

STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

*Sunnycrest Center
1717 Philo Road, Suite 24
Urbana, Illinois 61802-6099*



*Joanne E. Maitland
Merit Board Chair
Lewis T. (Tom) Morelock
Executive Director*

January 25, 2011

Dr. Elaine Maimon
President
Governors State University

Dr. Gebe Ejigu
Executive Vice President/Chief of Staff
Governors State University

Ms. Gail Bradshaw
Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity
Designated Employer Representative
Governors State University

Mr. David Dixon
Internal Auditor
Governors State University

Mrs. Joanne E. Maitland
Merit Board Chair
State Universities Civil Service System

Ms. Kristi DeLaurentiis
Merit Board Member
State Universities Civil Service System

The State Universities Civil Service System respectfully submits the Final Audit Report of the Biennial Institutional Compliance Audit conducted at Governors State University. The audit period tested was December 1, 2007 through March 31, 2010. This report is intended to communicate the final material findings, recommendations and corresponding institutional responses formulated through a comprehensive human resource compliance and operational audit.

On behalf of the audit staff, we thank Governors State University and their human resource staff for a very productive audit experience. If there are any questions or a personal briefing on any item is desired, please call Lucinda M. Neitzel (217) 278-3150 ext. 239.

[REDACTED]
Lewis T. (Tom) Morelock
Executive Director

Governors State University Final Audit Report



State Universities Civil Service System Compliance Audit

January 25, 2011

Audit Period

December 1, 2007 to March 31, 2010

Prepared by:



Lucinda M. Neitzel
Audit and Advisory Services Manager

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Table of Contents

Introduction.....1
Executive Summary.....3
Material Findings, Recommendations, Institutional Corrective Action Plans and Additional
Auditor Comments4

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Introduction

PURPOSE

The State Universities Civil Service System was created as a separate entity of the State of Illinois and is under the control of the University Civil Service Merit Board as set forth in Section 36b(3) of the State Universities Civil Service Act (Act) ([110 ILCS 70/36b\(3\)](#)). The purpose of the State Universities Civil Service System is to establish a sound program of personnel administration for its constituent employers (110 ILCS 70/36b(2)). To achieve this purpose, the Merit Board has been given a broad range of statutory powers and duties, which include the power to make rules to carry out the purpose of the State Universities Civil Service System and to appoint an Executive Director to administer the Act (110 ILCS 70/36d(11) and (12)).

As part of its statutory power, the Merit Board has promulgated rules that delegate to the Executive Director the authority and responsibility for conducting “ongoing audit programs of all Civil Service operations at all places of employment for the purpose of assuring compliance with the [Act (110 ILCS 70/36b et seq.)] and [Part 250 of the Illinois Administrative Code (Code) ([80 Ill. Adm. Code 250](#))] and for improving the programs of personnel administration of its constituent employers” ([80 Ill. Adm. Code §250.140\(c\)](#)).

This report communicates the final outcome of a comprehensive human resource operational audit, which included an on-site evaluation that was conducted July 26-28, 2010.

OVERVIEW

The following Human Resource activities were reviewed and utilized in identifying the Material (Final Audit Report) and Non-material Findings (Supplemental Report):

- **Assignment of Positions to Classes**

The Auditor completes a review of selected job descriptions for timely updates, proper administration, and correct assignment of position classifications. Additional desk audits of selected positions are conducted onsite for appropriateness of position classifications. There is also an evaluation of the Employer’s position audit process and corresponding determinations.

- **Compensation Programs**

The Auditor completes an analysis of the Employer’s use of pay rates and pay ranges, as approved by the Merit Board. An overall evaluation is then conducted of the Employer’s compensation program and initiatives to meet requirements of pay equity within the Employer’s market area.

- **Examination Program**
The Auditor conducts a review of pre-employment testing operations. This includes test administration, admission procedures of applicants to examinations, license and certification verifications, scheduling, security, and register management.
- **Administration of Employment and Separation Procedures**
The Auditor reviews the Employer's business processes and procedures related to the employment cycle, including pre-employment activities, probationary and status employment, and employment separation programs. There is also an assessment of the Employer's utilization and monitoring of non-status appointments.
- **Administration and Employment Protocols of Principal Administrative Appointments (PAA)**
The Auditor completes a review of the employment protocols and assigned responsibilities for Principal Administrative Appointments. This review is conducted to assure compliance with recognized exemption authorization procedures. The Employer's exemption forms and related position descriptions are reviewed and selected incumbent interviews are conducted for validation of approved exemptions. The audit process also includes a review of the Employer's administrative procedures related to these appointments and their approved exemption status.
- **General Review of the Employer's Human Resource Program**
The Auditor completes a general review of the Employer's human resource programs with respect to effectiveness, efficiency and levels of communication to constituencies. There is also an assessment of the recognition and interaction of human resource programs within the Employer's faculty, administrative and support staff employee groups. The impact of new technology on the recordkeeping and processing of information is also an element for review.
- **Other Follow-up Items from Previous Audit**
Other follow-up items from previous audits, as well as other matters deemed necessary and appropriate, may have been reviewed and submitted as additional audit topics.

The following staff members from the System Office, Audit and Advisory Services Division, were directly responsible for conducting various aspects of the audit:

[Lucinda Neitzel, Audit and Advisory Services Manager](#)
[Jeff Brownfield, Manager of Operations Division](#)
[Paula Mitchell, Human Resource Assistant](#)

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Executive Summary
YEAR ENDED -- 2011

The compliance testing performed during this examination was conducted in accordance with State Universities Civil Service Act ([110 ILCS 70/36b et seq.](#)), Part 250 of the Illinois Administrative Code (Code) ([80 Ill. Adm. Code 250](#)), [State Universities Civil Service Procedures Manuals](#), applicable University/agency policies/procedures, and auditing standards.

SUMMARY OF MATERIAL FINDINGS

<u>Number of</u>	<u>This Report</u>
Findings	4
Repeated findings from previous audit®	3®

SCHEDULE OF MATERIAL FINDINGS

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Description</u>
GSU FY11-01	4	FINDINGS (STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE ACT) Improper Register Maintenance and Referral of Candidates
GSU FY11-02	9	Exemption Authorization Applied to Positions That Match Civil Service Classification Specifications
GSU FY11-03	13	Principal Administrative Appointments - Non-Compliance with Triennial Review Standard for Position Descriptions
GSU FY11-04	15	FINDINGS (ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE) Off Campus Employment and Use of Contract Appointments

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

GSU FY11-01 Improper Register Maintenance and Referral of Candidates

Criteria/Standards (i.e., what should exist):

- 1) [State Universities Civil Service Act \(Act\), Section 36d\(7\) Power and Duties of the Merit Board](#)
- 2) [State Universities Civil Service Act \(Act\), Section 36h Appointment](#)
- 3) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.60 \(d\)\(3\)\(5\) Eligible Registers](#)
- 4) [Employment Procedures Manual, Section 1.5 Certification](#)

These reference points establish guidelines for the proper maintenance of employment registers and referral of candidates for status positions. In accordance with the State Universities Civil Service Act, Section 36(d), the “Merit Board shall have the power and duty to cause to be established from the results of examination registers for each class of positions in the classified service of the State Universities Civil Service System, of the persons who shall attain the minimum mark fixed by the Merit Board for the examination; and such persons shall take rank upon the registers as candidates in the order of the relative excellence as determined by examination, without reference to priority of time of examination.”

Section 250.60(d)(3)(5) of the Illinois Administrative Code states in part; “When ties in scores exist on an original entry register or promotional register for a class, all candidates with a tie score, and hence of the same relative excellence, shall be equally eligible to be considered as one of the available candidates certified from the register. No person on the register shall be eligible or available for certification as one of the three persons standing highest on the register if three or more persons are eligible at a higher score level as a result of tie scores. The Employer shall conduct a personal interview with, and shall consider, all candidates certified from the register in this manner prior to making its recommendation for selection, except that a single selecting official for the Employer shall not be required to interview more than once the same candidate, as currently certified from the register, for a position of the same class. A promotional register and/or an original entry register become closed for the purpose of certification of the names of candidates to a particular vacant position at a time established by the Employer.”

Conditions/Facts (i.e., what actually exists):

While on-site, the Auditor reviewed approximately twenty-five (25) newly hired applicant records and position referrals conducted during the audit time frame. Comparisons were made and registers were reconstructed utilizing both E-Test validation and documented registers maintained separately by the Employer. The following observations were noted by the Auditor:

1. The Maintenance Laborer Original Entry Register was reviewed to validate the employment of Percy Cornelious, hired 10/1/08, with an examination score of 94. One vacancy was to be filled in this instance. Among several other candidates listed on the register, the following were referred with examination scores and comments as noted:

<i>Peterson, Robert</i>	100	<i>Requested to Remain on Register</i>
<i>Smith, George</i>	100	<i>9/8/08; Referred to FDM/Not Selected</i>
<i>Foster, Raymond</i>	96	<i>9/8/08; Referred to FDM/Not Selected</i>
<i>Pellicci, Derek</i>	96	<i>9/8/08; Referred to FDM/Not Selected</i>
<i>Slover, David</i>	96	<i>Selected</i>
<i>*Cornelious, Percy</i>	94	<i>9/8/08; Referred to FDM/Removed/Hired 10/1/08</i>
<i>Johnson, Robert</i>	93	<i>Requested to Remain on Register</i>
<i>Myers, Mark</i>	93	<i>Requested to Remain on Register</i>

In this instance, it appears that too many candidates were referred to the department for consideration, since only the top three candidates and any tied scores should have been referred for these two vacancies. This inappropriate action is a statutory violation. The Auditor was unable to determine if and when Robert Peterson was referred for the position, or when David Slover was referred and apparently selected to fill a position. Additionally, the Auditor was unable to determine actual referral dates for several other candidates listed on the applicable classification register. Various comments were included on the register to reflect the presumption that referrals were made to the department for several other candidates with lower scores than those listed above.

The Auditor also noted that there were four (4) other candidates on the register - Jamal Adams, Robert Baggett, Gabriel Przybysz and Jeffrey Williams - tied with Robert Johnson and Mark Myers with an examination score of 93. Documentation did not appear to indicate that these applicants were contacted by the HR Department or if referral was actually made to the department for consideration.

2. The Clerical Assistant Original Entry Register was reviewed to validate the employment of Nyree Washington, hired 5/26/09, with an examination score of 92. It appears by the comments noted on the register that two vacancies were to be filled in this instance. Among other candidates listed on the register, the following were referred with examination scores and comments as noted:

<i>Brooks, Danielle</i>	100	<i>4/29/09; Only Interested in Full Time</i>
<i>Minefree, Carla</i>	97	<i>4/29/09; Referred to Registrar's</i>
<i>*Washington, Nyree</i>	92	<i>4/29/09; Referred to Registrar's; Hired</i>
<i>Glenn, Rochelle</i>	82	<i>No Response for 4/29/09 Referral</i>
<i>*Knox, Angela</i>	81	<i>4/29/09; Referred to Registrar's; Hired</i>
<i>Easterling, Ardia</i>	78	<i>4/29/09; Referred to Registrar's</i>
<i>Malvin, Johnnie</i>	78	<i>Not Referred</i>

Again, in this instance, it appears that too many candidates were referred to the department for consideration, since only the top four candidates and any tied scores should have been referred to the employing department. This is a statutory violation. The Auditor was unable to determine if Johnnie Malvin was in fact referred with a score of 78 since Ardia Easterling was referred with the same score.

Upon further review of audit materials, it was determined that Angela Knox was employed into a full time appointment on 5/26/09 and that Nyree Washington was dismissed during probation on 2/8/10. Consequently, it would appear that Knox was improperly referred and employed outside of the top four names on the register, which is a statutory violation. Additionally, the Auditor noted that the applicant with the score of 100 indicated that they were only interested in full time employment however both Nyree Washington and Angela Knox were hired into full time appointments for this classification based on the register information provided.

3. The Senior Library Specialist E-Test Original Entry register was reviewed to validate the employment of Judith Hanacek, hired 8/18/08 with an examination score of 85. The Auditor reviewed the saved register within E-Test as of the referral date of 2/11/08 with observations as follows:

It appears that the top three scores were referred to the department. Only the top three names and tie scores should have been referred for this position. Three (3) candidates with an examination score of 75 were referred to the department improperly with one of those candidates being offered a position and declining the offer. Again, this is a statutory violation.

4. The Office Support Specialist E-Test Original Entry register was reviewed to validate the employment of Sandra Kawanna, hired 8/16/08 with an examination score of 78. The Auditor reviewed the saved register within E-Test as of the referral date of 7/1/08 with observations as follows:

It appeared that candidate Araceli Marrufo was eligible to be referred to the vacant position based on an examination score of 86, but was not referred. Consequently, this led to the improper referral of three other candidates with a lower score of 76, with one of those candidates, Tracy Paynes, being selected to fill the position effective 8/16/08. Again, this is a statutory violation.

5. The Senior Library Specialist E-Test register was reviewed to validate the reclassification of Pam Taylor, effective 4/1/10 with an examination score of 75. The Auditor reviewed the saved register within the E-Test system and determined that the improper code was used to indicate the register was Original Entry instead of Promotional.

In general, after a thorough review of the employment registers for this Employer, several observations leading to significant violations were noted. Without proper notations in the comments sections and the subsequent removal from the register of those applicants employed by the university, the registers were essentially useless in validating employment decisions. This improper documentation created some significant statutory violations. In many instances, it simply was not possible to determine exactly how the register looked at the time it was utilized or how applicants were referred. Additionally, it appears more candidates were being referred for vacancies than are allowed under basic regulatory guidelines, which is technically a statutory violation and puts the Employer at risk for other significant liability regarding their final employment actions.

Cause (i.e., why deficient condition occurred):

According to the Employer during the exit conference, it was their understanding that referring the top three scores from the register, instead of the top three names including ties, was proper and met the intent of employment provisions outlined in the State Universities Civil Service Act, Illinois Administrative Code, and System Office Procedures. Additionally, registers were not properly maintained or documented, candidates were not removed upon hire, and proper comments/notations were lacking in some instances.

Effect (i.e., impact of the problem):

Inaccurate documentation and improper application of the 'Rule of Three' resulted in several candidates within various classifications being improperly referred and in some instances, employed outside of fundamental statutory guidelines. In some cases, candidates with higher scores were inappropriately skipped in the referral process, while those with lower scores were inappropriately referred for open positions.

Finding from Previous Audit:

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2008.

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Employer immediately implement practices and procedures that strictly adhere to employment protocols with respect to register maintenance by insuring that all candidates have been referred and hired in accordance with proper statutory guidelines. The inability to determine how candidates are referred to departments on the date the register was frozen makes it impossible to validate compliance. If necessary, the System Office can provide training and follow-up reviews as necessary to assist the Employer in achieving compliance in this regard. Records must be properly maintained to validate statutory compliance in every employment action taken. To insure that internal business procedures have been effectively implemented to address this issue, the Employer is asked to provide follow-up quarterly reports listing their new civil service employment actions and provide register documentation to validate their decisions in each case.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Gail M. Bradshaw, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity

For several years, our practice has been to refer the top 3 scores for each vacancy. This is the first time that this topic has been an audit finding. Now that it has been brought to our attention and been clarified, we have changed our practice to be in compliance.

Notes for each finding:

1. Maintenance Laborer: There was 1 vacancy in 2008. Peterson, Smith, Foster, Pellicci, Slover and Cornelious referred in accordance with prior practice. Cornelious hired.
2. Clerical Assistant: There were 2 vacancies in 2009. Minefree, Knox, Easterling, Malvin and Washington referred in accordance with prior practice. Washington and Knox hired 5/26/09 as 9-month seasonal appointments.
3. Senior Library Specialist: There were 2 vacancies in 2008, so we were allowed to send 4 scores. Rebeck, Taff Fuiz, Hanacek, DiMaggio, Arrington, Staples, Wilkins, Harris, Rickhoff, Griffin, Marquardt, Gordon, Newsom and Dombrous referred in accordance with prior practice. Hanacek and DiMaggio hired.
4. Office Support Specialist: There were 2 vacancies in 2008. Donaldson, Marrufo, Dawkins, Ciosek, Kawana, Easterling, Cozzolino and Paynes referred in accordance with prior practice. Kawana and Paynes hired. Marrufo was offered 1 position and declined it because of the salary.
5. Senior Library Specialist: Exam taken as result of audit. Exam score was changed to promotional score.

We don't feel that training is necessary in this area. We will submit quarterly reports as requested.

Additional Auditor Comments:

Regulatory requirements, and corresponding audit sampling and testing procedures, regarding this topic have remained consistent for the past 10-20 years. Previous biennial audits, and associated testing processes, regarding this topic do not confirm that this inappropriate register referral practice has been in place for several years at Governors State University.

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

GSU FY11-02 Exemption Authorization Applied to Positions That Match Civil Service Classification Specifications

Criteria/Standards (i.e., what should exist):

- 1) [State Universities Civil Service Act \(Act\), Section 36\(e\)](#)
- 2) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.30\(a\) Coverage](#)
- 3) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 1.1 Overview](#)
- 4) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 6.3 System Office Review](#)
- 5) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 8.2 Changing an Exempt Position to a Civil Service Position](#)

These guidelines provide that all positions are Civil Service, except as categorically outlined. Exemptions are allowed in accordance with procedures, requiring either documented exemption approval from the System Office or verification of exemption authorization through the position descriptions when general titles are used. Accordingly, a periodic review and update of position descriptions are required to confirm that these exemption authorizations remain valid.

Periodic job description review and update procedures may indicate that a position originally identified as a Principal Administrative Appointment (PAA) may have incorrectly been classified or may have changed to the point whereby a department now must convert this position, and any employee currently occupying these positions, to an identified and appropriate Civil Service classification.

In this respect, biennial compliance audits of University System employers will include, but not be limited to:

- Comprehensive review of position descriptions
- Compliance with statutory and procedural criteria for exemptions
- Adequacy and thoroughness of related employment procedures
- Adequacy of internal review and approval processes
- Thoroughness and accuracy of quarterly reporting requirements
- Any other associated special interest items

When it has been determined and established that the job responsibilities and duties of a position do not meet the criteria for a PAA exemption under Section 36e(3), the Employer may

be required to change the position from an exempt appointment to an appropriate Civil Service appointment in a recognized classification.

Conditions/Facts (i.e., what actually exists):

Through a review of approximately sixty (60) position descriptions, including on-site interviews with various exempted employees, it was determined that eleven (11) exempted positions listed below were performing duties matching the specifications for various Civil Service classifications. These positions are listed below, with the corresponding Civil Service classification match.

Employee	PAA Title	Civil Service Classification Match
Jennifer Finn	Assistant Director of Admissions	Admissions & Records Series or Program Adviser
Sharon Garey	Assistant To	Assistant Director of Alumni Relations, Administrative Assistant Series, or Administrative Aide
Myisha Meeks	Executive Assistant to VP for Advancement	Administrative Assistant Series, Administrative Aide, or Executive Secretary
Chris Dutton	eLearning Technology Support & Development Specialist	Information Technology Management Series or Information Technology Technical Associate
Noreen Heidelberg	Enrollment Counselor	Admissions & Records Series or Program Adviser
Jolander Jeffries	Debt Management and Veterans Affairs Coordinator	Financial Aid Adviser Series
Jill Stanley	Assistant to the Associate And Assistant Provosts	Administrative Assistant Series or Administrative Aide
William Craig	Associate Director of Admissions	Admissions & Records Series or Program Adviser
Laura Van Horne	Post-Training User Support Representative	Microcomputer Support Specialist Series or Information Technology Support Associate

Leslie Powless	IWCA Advocate	Program Services Aide
Terry Campbell	Specialist	Inventory Records Series

Cause (i.e., why deficient condition occurred):

According to the Employer, 'standard' titles approved for use by the System Office were applied to the majority of the exempted positions.

Effect (i.e., impact of the problem):

A failure to establish appropriate classification plan management protocols that properly update, analyze and evaluate position descriptions leads to unauthorized exemption authorizations, utilization of inappropriate employment protocols, and non-compliance with the Act, Code and Procedures. Consequently, positions are improperly identified and appropriate Civil Service protocols circumvented, significantly increasing the possibility of employment issues.

Finding from Previous Audit:

The Auditor identified five (5) exempted positions that appeared to be performing duties and responsibilities comparable to those found in Civil Service classification(s) in the FY2008 compliance audit and one (1) position in the FY2006 audit. *[Finding Code GSU FY08-01, pages 4-6 and FY2006, page 20].*

One of the positions cited in the previous audit in FY2008, Assistant to MILE Coordinator (163228), expired on June 30, 2010. While on-site, it was discovered that the contract for this position was renewed until June 30, 2011. During the exit conference, the Employer stated that positions are not reviewed at the time of contract expiration/renewal and that their internal procedures would change significantly should the necessity to do so become required.

Recommendation:

In accordance with the statutory intent and basic premise contained in [Section 36\(e\)](#) of the Act and other related procedures, the assignment of positions to Civil Service classifications when the position description matches appropriate classification specifications must take precedence over the use of exemptions through utilizing general titles.

We recommend that the Employer complete an in-depth review of the position descriptions for the positions listed to further determine if they meet the specifications of the recommended Civil Service classifications. If it is determined that these positions match the specifications of the recommended Civil Service classifications, they should be transitioned to a Civil Service appointment as soon as possible. *It is strongly recommended that these positions be moved immediately, or at the next employment contract renewal date if applicable. Specifically, positions that are flagged as a result of Auditor recommendations discovered through the compliance audit process must be reviewed as a matter of standard protocol at the next contract renewal date.* We refer the Employer to the [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section](#)

[8.2, Changing an Exempt Position to a Civil Service Position](#) for guidance in transitioning these positions to appropriate Civil service Appointments.

The Employer may also utilize the Pilot Program classification designations and transition the positions to be reviewed to one of these classifications if appropriate. These [Pilot Program](#) classifications utilize more flexible employment protocols and would offer a more transparent transition.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Gail M. Bradshaw, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity

Van Horne, Powless and Campbell will be reviewed in June 2011 when their contracts are reviewed for renewal.

All others will be reviewed when they are vacant.

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

GSU FY11-03 Principal Administrative Appointments - Non-Compliance with Triennial Review Standard for Position Descriptions

Criteria/Standards (i.e., what should exist):

- 1) [State Universities Civil Service Act \(Act\), Section 36\(e\)](#)
- 2) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.30\(a\) Coverage](#)
- 3) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 1.1 Overview](#)
- 4) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 6.3 System Office Review](#)

The Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 6.3 System Office Review states, "As a means of helping insure the maintenance of position changes, University System employers shall establish and implement a cyclic review program wherein position descriptions for all exempt positions are reviewed by the University System employer for currency of job content and title *no less often than once every three years.*"

Conditions/Facts (i.e., what actually exists):

Sixty (60) Principal Administrative Appointment position descriptions were requested as the test sample for compliance with triennial review standards. Upon initial review and check-in of the audit materials, it was determined that nine (9) of those position descriptions requested were out of date and two (2) were not received by the Auditor.

Cause (i.e., why deficient condition occurred):

The Employer has not maintained adequate business processes to properly manage PAA position descriptions as procedurally required.

Effect (i.e., impact of the problem):

Classification plan management protocols include base line standards for exemption authorization and evolve simply around one central concept, an evaluation of the position description. The cornerstone of proper position control management lies with the proper administration and maintenance of the position description. This is a fundamental necessity. Without this component in place, exemption authorization simply cannot be validated resulting in significant liability consequences.

Finding from Previous Audit:

Five (5) principal administrative appointment position descriptions, of twenty-six (26) tested, were not in compliance with cyclical review standards. [*Finding Code NMGSU FY08-06, pages 11-12*]

Recommendation:

Consistent with the Exemption Procedures Manual, it is strongly recommended that the Employer immediately establish business procedures to properly maintain the position descriptions for these exempted positions. The Employer is asked to provide any updates in this respect as business processes are developed or implemented.

It is recommended that Employer emphasize the fundamental importance of the establishment of a periodic position development and review process for all Principal Administrative Appointments/Exemptions, in accordance with the Exemption Procedures Manual. Employees directly responsible for performing the position description review and authorization of civil service exemptions should routinely be properly informed and trained regarding classification plan management concepts, specifically those directly related to the exemption authorization process and corresponding procedural requirements.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Gail M. Bradshaw, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity

We have assigned a staff member to monitor job description dates. Supervisors are notified when their employees' job description is out-of-date. They are requested to submit an updated, signed job description by a specific date.

In response to the material requested for this audit, an extra effort was made to secure as many current job descriptions as possible.

Governors State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

GSU FY11-04 Off Campus Employment and Use of Contract Appointments

Criteria/Standards (i.e., what should exist):

- 1) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.80\(b\) Contract Appointments](#)
- 2) [Employment and Separation Procedures Manual, Section 3.3 Contract Appointments](#)

Guidelines for Contract Appointments are prescribed in [Section 250.80\(b\)](#) of the Code and in [Section 3.3](#) of the Employment and Separation Procedures Manual. Employers recommend, to the University System Executive Director, positions for contract appointments if the work is covered by contractual agreements between off-campus organizations served by the System and such work is either:

- 1) Under the supervision of any organization of the State of Illinois, or
- 2) Under the supervision of other organizations and performed at an off-campus location.

All incumbents with Contract Appointments shall receive notices of employment, with position control numbers assigned. Such notices must be clearly marked as **Contract Appointments** and the System Office shall be notified *at the time* of the appointment.

Conditions/Facts (i.e., what actually exists):

The Auditor reviewed a list of seventeen (17) off-campus positions reported during the audit time frame as Contract Appointments. After further review of documentation on file at the System Office, Contract Appointments were requested and approved only for the following classifications/locations listed below:

Classification	Department/Program	Date of Request	Work Location
Staff Clerk	DCFS/RMTS	6/5/2008	Springfield
Trainer	DCFS/RMTS	6/18/2008	Springfield
Business/Administrative Associate	DCFS/Ed. Access Project	12/12/2008	Chicago
Program Administrative Assistant	DCFS/Ed. Access Project	12/23/2008	Chicago
IT Support Associate	DCFS/OITS Support Staff	5/13/2009	Chicago

Among the audit material submitted by the Employer during the current audit time frame, it was determined that the Information Technology Support Associate position, approved by the System Office on May 13, 2009 was not currently filled.

The positions listed below were not submitted to the System Office for approval prior to being filled nor was the System Office notified of the appointments made to these positions in accordance with regulatory and procedural guidelines:

Employee Name	Department	Classification	Appointment Date	Work Location
Alferink, Paul	DCFS	Office Support Associate	8/16/07	Springfield
Frierson, Aja	DCFS	Office Support Assistant	7/16/07	Chicago
Johnson, Phyllis	DCFS	Staff Clerk	9/4/01	Chicago
Jones, Carla	DCFS	Office Support Associate	7/2/07	Springfield
Painter, Sandra	DCFS	Administrative Clerk	5/16/07	Springfield
Staples, Sharron	DCFS	Administrative Clerk	5/16/07	Chicago
Sullivan, Christianna	DCFS	Program Coordinator	9/16/99	Springfield
Watson, Alicia	DCFS	Staff Clerk	6/1/06	Chicago
Winston, Marnie	DCFS	Office Manager	7/1/06	Chicago

Cause (i.e., why deficient condition occurred):

The Employer did not obtain authorization from the System Office and/or provide notification of Contract Appointments to these off-campus positions.

Effect (i.e., impact of the problem):

The failure to follow position and appointment guidelines results in the circumvention of employment obligations that include inappropriate class designation, improper certification and referral of qualified applicants, inadvertent seniority accrual discrepancies, and improper compensation for work performed with off-campus organizations.

Finding from Previous Audit:

All seventeen (17) of the Employer's off-campus positions had not been approved as Contract Appointments. In FY2006, the Auditor identified two (2) authorized Contract Appointments that were filled and not reported to the System Office. *[Finding Code GSU FY08-03, pages 9 -10 and FY06, page 19]*

During the FY2008 compliance audit, the Auditor recommended a review of all off-campus positions to verify that they were appropriate as Contract Appointments and to submit verification requests to the System Office. Further, it was recommended that implementing procedures utilizing specific criteria to request approval of these off-campus positions was essential to alleviating this finding.

The Employer concurred with the Auditor's recommendations and indicated that they revised the approval process, to include review by the System Office prior to filling a Contract Appointment.

Recommendation:

The Auditor recommends that the Employer submit the required documentation for the identified off-campus positions to verify that they are appropriate as Contract Appointments. Requests should be submitted to the System Office providing the following updated information for all positions recommended for Contract Appointments:

- 1) Control Number and Classification Title
- 2) Employing Program's Name
- 3) Sponsoring Department
- 4) Position Description

The Employer is reminded that all incumbents with Contract Appointments shall receive notices of employment and that the System Office is to be notified at the time of the appointment. The Employer is once again asked to implement internal employment protocols to comply with these statutory requirements.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Gail M. Bradshaw, Associate Vice President for Human Resources and Diversity

The System Office will be notified of all requests to fill a contract appointment.

**State Universities Civil Service System
Governors State University
FY2011 Compliance Audit**

Appendix A

***Principal Administrative Appointments
Inaccurate Position Exemption Authorization Applied***

Classification Code/Position Number	Position Title	Recommended Exemption
6012	Assistant Vice President	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
6004	Associate Vice President	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A537	Deputy Vice President/Administration & Finance	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A016	Executive Vice President/Chief of Staff & Treasurer	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A642	Vice President/Advancement CEO Foundation	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
6003	Associate Dean	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
6009	Associate Department Head/Chair	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
6002	Dean	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
6013	Division Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A6881	Assistant Dean (Interim)	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A6831	Vice Provost/Research and GS (Interim)	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A663	Vice Provost of Academic Affairs	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A435	Assistant Provost/Vice President	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A423	Associate Provost/AVP Academic Affairs	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A009	Associate Pre-K Teacher	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
F400DPC	Department Chair	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
F245DPC	Department Chair	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
F212DPC	Department Chair	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
FP266DCI	Department Chair	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
F330DPCI	Department Chair, Interim	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty