five of the eight are considered “full service districts,” with the other three receiving typically expanding services on an a la carte basis.

As in the S-C-T BOCES, the enrollment of the participating districts in the Broome-Tioga CBO ranges from very small to substantial, with two districts with enrollments below 1,000 students, two around 4,500 and an urban district with enrollment of about 6,400. Total enrollment for the eight B-T districts is about 20,000, compared to about 15,750 students in the six districts likely to participate in the S-C-T model. Combined budgets of the six S-C-T districts total about \$200 million, compared with about \$250 million in the eight B-T districts. Comparing staffing for the core services in the B-T model that correspond to the comparable services expected to be included in the S-C-T model, the Broome-Tioga CBO appears to have about 21 employees (including administrative and clerical staff) providing similar functions for its seven primary and eight total districts, compared with the proposed 17.5 for six S-C-T districts. Based on these comparisons, the proposed S-C-T staffing level appears comparable to that in the B-T CBO.

The proposed staffing for the CBO model appears proportionate to the slightly larger Broome-Tioga CBO.

Limited Disruption Likely for Non-CBO Business Functions Within Home Districts

As shown in Table 3, across all positions and districts, 87% of the total time of the 16.5 proposed CBO positions (not including the Coordinator) is currently devoted to the core functions designated to be included in the CBO (14.36 FTEs of the total of 16.52). Moreover, 11 of the 17 persons to be transferred into the CBO currently spend at least 90% of their time on the core CBO

functions, and another three spend 80% or more. Thus, their transfer/removal from the home district would be expected to have relatively little impact on other non-CBO business office activities and the workloads and responsibilities of the staff remaining in the home district offices. The major exceptions to that general statement are the Account Clerk/Payroll position from Spencer-Van Etten and the Purchasing position from Horseheads, both of which now spend about 40% of their time on non-CBO tasks—and the Sr. Account Clerk/Typist position to be transferred from Elmira, 55% of whose time is currently spent on functions other than those to be included in the CBO. Possible implications of those staffing workloads on the CBO model and on remaining district workloads will be discussed in Chapter 5.

Critical Mass of Staff Available to Perform Core CBO Functions

The number of proposed CBO employees with experience in most core functional areas appears appropriate.

With the possible exception of the Benefits functional area, the proposed staffing model appears to provide a sufficient critical mass of employees with the right combination of skills and experience to efficiently and effectively staff the core proposed CBO functional areas. As indicated in the final rows of Table 3, about two-thirds of the time currently devoted across all six districts (excluding Waverly) to the proposed core CBO functions would be represented by the staff proposed for transfer to the CBO (14.36 FTEs, out of the current total of 21.8). This would seem to be an appropriate overall ratio, given expected efficiencies within each functional area. By contrast, only about 10% of the current time spent on non-CBO functional tasks (2.16 of 20.37 FTEs) is represented by the proposed CBO staff, thus further suggesting that transferring these staff from their home districts will have relatively little overall impact on the provision of the remaining business office functions not included in the CBO.

More specifically, the proposed staffing patterns for each functional area would be as follows (with the caveat that the Director/Coordinator would need to have the flexibility to make shifts in allocations of time and responsibilities as needed, based on actual experiences once the new office is in place):

Purchasing

Excluding Waverly, 4.22 FTE person years are currently devoted in the other six district business offices to purchasing-related tasks. With the proposed staffing transfers to the CBO, about 73% of that time (3.08 FTEs) would become part of the central business

office in this model. This would include two experienced full-time purchasing staff from Elmira, as well as individuals from Horseheads and Elmira Heights who, together, add up to an additional FTE position—and who each have had full responsibility for the purchasing function within their respective districts, as indicated in the detailed breakdown of tasks by person by district shown in the Appendix. With the efficiencies expected through the CBO, this would appear to be an appropriate staffing level with which to begin the centralized purchasing function.

Creation of a central purchasing function could also potentially have the effect of freeing up for other tasks about two-thirds of the time of the Typist position in Odessa-Montour which is now devoted to purchasing, and of more limited amounts of time currently spent on purchasing by two different staff members in both Watkins Glen (a cumulative total of about .3 of an FTE) and Spencer-Van Etten (about .15 FTE).

Payroll

Seven individuals with significant payroll experience in their home districts (three from Elmira, two from Horseheads and one each from Watkins Glen and Spencer-Van Etten) would transfer to the CBO under this model. In each case, these are the people who have had virtually the entire responsibility for the payroll function in their home districts. Together, they represent about 5.8 person years which could be allocated within the CBO to payroll functions (about 84% of the total time currently devoted to payroll tasks in the six non-Waverly districts). In turn, centralizing this function could help to free up the equivalent of up to 40% of one person's time in Elmira Heights and 35% of the time of one person and 10% of another's in Odessa-Montour—time currently devoted to payroll matters that should be reduced or eliminated with the creation of a centralized approach to such services in a CBO.

Accounts Payable

Six staff members with significant amounts of experience carrying out accounts payable tasks would be transferred to the CBO under this model. They would include three people from Elmira (including two who currently spend 95% and 75% of their time, respectively, on accounts payable tasks), one from Horseheads (97% of the time devoted to AP), and one each from Elmira Heights and Odessa-Montour (each currently spending 40% of a

full-time equivalent position on accounts payable tasks). Together, these six persons are responsible for carrying out virtually all the accounts payable tasks in their respective districts—and currently spend about 3.9 person years conducting the accounts payable function, or about 79% of the total time spent on the function by the six districts. Centralizing the function could help free up some time in the two districts which would not be contributing direct accounts payable staff to the CBO—almost half an FTE (.45) spread across two people in Watkins Glen, and .25 FTE spread across two staff in Spencer-Van Etten.

Secretarial/Clerical

Only a little over a third of the total time allocated to secretarial/ clerical functions by business office staff in the six districts would be transferred to the CBO, under this model. A number of staff indicated that they currently spend small proportions of their time on clerical support tasks, but one of the proposed transfers (from Elmira) currently spends full-time on secretarial-clerical tasks. Given the fact that some of the clerical time in other districts is split between business office and other support tasks (such as secretarial support for the Superintendent in one or two cases), and given the fact that several of the proposed CBO staff have experience doing clerical support tasks, it seems reasonable to assume that the proposed clerical support in this model should be sufficient to meet initial needs.

Benefits

The benefits area is arguably the least well-defined of the functional areas designated for inclusion in the CBO. The two largest districts, Elmira and Horseheads, each operate independent health care plans and have staff within their business offices who have responsibilities for those plans. In both cases, those staff members would remain within their respective district business offices, and would not be transferred to the CBO. The other districts within the S-C-T region devote little business office staff time to the benefits function, and are part of a health insurance consortium operated under BOCES. With the two larger districts operating independent health insurance plans, and the other districts involved in the BOCES-operated consortium, there may be relatively little that the CBO needs to do in this area. Given the uncertainty as to how the CBO should operate with regard to the benefits function—presumably in ways that would at least initially simply complement operations already in place—it is probably

reasonable that this function is the most understaffed of the proposed CBO functional areas, with only about 17% of the total FTEs currently devoted to this area in district business offices slated for transfer to the CBO. The specifics of the function would ultimately need to be worked out by the Director/Coordinator, in coordination with the existing plans, once the CBO is established.

The cost, savings and service implications of the proposed model are spelled out in more detail in Chapter 5.

5. IMPLICATIONS OF THE PROPOSED MODEL

To enable further assessment of the value of the proposed CBO model outlined in Chapter 4, this chapter provides a more detailed assessment of the model's likely costs, benefits and staffing implications, both short- and longer-term. Implications are discussed at the overall regional, cross-district level, as well as by individual district.

Calculating Costs and Savings

First, a word about the methodology used to assess the relative costs and savings associated with the model. For each staff member considered for transfer from a district business office to the proposed central business office, the home districts supplied CGR with information about current salary and benefits, along with the numbers of hours worked per week, position title, and other information such as how long the person has been an employee of the district and in the current position. CGR and BOCES discussed how this information would be used, and what calculations would be undertaken to determine costs and benefits of the different options.

BOCES staff, using calculation approaches jointly determined by BOCES and CGR, first calculated the current salary and benefit costs of all staff targeted for transfer to the CBO. Since the CBO would be operated under BOCES and therefore all employees of the CBO would have to become BOCES employees, who work 40-hour weeks, salaries and benefits were first adjusted upward to 40 hours for all employees who are not now working 40-hour weeks. All positions and titles were converted to appropriate union and Civil Service titles under BOCES, and any positions currently paid less than the equivalent position would pay under BOCES were upgraded to the higher level salary. Any salaries that currently exceed the equivalent BOCES pay scale were held harmless, so that no one would lose salary or benefits as part of a transfer.

In addition, costs were determined for one-time equipment and related purchases, ongoing costs of equipment and supplies, rental cost, operations and maintenance costs charged against programs by BOCES, etc. Furthermore, the assumption was made that the

CBO Director/Coordinator position would require an annual salary of up to \$80,000, and benefits were calculated against that base to determine the overall added annual costs associated with creating that new position. The costs of the Coordinator position were spread across the six participating districts based on the RWADA formula.

After calculating the total projected costs under the staffing assumptions of the model, projected BOCES aid was calculated, based on current aid formulas. Resulting net costs and overall savings were then calculated for each district individually, and overall across the region, after BOCES aid was factored in.

Cost-Benefit Implications

Detailed tables in the Appendix outline the above cost allocations and assumptions used to calculate the costs of starting and operating the Central Business Office in its first year. The bottom line was calculated in two different ways:

(1) with all transfer charges (e.g., rental, operations and maintenance, phone and service charges, etc.) and one-time costs such as purchases of new furniture and equipment included in the budgeted costs for the first year of CBO operations; and

(2) with such costs pulled out and either included within other operational expenditures contained in the capital portion of the administrative budget, and/or charged as purchases in 2004-05 to enable BOCES aid to be generated in 2005-06 to help mitigate against the initial startup costs of the CBO, since the 2005-06 CBO expenditures would not actually generate BOCES aid until the following year. Either way, the net effect of this second option was to reduce as much as possible the added first-year costs to each district during the year when they would be most vulnerable due to the delay in receiving BOCES aid against the new program costs.

Tables 4 and 5 on the next page summarize the bottom-line cost and savings implications resulting from these two sets of assumptions and approaches to calculating the impact of the proposed CBO. The tables represent the summary of the more detailed set of Appendix tables 1A and 2A for each of these options, and are used as the basis for much of the discussion which follows.

Table 4

**Full-Staffing Model: Option with Furniture and
O&M/Transfer Charges Included**

	Estimated Current Cost	Projected Cost With Office Furniture	Projected BOCES Aid with Office Furniture	Net Cost To Districts	Districts Savings with BOCES Aid	% Savings
Districts						
Elmira	\$429,019.00	\$553,091.00	\$398,972.00	\$154,119.00	\$274,900.00	64.08
Elmira Heights	\$54,513.00	\$63,824.00	\$40,077.00	\$23,747.00	\$30,766.00	56.44
Horseheads	\$175,080.00	\$254,082.00	\$149,338.00	\$104,744.00	\$70,336.00	40.17
Odessa Montour	\$17,658.00	\$33,944.00	\$21,607.00	\$12,337.00	\$5,321.00	30.13
Spencer Van Etten	\$28,243.00	\$63,353.00	\$44,051.00	\$19,302.00	\$8,941.00	31.66
Watkins Glen	\$53,463.00	\$64,756.00	\$36,720.00	\$28,036.00	\$25,427.00	47.56
Total	\$757,976.00*	\$1,033,050.00	\$690,765.00	\$342,285.00	\$415,691.00	54.84

*Conservative estimate of savings, does not include districts' current cost of materials, supplies, etc.

Table 5

**Full-Staffing Model: Option with Furniture and
O&M/Transfer Charges Not Included**

	Estimated Current Cost	Projected Cost Without Office Furniture/O&M	Projected BOCES Aid	Net Cost To Districts	Districts Savings with BOCES Aid	% Savings
Districts						
Elmira	\$429,019.00	\$512,924.00	\$367,160.00	\$145,764.00	\$283,255.00	66.02
Elmira Heights	\$54,513.00	\$59,361.00	\$36,881.00	\$22,480.00	\$32,033.00	58.76
Horseheads	\$175,080.00	\$236,230.00	\$137,431.00	\$98,799.00	\$76,281.00	43.57
Odessa Montour	\$17,658.00	\$31,713.00	\$19,884.00	\$11,829.00	\$5,829.00	33.01
Spencer Van Etten	\$28,243.00	\$58,890.00	\$40,538.00	\$18,352.00	\$9,891.00	35.02
Watkins Glen	\$53,463.00	\$60,293.00	\$33,792.00	\$26,501.00	\$26,962.00	50.43
Total	\$757,976.00	\$959,411.00	\$635,686.00	\$323,725.00	\$434,251.00	57.29

*Conservative estimate of savings, does not include districts' current cost of materials, supplies, etc.

Added First-Year Costs

Added costs of starting a CBO include adjustments to a 40-hour week, salary/benefit upgrades, creating Coordinator position, rental costs, and one-time purchases.

Added first-year costs of as much as \$275,000 could be reduced by about \$75,000 through prepayment and/or spreading of new furniture/equipment and O&M/transfer charges.

Clearly there are significant additional costs associated with establishing the CBO, over and above the current costs associated with the salaries and benefits of the employees who would staff the new central office. The establishment of the CBO would increase costs, no matter how they are apportioned, due to such factors as the new cost of more than \$109,000 for the Coordinator, upward workload and salary adjustments for some current staff, new rental costs, furniture and equipment, etc.

As shown by comparing the first two columns in Table 4, if all the actual costs had to be paid in the first year, they would amount to as much as an additional \$275,000 over current salary and benefit costs (\$1,033,050 compared with \$757,976)—though that is likely to be an overstatement of the additional costs, since the “current cost” figures shown in column one in the table do not include various district costs related to existing operations and maintenance, service charges, cost of supplies, etc.

Even if this is a “worst-case scenario” overstatement of added startup costs, each district would clearly have added out-of-pocket costs as the new CBO begins, no matter how the first-year costs are apportioned. However, as seen by comparing Tables 4 and 5, the second option, involving the elimination and/or prepayment and/or spreading of the new furniture/equipment and O&M/transfer charges (summarized in Table 5), would reduce the first-year costs by almost \$75,000 (from \$1,033,050 to \$959,411)—with Elmira reducing its first-year costs by more than \$40,000, Horseheads by almost \$18,000, and the other districts by between about \$2,000 and \$4,500 each.

The first year would clearly be the most difficult to navigate for participating districts, but total future annual costs should never again approach the worst-case first-year total costs of more than \$1 million. Not only would subsequent annual costs decline (other than routine annual cost adjustments) as a result of the elimination of one-time startup costs, but “hits” against each district’s future budgets would also be softened in each subsequent year due to the BOCES aid that would begin to flow beginning with the second year of the CBO’s implementation. Moreover, it may well be that future annual costs would also decline, or at least hold relatively steady, as a result of possible factors such as new hires being made

at reduced incoming salary and benefit levels, and possible reductions in staff through attrition as staffing and workload efficiencies begin to occur across the program.

Annual Savings to Each District

Although it is clear that it is more expensive to start and operate a CBO, at least in the short run, than to continue to do business as usual in separate district business offices, it is equally clear that the six participating districts would save money, often substantial amounts of money, in subsequent years, once the BOCES aid begins to flow. *Even with the added actual costs, the effect of BOCES aid would be to drive down the net annual costs to every district, as a direct result of establishing and participating in the CBO.* Obviously, if New York State ultimately decides to change BOCES funding formulas in ways that limit their value as incentives to such cooperative ventures as CBOs, districts would need to rethink their decisions concerning participation in the CBO. But BOCES around the state continue to maintain strong support among legislators, and CGR knows of no reasons at this point to believe that the aid formulas and incentives they represent are likely to change substantially in the near future.

Under the proposed CBO model, participating districts would save well over \$400,000 a year, or 55%+ compared with current costs of the same staff.

Under the reduced O&M option (summarized in Table 5), the net costs to all six districts combined would be about \$19,000 less than under the full-pay option (\$323,725 compared with \$342,285). *But no matter which option is activated, the annual net savings across all districts would be well over \$400,000, compared with the current costs of paying for the same staff within district business offices, which represents a savings of at least 55% compared with the status quo—with net savings per district ranging from about 30 to 33% in Odessa-Montour to about 65% in Elmira. For example, in option 2, the net costs to all districts would be \$323,725, compared with current costs of almost \$758,000—a savings of more than \$434,000 per year.¹*

Staffing Implications

The proposed staffing model should ensure that sufficient staff are in place from the beginning to enhance the likelihood that the CBO will hit the ground running in meeting its objectives of saving money while improving core administrative support functions.

¹ As noted above, this probably represents a conservative estimate of actual annual savings, since current costs do not include various costs of existing operations and maintenance, service charges, costs of materials and supplies, etc.

In addition to dollar savings, CBO efficiencies may also free up time of staff remaining in home districts to carry out other required tasks.

In addition, as noted in the previous chapter, it is likely that full implementation of the proposed model, with the efficiencies likely to result from a centralized consistent provision of the core services, would also have the effect of freeing up time of selected other staff who would remain in the home districts to undertake other tasks and perhaps fill other vacant positions, at further net savings and more efficient use of staff within the districts (see district summaries below). This factor may have special significance for districts as increased staff/resources are likely to be needed in the future to meet anticipated increases in workloads resulting from expanded federal and state regulations.

Selected districts may choose to contract for additional services from the CBO Coordinator.

One other point should be raised about the use of the CBO Director/Coordinator. It is assumed that he/she would be a resource to all districts. But it may be that some districts, particularly among the smaller ones within the region, may choose to make more extended use of the Coordinator to provide enhanced guidance, budget development support, and/or strategic fiscal planning support upon request. During this study, at least two districts have indicated that they may be interested in acquiring specified portions of the Coordinator's time to be designated for their district. Under such circumstances, presumably the allocation of the Coordinator's costs against districts would be adjusted to reflect the differential use of the Coordinator's time and skills.

Implications by District

Elmira

This section briefly summarizes the implications of the proposed staffing model by district:

Elmira's actual additional costs associated with the creation of the CBO would be the highest by far of any of the six participating districts, but it would also stand to gain the most, also by far, in net savings as a result of its participation, with annual savings of about \$275,000 or more, compared with current costs, representing annual savings with BOCES aid factored in of about 65%.

Staff likely to be allocated to the CBO by Elmira, with one exception, reported little current involvement with non-CBO functions, so that their transfer to the CBO should not leave behind significant amounts of other business office tasks that would need to be reassigned to other remaining staff. The one

exception to that would be the Sr. Account Clerk/Typist position. Transfer of that position would appear to leave behind the need for some reshuffling of responsibilities to pick up portions of tasks related to capital projects, and state and federal reports.

Elmira Heights

Elmira Heights would experience a relatively light initial first-year hit, as projected CBO costs in the first year would be between about \$5,000 and \$9,000 higher than current costs, depending on which transfer charge option is followed (see Tables 4 and 5). Its ultimate expected annual savings, with aid factored in, would exceed \$30,000, representing a net savings of between 56% and 59%, compared to current costs.

The staff person expected to be shifted to the CBO, the Account Clerk Typist, currently spends about 40% of her time in purchasing and 40% in accounts payable functions, with some other time spent on general accounting and budget monitoring, billing and tax collection. Some of these tasks may need to be reassigned, but since none of them take very much of the person's time, this should be relatively easy to do. At the same time, because of expected efficiencies from centralizing the payroll function within the CBO, the equivalent of about 40% of one EH person's time in the district business office might be freed up for other tasks in the future.

Horseheads

Horseheads' initial costs would increase under the full-staffing model by between \$60,000 and \$80,000, compared to current costs. However, once BOCES aid kicks in, the district ultimately would save about \$75,000 a year or more as a result of participation in the proposed CBO model, representing a reduction of more than 40% in annual costs.

Three of the four staff expected to become part of the CBO currently have few responsibilities other than those related to core CBO-related tasks. However, the Sr. Purchasing Clerk also is now responsible for the district's inventory/fixed assets function, so the roughly 10% of her time spent on that function would presumably need to be reassigned.

Odessa-Montour

Odessa-Montour probably has the least to gain from the CBO from a strictly monetary perspective, although it would come out ahead after the first year. In the first year, it would have to absorb

between about \$14,000 and \$16,000 in additional costs associated with the creation of the CBO. However, in subsequent years, it would save more than \$5,800 a year, representing about a 33% savings compared to the current cost of the position to be transferred to the CBO. Transferring other staff to the CBO would not be likely to further reduce net costs to the district. In addition to annual savings, O-M, as the smallest district in the region, and having experienced fiscal upheavals under previous administrations, could profit from the expanded strategic fiscal planning support the Coordinator could provide, should the district choose to avail itself of such support.

By contributing a part-time position (currently vacant) to the CBO, there would be very little in the way of additional tasks that would need to be reallocated to other staff. Moreover, the creation of centralized efficiencies within the CBO could help free up about two-thirds of the time of the O-M Typist position which now is spent on purchasing tasks, as well as about 35% of a person's time now spent on payroll matters.

Spencer-Van Etten

Initial costs of joining the CBO would virtually double for the Spencer-Van Etten district, from current costs of about \$28,000 for the person to be transferred to the CBO to between about \$59,000 and \$63,000, depending on which transfer charge strategy is used in the first year. However, even this increase is substantially less than what it would cost for the district to hire an on-site district business manager. Moreover, subsequent savings to the district would be between about \$9,000 and \$10,000 a year, representing about a 35% reduction in the current costs. Beyond costs, however, S-VE is another of the districts that has not had, or been able to afford, a strong business official or administrator, and the presence of a CBO Director/Coordinator could open the door for the district to explore opportunities to link up with the that person to provide fiscal strategic planning support in the future.

The Account Clerk/Payroll who would likely be identified for transfer to the CBO spends about 40% of her time on non-CBO-related tasks. Thus there may be a need to reassign some functions she was carrying out to other staff, such as federal and state reports and personnel/HR support.

Watkins Glen

Depending on the strategy used to help distribute first-year costs, Watkins Glen would experience additional first-year costs of between about \$7,000 and \$11,000 to participate in the CBO. However, compared to current costs of the position to be sent to the CBO, the district could be expected to cut annual net costs virtually in half, based on the increased BOCES aid, with annual savings of between \$25,000 and \$27,000.

WG's position to be shifted to the CBO is heavily focused on the payroll function, although she appears to also be the only person in the district office to be responsible for completing federal reports (although it represents a very small portion of her time, so that it should be relatively easy to reassign the time). By centralizing the accounts payable function within the CBO, efficiencies may make it possible in the future to free up the time of almost half an FTE across two WG business office employees.

6. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

CGR believes there is clear justification for the creation of a Central Business Office within the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga BOCES district, and strongly recommends its creation. It also recommends that all six districts which have expressed potential interest in participation should formally agree to do so, as each would experience financial benefits from being part of the CBO, as well as enhanced services. Given its existing small business office staff, it makes sense for Waverly to opt out of participation at this point, but it should consider perhaps joining on a partial basis, for selected services, at some point in the future.

In addition to significant annual savings from participation in the CBO, the districts would experience other benefits as well, including:

- ❖ expanded internal controls and safeguards to protect against the potential for accounting problems, fraud and fiscal abuses such as those experienced in school districts in other parts of the state;
- ❖ improved management and integrity of fiscal information presented to districts and prepared by an entity with a degree of independence from each district;
- ❖ expanded access to higher levels of financial skills, business management oversight, and strategic and budget planning, especially for smaller districts;
- ❖ greater efficiencies in the provision and staffing of services, thereby helping to free up the time of remaining staff in some districts to undertake other required tasks.

The CBO should begin by providing the limited number of functional services identified in the report. Success should be assured with these services before any expansion is considered, and any expansion in the future should be incremental, only as needs can be justified.

An implementation steering committee should be established as soon as possible to oversee the process of reviewing the recommendations in this report and developing specific implementation plans and timelines. There should also be a

formal annual review process whereby the districts and BOCES assess the performance of the CBO each year, and determine if any changes are needed for the future.

Finally, a reminder of the promise made to staff at the beginning of this project: no employees would lose a job as a result of this new initiative. Staff may be reassigned to other jobs as appropriate, but no one would actually lose a job, and any possible reductions over time would occur only through attrition.

Suggested Implementation Timeline

The following action steps and timelines are suggested to ensure successful and timely implementation of the CBO model:

- ❖ Creation of implementation steering committee by mid-January, 2005.
- ❖ Official Board of Education decisions to participate in the CBO by mid-March.
- ❖ Hiring of Director/Coordinator in April, to begin to establish procedures and staffing protocols, establish orderly procedures for transfers of designated staff from districts to CBO, purchase equipment and furniture, establish computer linkages, organize the office, and generally prepare for CBO's formal opening.
- ❖ CBO open for business July 1, at the beginning of the 2005-06 school year.

APPENDICES

S-C-T BOCES CBO Study: Potential CBO Functions Survey

S-C-T BOCES Business Office Staff Survey

Tables of Business Office Tasks by Individual Staff Member by District

Cost Allocation and Assumption Options for Implementing Proposed CBO Model: Options 1A and 2A

S-C-T BOCES CBO STUDY: POTENTIAL CBO FUNCTIONS

District: _____

Name/Title of Respondent: _____

Which of the following functions do you think, from your district’s perspective, should be included in a CBO? (please check)

Which of the functions would you want to retain on a decentralized basis within your district, in whole or in part (including any that you would want to be part of the CBO, but still retain some of the function within the district)?

<u>Function</u>	<u>In CBO?</u>	<u>Keep <i>Entirely</i> Within District?</u>	<u>Keep <i>Partly</i> Within District?</u>
Payroll	_____	_____	_____
Purchasing	_____	_____	_____
General accounting	_____	_____	_____
Accounts payable	_____	_____	_____
Cash receivables	_____	_____	_____
Cash management	_____	_____	_____
Benefits	_____	_____	_____
Budget development	_____	_____	_____
Billing	_____	_____	_____
Insurance	_____	_____	_____
Capital projects	_____	_____	_____
Internal claims	_____	_____	_____
Tax collection	_____	_____	_____

Reports

State Education	_____	_____	_____
Federal	_____	_____	_____
Other	_____	_____	_____
Business management oversight/ supervision	_____	_____	_____
		Keep <i>Entirely</i>	Keep <i>Partly</i>
<u>Function</u>	<u>In CBO?</u>	<u>Within District?</u>	<u>Within District?</u>
Strategic fiscal planning	_____	_____	_____
Inventory	_____	_____	_____
Transportation	_____	_____	_____
Operations and maintenance/ buildings and grounds	_____	_____	_____
Personnel/HR	_____	_____	_____
Census maintenance	_____	_____	_____
Grant-writing	_____	_____	_____
School lunch program	_____	_____	_____
What else? (specify)	_____	_____	_____

Please return to Pryor/Zettek, CGR, One South Washington Street, Suite 400, Rochester, NY 14614. Please return by August 20, 2004. Thank you very much.

S-C-T BOCES BUSINESS OFFICE STAFF SURVEY

Dear Business Office Staff Member:

The seven members of the Schuyler-Chemung-Tioga BOCES have jointly agreed to undertake a study of their business office operations, and to determine if any of the functions could more efficiently be carried out at some point in the future through a centralized business office. The Superintendents of each of the seven participating districts have also agreed that, whether any changes ultimately occur as a result of this study or not, no jobs will be lost by current employees as a result of the findings or recommendations of the study.

The S-C-T BOCES has hired CGR (Center for Governmental Research), a highly-respected, non-profit, independent research and consulting firm from Rochester, to ensure that this study is conducted on an impartial, objective basis. BOCES and its seven districts have asked CGR to determine how business office functions are currently carried out, and to make recommendations concerning what changes, if any, should be considered in the future. As part of that process, CGR has requested each district staff member who currently provides any business office tasks to complete the following survey.

The survey is intended to identify each person in each district, by title, who is currently working on business office functions, and to determine how much time is spent on each function. Using the list in the following survey matrix, please indicate which functions you are involved with, and estimate what percentage of your time is spent on each. If you spend all your time on one function, please write 100% on the appropriate line. If your time is split between different functions, please provide your best estimate of how much time you spend on each task. We suggest that you round percentages of time to 5%, and figure the average time spent during the course of a school year. If there are significant fluctuations at different times of the year, please indicate that in the comments section. If the functions we have listed do not include an important part of your business office responsibilities, please write in any missing function under "Other," and indicate how much of your time is devoted to such tasks. Also, if you are not comfortable with the terminology we have used, and you wish to describe what you do in different terms, or if you wish to group some of the listed tasks under one heading, please also indicate that under "Other" and estimate the time spent on the group of tasks as you define them.

We realize that some business office staff in some districts may spend part of their time working on other functions outside their business office responsibilities. If you spend any of your time on such functions, please indicate what those tasks are in the section at the bottom of the list labeled "Time spent on non-business office functions," and estimate the amount of time during the year that you spend on such tasks. The total of your business office responsibilities and any non-business office tasks should sum to 100% of your work time.

Please also note that for each possible task, there is a final column in which you are asked to indicate if you are aware of any other person who, in addition to you, also performs a portion of that particular function. If so, please indicate any names of such persons, and your estimate of the proportion of his/her work time spent on that particular function during the course of the school year.

If you have any questions about the survey, please contact Don Pryor at CGR (585/327-7067 or via email at dpryor@cgr.org). We ask that you ***please complete the survey and return it to your supervisor by no later than September 15.*** The surveys will then be returned directly to CGR for analysis. THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

CGR/S-C-T BOCES Business Office Staff Survey – September 2004

Name and Title: _____ School District: _____

Indicate if full-time or part-time position, and # of hours worked per week: _____

Function/Task	% of	Comments	Name who else does this
1. Payroll			
2. Purchasing			
3. General accounting			
4. Accounts payable			
5. Accounts receivable			
6. Cash management			
7. Benefits			
8. Budget development			
9. Budget monitoring			
10. Billing			
11. Insurance			
12. Capital projects			
13. Internal claims			
14. Tax collection			
15. Treasurer			
16. State reports			
17. Federal reports			
18. Business management/			
19. Strategic fiscal planning			
20. Records management			
21. Inventory/fixed assets			
22. Personnel/HR			
23. Contract administration			
24. Secretarial/clerical			
25. Census maintenance			
26. Grant-writing			
27. School lunch program			
28. Transportation			
29. Operations & maintenance			
30. Buildings & grounds			
31. Internal audit			
32. Other (specify)			
33. Other (specify)			
34. TIME SPENT ON NON-			
35. TOTAL – add to 100%	100%		

Please return the completed survey to your supervisor by September 15. Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Summary of Elmira CSD by FTE's

	Asst. Superint. for Mngt. Services	Secretary II	Insurance Specialist	Chief Payroll Clerk	Sr. Account Clerk	Account Clerk Typist	Principal Account Clerk/Treasurer	Deputy Treasurer	Account Clerk	Account Clerk/Typist	Purchasing Manager	Sr. Account Clerk/Typist	Coordinator of Mngt. Services	Sr. Account Clerk	Sr. Account Clerk	Clerk	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.020	0.00	0.10	1.00	0.93	0.95	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.00	0.00	3.150
Purchasing	0.015	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	1.00	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.065
General Accounting	0.005	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.25	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.15	0.20	0.10	1.125
Accounts Payable	0.005	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.95	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.75	0.05	2.225
Accounts Receivable	0.005	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.105
Cash Management	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.210
Benefits	0.100	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.350
Budget Development	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.60	0.00	0.00	0.900
Budget Monitoring	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.070
Billing	0.005	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.005
Insurance	0.020	0.00	0.46	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.580
Capital Projects	0.150	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.650
Internal Claims	0.003	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.003
Tax Collection	0.001	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.151
Treasurer	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.650
State Reports	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.380
Federal Reports	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.110
Business management/admin/super.	0.320	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.670
Strategic fiscal planning	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Records management	0.005	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.125
Inventory/fixed assets	0.001	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.101
Personnel/HR	0.050	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.130
Contract Administration	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Secretarial/clerical	0.004	1.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.50	1.554
Census maintenance	0.001	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.001
Grant-writing	0.001	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.001
School lunch program	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.110
Transportation	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Operations & maintenance	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Buildings & grounds	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Internal Audit	0.001	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.051
Other (Specify)	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.200
Other (Specify)	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.200
Total FTEs	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.95	1	1	1	15.950

Summary of Elmira Heights by FTE's

	Secretary to Superintendent	Account Clerk Typist	Bus. Manager/Treasurer	Account Clerk	Sr. Account Clerk	Central Treasurer	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.00	0.410
Purchasing	0.000	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.400
General Accounting	0.000	0.10	0.01	0.44	0.10	0.00	0.645
Accounts Payable	0.000	0.40	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.400
Accounts Receivable	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Cash Management	0.000	0.00	0.10	0.03	0.00	0.18	0.305
Benefits	0.000	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.110
Budget Development	0.000	0.01	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.160
Budget Monitoring	0.000	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Billing	0.000	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Insurance	0.010	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.070
Capital Projects	0.000	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Internal Claims	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.050
Tax Collection	0.090	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.110
Treasurer	0.000	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
State Reports	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.01	0.128
Federal Reports	0.000	0.00	0.01	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.075
Business management/admin/super.	0.000	0.00	0.50	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.500
Strategic fiscal planning	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Records management	0.000	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.110
Inventory/fixed assets	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Personnel/HR	0.030	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.080
Contract Administration	0.000	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Secretarial/clerical	0.850	0.02	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.875
Census maintenance	0.010	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Grant-writing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
School lunch program	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Transportation	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Operations & maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Buildings & grounds	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Internal Audit	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.050
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.06	0.063
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Total FTEs	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.25	4.750

Summary of Horseheads by FTE's

	Tax Collector/Secretary	Payroll	Principal Account Clerk	Treasurer	Accounts Payable	Payroll	Purchasing	Employee Benefits Specialist	Business Manager/Vacant	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.000	0.75	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.70	0.00	0.00		1.450
Purchasing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.62	0.00		0.630
General Accounting	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.300
Accounts Payable	0.200	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.97	0.00	0.01	0.00		1.180
Accounts Receivable	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00		0.220
Cash Management	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.100
Benefits	0.000	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.98		1.380
Budget Development	0.000	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.350
Budget Monitoring	0.000	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.300
Billing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.050
Insurance	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.100
Capital Projects	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.150
Internal Claims	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Tax Collection	0.500	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.02		0.520
Treasurer	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.100
State Reports	0.000	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00		0.245
Federal Reports	0.000	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00		0.085
Business management/admin/super.	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Strategic fiscal planning	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Records management	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Inventory/fixed assets	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00		0.100
Personnel/HR	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Contract Administration	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Secretarial/clerical	0.250	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00		0.290
Census maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Grant-writing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
School lunch program	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Transportation	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Operations & maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Buildings & grounds	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Internal Audit	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.050
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.10	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.25	0.00		0.400
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.000
Total FTEs	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	8.000

Summary of Odessa-Montour by FTE's

	Treasurer	Typist	Admin. Asst. to Superintendent	Payroll Clerk	Account Clerk	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.35	0.00	0.450
Purchasing	0.000	0.65	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.650
General Accounting	0.200	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.200
Accounts Payable	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.40	0.400
Accounts Receivable	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Cash Management	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Benefits	0.000	0.00	0.10	0.30	0.00	0.400
Budget Development	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Budget Monitoring	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Billing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Insurance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Capital Projects	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Internal Claims	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Tax Collection	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Treasurer	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
State Reports	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.100
Federal Reports	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.100
Business management/admin/super.	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Strategic fiscal planning	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Records management	0.000	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Inventory/fixed assets	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.025
Personnel/HR	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.25	0.00	0.300
Contract Administration	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Secretarial/clerical	0.000	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.300
Census maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Grant-writing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
School lunch program	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Transportation	0.000	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Operations & maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Buildings & grounds	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Internal Audit	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.03	0.075
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.80	0.00	0.00	0.800
Total FTEs	1	1	1	1	0.5	4.500

Summary of Spencer-Van Etten by FTE's

	Supintendent	Treasurer		Clerk/Internal Auditor	Account Clerk/Payroll	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.000	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.55	0.600
Purchasing	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.00	0.150
General Accounting	0.000	0.05	0.60	0.10	0.00	0.750
Accounts Payable	0.000	0.00	0.10	0.15	0.00	0.250
Accounts Receivable	0.000	0.03	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.080
Cash Management	0.000	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.220
Benefits	0.000	0.02	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.120
Budget Development	0.150	0.03	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.180
Budget Monitoring	0.100	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.170
Billing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.050
Insurance	0.000	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.100
Capital Projects	0.100	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.150
Internal Claims	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Tax Collection	0.000	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.00	0.100
Treasurer	0.000	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.150
State Reports	0.000	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.150
Federal Reports	0.000	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.250
Business management/admin/super.	0.100	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.140
Strategic fiscal planning	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Records management	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.100
Inventory/fixed assets	0.000	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Personnel/HR	0.000	0.02	0.00	0.05	0.10	0.170
Contract Administration	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Secretarial/clerical	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.05	0.100
Census maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Grant-writing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
School lunch program	0.000	0.02	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.070
Transportation	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Operations & maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Buildings & grounds	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Internal Audit	0.000	0.01	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.060
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.01	0.00	0.10	0.02	0.130
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.02	0.00	0.10	0.03	0.150
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.550	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.600
Total FTEs	1	1	1	1	1	5.000

Summary of Watkins Glen CSD by FTE's

	Treasurer w/Bus. Manager Duty	Payroll Clerk	Account Clerk/Kybd. Spec.	Deputy Treasurer	Internal Claims Auditor	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.010	0.90	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.910
Purchasing	0.020	0.00	0.20	0.10	0.00	0.320
General Accounting	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.150
Accounts Payable	0.020	0.00	0.30	0.15	0.00	0.470
Accounts Receivable	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.170
Cash Management	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.100
Benefits	0.000	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.010
Budget Development	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Budget Monitoring	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Billing	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.10	0.00	0.120
Insurance	0.020	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.030
Capital Projects	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Internal Claims	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Tax Collection	0.020	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.170
Treasurer	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
State Reports	0.050	0.04	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.240
Federal Reports	0.000	0.04	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.040
Business management/admin/super.	0.100	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.100
Strategic fiscal planning	0.050	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.050
Records management	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Inventory/fixed assets	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Personnel/HR	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Contract Administration	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Secretarial/clerical	0.000	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.200
Census maintenance	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.200
Grant-writing	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
School lunch program	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Transportation	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Operations & maintenance	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Buildings & grounds	0.020	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.020
Internal Audit	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.040
Other (Specify)	0.050	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.00	0.200
Other (Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.000	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.000
Total FTEs	0.93	1	1	1	0.04	3.970

Summary of Waverly by FTE's

	Sr. Account Clerk	Bus. Admin	Account Clerk	Total FTEs
Payroll	0.60	0.05	0.00	0.65
Purchasing	0.00	0.02	0.05	0.07
General Accounting	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Accounts Payable	0.00	0.07	0.50	0.57
Accounts Receivable	0.05	0.00	0.05	0.10
Cash Management	0.00	0.05	0.00	0.05
Benefits	0.10	0.00	0.00	0.10
Budget Development	0.00	0.25	0.00	0.25
Budget Monitoring	0.00	0.30	0.00	0.30
Billing	0.00	0.00	0.03	0.03
Insurance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Capital Projects	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Internal Claims	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Tax Collection	0.15	0.01	0.00	0.16
Treasurer	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.02
State Reports	0.00	0.15	0.00	0.15
Federal Reports	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Business management/admin/super.	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Strategic fiscal planning	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Records management	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Inventory/fixed assets	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Personnel/HR	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Contract Administration	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Secretarial/clerical	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Census maintenance	0.00	0.01	0.05	0.06
Grant-writing	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
School lunch program	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Transportation	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.01
Operations & maintenance	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Buildings & grounds	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Internal Audit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Other (Specify)	0.05	0.00	0.00	0.05
Other (Specify)	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Time Spent on Non-Business Office Functions(Specify)	0.00	0.00	0.32	0.32
Total FTEs	0.95	1	1	2.950

17.5 Staff With Furniture and O&M

1A

Proposed Central Business Office Service Cost

Budget Item	Cost
1. Salaries 17.5 FTE(603,000)	\$603,000.00
2. Attendance Incentive 0.50%	\$3,015.00
3. Comp Insurance (0.90%)	\$5,427.00
4. New York State ERS	\$72,360.00
5. ESSA Disability (134.00 x 16)	\$2,144.00
6. Social Security (7.65%)	\$46,130.00
7. Health Insurance (4,632) x 2 single	\$9,264.00
8. Health Insurance (12,120) x 15 family	\$181,800.00
9. Unemployment Insurance (50 x 18)	\$900.00
10. Defined Medical Expense Reimbursement (535 x 18)	\$9,630.00
Total	\$933,670.00

Proposed Central Business Office Service Cost

Materials / Items	Cost with Office Furniture
Equipment	\$5,000.00
Supplies	\$5,000.00
Contractual	\$3,000.00
Mileage	\$1,000.00
Conference / Training	\$1,000.00
Postage	\$1,000.00
Extra Work	\$5,000.00
Computer Services	\$4,736.00
O&M Transfer Charge	\$73,647.00*
Total	\$99,383.00

Computers are not included in these charges. Districts have the option of sending the computers that are now being used in their districts or having BOCES purchase new ones for \$1,100. Per machine.

*Approx. \$34,286. of the transfer charge is budgeted for office furniture (desks/chairs/file cabinets/phones) this is a one time cost for setting the service up. This line could be reduced if these items were to be purchased in the 04-05 year which would also generate aid for the 05-06 year and reduce the initial set up costs.

\$933,670.00

\$99,383.00 with OF

Total - \$1,033,053.00 with office furniture

17.5 Staff With Furniture and O&M

1A

District Cost Analysis

Program Coordinator Position	
Salary	\$80,000.00
Attendance incentive	\$400.00
Retirement	\$9,600.00
Comp.	\$720.00
Disability	N/A
Social Security	\$6,120.00
Health Insurance	\$12,120.00 family
Unemployment	\$50.00
Medical reimbursement	\$535.00
Total	\$109,545.00

Program coordinator's cost based on RWADA		
Districts	RWADA	\$109,545.00
Elmira	45.06	\$49,361.00
Elmira Heights	7.17	\$7,854.00
Horseheads	27.57	\$30,202.00
Odessa Montour	5.44	\$5,959.00
Spencer Van Etten	6.74	\$7,383.00
Watkins Glen	8.02	\$8,786.00
Total	100%	\$109,545.00

STAFF COST

16.5 FTE

TOTAL SALARY AND FRINGE FOR 16.5 STAFF = \$824,125.00

FTE = \$49,947.00

TOTAL MATERIAL / SUPPLIES / OVERHEAD = \$99,383.00

FTE = \$6,023.00

TOTAL FTE = \$55,970.00

17.5 Staff With Furniture and O&M

1A

Districts	Coordinator Cost	FTE	# of Staff x FTE (\$55,970.00) With Office Furniture	Computer Cost 1,100.00 Per Machine If Requested	Total District Cost With Office Furniture
Elmira	\$49,361.00	9	\$503,730.00		\$553,091.00
Elmira Heights	\$7,854.00	1	\$55,970.00		\$63,824.00
Horseheads	\$30,202.00	4	\$223,880.00		\$254,082.00
Odessa Montour	\$5,959.00	.5	\$27,985.00		\$33,944.00
Spencer Van Etten	\$7,383.00	1	\$55,970.00		\$63,353.00
Watkins Glen	\$8,786.00	1	\$55,970.00		\$64,756.00
Total	\$109,545.00	16.5	\$923,505.00		\$1,033,050.00

Districts	Estimated Current Cost	Projected Cost With Office Furniture	Projected BOCES Aid with Office Furniture	Net Cost To Districts	Districts Savings with BOCES Aid	% Savings
Elmira	\$429,019.00	\$553,091.00	\$398,972.00	\$154,119.00	\$274,900.00	64.08
Elmira Heights	\$54,513.00	\$63,824.00	\$40,077.00	\$23,747.00	\$30,766.00	56.44
Horseheads	\$175,080.00	\$254,082.00	\$149,338.00	\$104,744.00	\$70,336.00	40.17
Odessa Montour	\$17,658.00	\$33,944.00	\$21,607.00	\$12,337.00	\$5,321.00	30.13
Spencer Van Etten	\$28,243.00	\$63,353.00	\$44,051.00	\$19,302.00	\$8,941.00	31.66
Watkins Glen	\$53,463.00	\$64,756.00	\$36,720.00	\$28,036.00	\$25,427.00	47.56
Total	\$757,976.00*	\$1,033,050.00	\$690,765.00	\$342,285.00	\$415,691.00	54.84

*Conservative estimate of savings, does not include districts' current cost of materials, supplies, etc.

GMP:mtm
Proposal 1A
1/4/05

17.5 Staff Without Furniture and O&M

2A

Proposed Central Business Office Service Cost

Budget Item	Cost
11. Salaries 17.5 FTE (603,000)	\$603,000.00
12. Attendance Incentive 0.50%	\$3,015.00
13. Comp Insurance (0.90%)	\$5,427.00
14. New York State ERS	\$72,360.00
15. ESSA Disability (134.00 x 16)	\$2,144.00
16. Social Security (7.65%)	\$46,130.00
17. Health Insurance (4,632) x 2 single	\$9,264.00
18. Health Insurance (12,120) x 15 family	\$181,800.00
19. Unemployment Insurance (50 x 18)	\$900.00
20. Defined Medical Expense Reimbursement (535 x 18)	\$9,630.00
Total	\$933,670.00

Proposed Central Business Office Service Cost

Materials / Items	Cost without Office Furniture
Equipment	\$5,000.00
Supplies	\$5,000.00
Contractual	\$3,000.00
Mileage	\$1,000.00
Conference / Training	\$1,000.00
Postage	\$1,000.00
Extra Work	\$5,000.00
Computer Services	\$4,736.00
O&M Transfer Charge	\$ 0.00
Total	\$25,736.00

Computers are not included in these charges. Districts have the option of sending the computers that are now being used in their districts or having BOCES purchase new ones for \$1,100. Per machine.

*Approx. \$34,286 for office furniture (desks/chairs/file cabinets/phones) to be purchased in the 04-05 year which would also generate aid for the 05-06 year and reduce the initial set up costs.

\$933,670.00
 \$25,736.00 without OF/O&M
 Total - \$959,406.00

*In this proposal, O&M costs would be spread among current BOCES programs in the first year to reduce up-front costs. Office furniture would be purchased in 2004-05 and generate approx-imately the following aid in 2005-06:

Elmira	\$14,812
Elmira Heights	\$ 1,488
Horseheads	\$ 5,544
Odessa-Montour	\$ 802
Spencer-Van Etten	\$ 1,635
Watkins Glen	<u>\$ 1,363</u>
	\$25,644

17.5 Staff Without Furniture and O&M

2A

District Cost Analysis

Program Coordinator Position	
Salary	\$80,000.00
Attendance incentive	\$400.00
Retirement	\$9,600.00
Comp.	\$720.00
Disability	N/A
Social Security	\$6,120.00
Health Insurance	\$12,120.00 family
Unemployment	\$50.00
Medical reimbursement	\$535.00
Total	\$109,545.00

Program coordinator's cost based on RWADA		
Districts	RWADA	\$109,545.00
Elmira	45.06	\$49,361.00
Elmira Heights	7.17	\$7,854.00
Horseheads	27.57	\$30,202.00
Odessa Montour	5.44	\$5,959.00
Spencer Van Etten	6.74	\$7,383.00
Watkins Glen	8.02	\$8,786.00
Total	100%	\$109,545.00

STAFF COST

16.5 FTE

TOTAL SALARY AND FRINGE FOR 16.5 STAFF = \$824,125.00

FTE = \$49,947.00

TOTAL MATERIAL / SUPPLIES / OVERHEAD = \$25,736.00

FTE = \$1,560.00

TOTAL FTE = \$51,507.00

17.5 Staff Without Furniture and O&M

2A

Districts	Coordinator Cost	FTE	# of Staff x FTE (\$51,507.00) Without Office Furniture/O&M	Computer Cost 1,100.00 Per Machine If Requested	Total District Cost Without Office Furniture/O&M
Elmira	\$49,361.00	9	\$463,563.00		\$512,924.00
Elmira Heights	\$7,854.00	1	\$51,507.00		\$59,361.00
Horseheads	\$30,202.00	4	\$206,028.00		\$236,230.00
Odessa Montour	\$5,959.00	.5	\$25,754.00		\$31,713.00
Spencer Van Etten	\$7,383.00	1	\$51,507.00		\$58,890.00
Watkins Glen	\$8,786.00	1	\$51,507.00		\$60,293.00
Total	\$109,545.00	16.5	\$849,866.00		\$959,411.00

Districts	Estimated Current Cost	Projected Cost Without Office Furniture/O&M	Projected BOCES Aid	Net Cost To Districts	Districts Savings with BOCES Aid	% Savings
Elmira	\$429,019.00	\$512,924.00	\$367,160.00	\$145,764.00	\$283,255.00	66.02
Elmira Heights	\$54,513.00	\$59,361.00	\$36,881.00	\$22,480.00	\$32,033.00	58.76
Horseheads	\$175,080.00	\$236,230.00	\$137,431.00	\$98,799.00	\$76,281.00	43.57
Odessa Montour	\$17,658.00	\$31,713.00	\$19,884.00	\$11,829.00	\$5,829.00	33.01
Spencer Van Etten	\$28,243.00	\$58,890.00	\$40,538.00	\$18,352.00	\$9,891.00	35.02
Watkins Glen	\$53,463.00	\$60,293.00	\$33,792.00	\$26,501.00	\$26,962.00	50.43
Total	\$757,976.00	\$959,411.00	\$635,686.00	\$323,725.00	\$434,251.00	57.29

*Conservative estimate of savings, does not include districts' current cost of materials, supplies, etc.

GMP:mtm
Proposal 2A (17.5 staff w/o O&M & Furniture)
1/4/05