

STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

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



*James D. Montgomery
Merit Board Vice Chair
Lewis T. (Tom) Morelock
Executive Director*

October 3, 2013

Dr. Wayne D. Watson
President
Chicago State University

Mr. Larry Pinkelton
Vice President for Administration & Finance
Chicago State University

Dr. Renee D. Mitchell
Director of Human Resources
Designated Employer Representative
Chicago State University

Mr. Kenneth A. Clow III
Chief Internal Auditor
Chicago State University

Mr. James D. Montgomery
Merit Board Vice-Chair
State Universities Civil Service System

Mr. Spencer Leak, Sr.
Merit Board Representative
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 Chicago State University. The audit period tested was November 1, 2010 through November 30, 2012. 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 Chicago 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

Chicago State University Final Audit Report



State Universities Civil Service System Compliance Audit

October 3, 2013

Audit Period

November 1, 2010 to November 30, 2012

Prepared by:



Lucinda M. Neitzel
Audit and Advisory Services Manager

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

Executive Summary 3

Material Findings, Recommendations, Institutional Corrective Action Plans and Additional Auditor Comments 4

Appendices

- Appendix A: Principal Administrative Appointments Matching Civil Service Specifications
- Appendix B: Extra Help Employees Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule
- Appendix C: Extra Help Positions Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule

Chicago 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 February 27 – March 1, 2013.

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 Positions Exempt from Civil Service Guidelines**
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
Danielle Routh, Human Resource Associate

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Executive Summary
YEAR ENDED—FY2013

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	7
Repeated findings from previous audit®	5®

SCHEDULE OF MATERIAL FINDINGS

<u>Item Number</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Description</u>
		FINDINGS (STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE ACT)
CSU FY13-01	4	Basic Record Management and Business Process Deficiencies
CSU FY13-02	8	Improper Register Maintenance and Referral of Candidates®
CSU FY13-03	16	Exemption Authorization Applied to Positions That Match Civil Service Classification Specifications®
CSU FY13-04	22	Employees Paid Outside of Approved Salary Ranges®
		FINDINGS (ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE)
CSU FY13-05	25	Temporary Upgrades Exceeding Thirty-Day Limitation®
CSU FY13-06	27	Non-Compliance with Extra Help Employment and Position Limitations®
CSU FY13-07	31	Failure to Provide Verification of Probationary Evaluations

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

CSU FY13-01 Basic Record Management and Business Process Deficiencies

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

- 1) *State Universities Civil Service Act (Act), Section 70/36b(2)*
- 2) *Illinois Administrative Code (Code), Section 250.140 Delegation of Authority and Responsibilities*

Section 70/36b(2) of the Act states, “The purpose of the University System is to establish a sound program of personnel administration for the Illinois Community College Board, Southern Illinois University, Chicago State University, Eastern Illinois University, Governors State University, Illinois State University, Northeastern Illinois University, Northern Illinois University, Western Illinois University, University of Illinois, State Universities Civil Service System, State Universities Retirement System, the Illinois Student Assistance Commission, and the Board of Higher Education. All certificates, appointments, and promotions to positions in these agencies and institutions shall be made solely on the basis of merit and fitness, to be ascertained by examination, except as specified in Section 36e.”

As stated in Section 250.140 of the Code, “Delegation of Authority and Responsibilities”:

- a) “Delegation to the Executive Director. The Executive Director is delegated the authority and responsibility to effectively administer the State Universities Civil Service System in accordance with the Act and this Part. The Executive Director may be further delegated the authority and responsibility to act on behalf of the Merit Board by specific authorization or direction of the Merit Board.”
- b) “Delegation by the Executive Director. The Executive Director is authorized to delegate to the employer, and to members of the University System staff, such duties and responsibilities as, in his/her judgment, are appropriate and effective for the efficient administration of the service of the System to its constituent institutions and agencies.”
- c) “Conduct of Audits. The Executive Director shall conduct ongoing audit programs of all Civil Service operations at all places of employment for the purpose of assuring compliance with the Act and this Part and for improving the programs of personnel administration of its constituent employers and shall prepare, distribute, and follow up on audit reports in accordance with Merit Board direction.”

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

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

Consistent with standard protocols for the FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor selected a sampling of employee personnel records for review during the on-site portion of the audit. The purpose of this review is to determine whether the employment protocols utilized by the Employer are adequate to ensure compliance with the Act, Code, and System Procedures. Further, the Auditor must evaluate whether the Employer has established a sound program of personnel administration.

The Auditor requested the review of thirty-six (36) personnel records for those employees newly hired within the audit time frame, and three (3) additional personnel records for employees reallocated from other classifications. In general, employment records and associated documents were either incomplete or simply non-existent. In this respect, the following discrepancies were noted:

- The Employer was unable to locate the employment record of Richard Rodriguez, Network Engineer II, whose date of appointment was March 1, 2012.
- Of the three (3) reallocation transaction records reviewed and referenced above, the Employer was unable to locate examination information for Minnie Lee, Purchasing Officer I.
- The employment records of Marsean Phillips and Shanina Jenkins did not contain resumes or employment applications to determine whether the applicants met the minimum acceptable qualifications (MAQ's) for admittance to the examination.
- The employment records of Alonzo Hedgepeth and Javier Hernandez did not contain evidence that the employees possessed an appropriate driver's license as outlined in the Minimum Acceptable Qualifications (MAQ's) for the Parking Services Agent I and Mail Messenger classifications respectively.
- Employment registers for eight (8) candidates did not contain referral (freeze) dates. Therefore, the Auditor was unable to confirm in each instance whether the proper candidates, consistent with statutory provisions regarding the 'Rule of 3', were referred to departments for interview at specific points in time.

- Of the employment records reviewed, probationary evaluations were not found in fourteen (14) instances.

(The specifics regarding employment registers and probationary evaluations are outlined in further detail later in this report.)

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

Employment records and their associated personnel transaction documents were not properly established, maintained, or documented. In several instances, Civil Service personnel records and associated employment documents were either inadequate or simply unavailable.

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

The failure to establish and maintain a sound program of personnel administration with respect to Civil Service employment has significant consequences and increased liability risk for the Employer. The Employer was unable to demonstrate the validity of their overall employment process. These poor recordkeeping practices resulted in the inability to demonstrate whether candidates were properly referred and/or employed within fundamental statutory guidelines.

Finding from Previous Audit:

No findings in this overall topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2011. Previous findings cited separately are outlined later in this report.

Recommendation:

It is strongly recommended that the Employer immediately implement practices and procedures that strictly adhere to proper employment records maintenance by insuring that all candidates have been properly evaluated for qualifications, and subsequently referred and/or employed in accordance with statutory guidelines. The inability to determine whether candidates meet the Minimum Acceptable Qualifications (MAQ's), or demonstrate how candidates are referred to departments on the date an employment register was frozen, or validate examination and probationary evaluation information is clearly inadequate. **The Employer's 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 Auditor will schedule a supplemental on-site audit in February 2014 to specifically review employment records for Civil Service employees hired from September 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014. The System Office is also available to provide additional resources for training and development of business processes to insure future compliance in this respect.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will implement practices and procedures that adhere to proper employment records maintenance by insuring that all candidates have been properly evaluated for qualifications, and subsequently referred and/or employed in accordance with statutory guidelines.

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

CSU FY13-02 Improper Register Maintenance and Referral of Candidates

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

- 1) *State Universities Civil Service Act (Act), Section 70/36d(7) Power and Duties of the Merit Board*
- 2) *State Universities Civil Service Act (Act), Section 70/36h Appointment*
- 3) *Illinois Administrative Code (Code), Section 250.60(d)(3)(5) Certification from 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 36d(7), "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 thirty-five (35) newly employed applicant records and position referrals completed during the audit time frame. Regarding register maintenance, the Auditor determined that the Employer did not properly maintain information components to validate their employment actions. The Auditor was unable to validate actual

referral (freeze) dates in several of these instances, or determine when the applicant register was referred out to departments for interview and consideration. Additionally, register comments regarding the status of the actual employment transactions were either non-existent on standard registers, or utilized improperly within the E-Test register maintenance system. For classifications whose examinations were given through the E-Test system, the Auditor was unable to determine the accuracy of these registers since the Employer failed to save the register records when the positions were referred.

In reviewing employment registers to validate statutory compliance with respect to testing, referral, and implementation of the 'Rule of Three', the Auditor noted several documentation maintenance and potential employment issues. The following observations and discrepancies were noted below:

1. The Network Engineer II Original Entry Register was reviewed to validate the employment of Richard Rodriguez, hired 3/1/2012, with an examination score of 71. As noted in the previous finding, critical employment records regarding this candidate were either missing or non-existent when the Auditor conducted the on-site portion of the audit.

It should be noted that the Employer did provide a register, with details outlined below, for this classification. However, a referral (freeze) date was not noted or otherwise provided by the Employer.

<i>Essex, Lowell</i>	<i>101</i>	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Coleman, Jackie</i>	<i>91</i>	<i>Hired 4/2/2012</i>
<i>Gatmatian, Rolando</i>	<i>90 PROM</i>	<i>Request Address Change 7/9/2012</i>
<i>Jenkins, Quincy</i>	<i>77</i>	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Granjean, Reginald</i>	<i>77 PROM</i>	<i>Accept Promotion 8/16/2011</i>
<i>Weatherspoon, Deborah</i>	<i>74</i>	<i>Accept Promotion 3/16/2011</i>
<i>*Rodriguez, Richard</i>	<i>71</i>	<i>Hired 3/1/2012</i>

Of particular concern regarding this register is the 'PROM' notation, which appears to indicate that Rolando Gatmatian and Reginald Granjean were both Promotional candidates on the Network Engineer II register at the time an employment decision was made with respect to Richard Rodriguez'. It should be noted that as a result of the layoff of Rolando Gatmatian on 5/29/2010, his name and score should not have appeared on this register as Promotional since he was no longer employed. (His name would appear on the Reemployment register in the Network Specialist II classification.) Additionally, Reginald Granjean's examination score of 90 as Promotional would be inappropriate since he was already serving in the Network Engineer II classification as of 4/29/2010. The register also indicates that Deborah Weatherspoon accepted a promotion into this classification as of 3/16/2011; however, her name did not appear on the reclassification log document submitted by the Employer. Previous audit records indicate that Ms. Weatherspoon was previously employed in the Systems Administrator II classification, therefore this transaction was likely a reallocation transaction and her name

would have appeared on this register as an Original Entry candidate and not a Promotional candidate, as noted above.

Based on what can reasonably be determined with respect to the employment action of Richard Rodriguez, it appears that other candidates were referred to the department for consideration irrespective of examination score or register status. Due to the lack of detail and comments noted on this particular register, it appears candidates were referred and selected in the improper sequence. Consequently, the Auditor was unable to determine what actually occurred or validate whether any of the candidate referrals for this classification were in compliance with established regulatory guidelines.

2. The Residence Hall Attendant Original Entry Register was reviewed to validate the employment of Traci Driver, hired 11/16/2011, with an examination score of 100. A referral (freeze) date of 10/26/2011 was provided by the Employer, but only for the selected applicant. The register itself did not indicate that this was in fact the actual date of referral, and it appeared that several candidates were referred to the departments at the same time for consideration irrespective of examination score. Based on the comments listed on this particular register, it appears too many candidates were referred and in the improper sequence:

<i>Fredricks, Tyeshia</i>	100	<i>Letter Sent: 8/11/2011, No Response</i>
<i>Dukes, Bettie</i>	100	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
*Driver, Traci	100	Hired 11/16/2011
<i>Jordan, Charles</i>	100	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Smith, Samantha</i>	100	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Byles, Deborah</i>	100	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Norman, Kendale</i>	96	<i>Letter Sent: 8/11/2011, No Response</i>
<i>Cooper, Ariel</i>	96	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Wilson, Simone</i>	96	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Danzy, Samantha</i>	96	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Jean-Baptiste, Jude</i>	93	<i>Letter Sent: 8/11/2011, No Response</i>
<i>Steverson, Derek</i>	93	<i>R/R Letter Sent: 8/12/2012, Retain</i>
<i>Wright, Emma</i>	89	<i>Letter Sent: 8/11/2011, No Response</i>
<i>Pointer, Valencia</i>	85	<i>Letter Sent: 8/11/2011, Retain</i>
<i>Owens, Augustine</i>	85	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Westbrooks, Monica</i>	85	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>White, Candice</i>	81	<i>Letter Sent: 8/11/2011, Retain</i>
<i>Lewis, Kenneth</i>	81	<i>No Comments Listed</i>

Since there were few comments noted on the register, the Auditor was unable to determine what occurred or validate whether any of the candidate referrals for this classification were in fact appropriate or in compliance with established regulatory guidelines.

3. The Mail Messenger Original Entry register was reviewed to validate the employment of Javier Hernandez, hired 2/16/2011 with an examination score of 73. On this register, the

Employer did not provide any type of employment status in the comments section. Among other candidates listed on the register, the following were referred with examination scores as noted:

<i>Terrell, Richard</i>	92	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Sullivan, Jannette</i>	85	"
<i>Gray, Darrell</i>	74	"
<i>Taylor, James</i>	73	"
<i>*Hernandez, Javier</i>	73	"
<i>Jennings, Sonya</i>	72	"

Based on the limited amount of information contained in this employment register, it appears that other candidates were passed over in favor of another candidate with a lower score. However, without status codes or comments referenced in this register, the Auditor was simply unable to validate compliance in this respect.

4. The Program Services Aide Original Entry register was reviewed to validate the employment of QueShawn Williams, hired 11/1/2012 with an examination score of 99. The referral date, which was not contained on the register document, was determined through other employment records to be 10/10/2012. Additionally, on this register the Employer did not provide any type of employment status in the comments section. Among other candidates listed on the register, the following were referred with examination scores as noted:

<i>Rodriguez, Alfredo</i>	100	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Jackson, Dallas</i>	100	"
<i>Peeler-Jones, Janet</i>	100	"
<i>Wilkins, Elder</i>	100	"
<i>Epps, Marilyn</i>	100	"
<i>Hooker, Keith</i>	99	"
<i>Gilmore, Janice</i>	99	"
<i>Mannie, Alicia</i>	99	"
<i>George, Margo</i>	99	"
<i>*Williams, QueShawn</i>	99	"
<i>Julian, Barbara</i>	99	"
<i>LeFrere, Jermaine</i>	99	"
<i>Hull, Sakina</i>	99	"
<i>Banks, Cherise</i>	99	"
<i>Siler, Iceiss</i>	99	"
<i>McPherson, Shani</i>	99	"
<i>Myrthil, Samantha</i>	99	"
<i>Wright, Patricia</i>	98	"
<i>Barnes, Robin</i>	98 PROM	"
<i>(8) Other Candidates</i>	98	"
<i>Sullivan, Jannette</i>	97	"
<i>Sims, Jordan</i>	96	"
<i>Robinson, Kavata</i>	96	"

<i>Gauthier, Laura</i>	95	“
<i>Robinson, Nikita</i>	94	“
<i>Jenkins, Mildred</i>	94	“

While the selected candidate obtained an examination score of 99, it appears that several other candidates, irrespective of register placement, were also referred for consideration into the vacant position. Based on the limited amount of information contained in this employment register, it appears that the candidates that scored 100 were passed over in favor of another candidate with a lower score. However, without status codes or comments referenced in this register, the Auditor was simply unable to validate compliance in this respect.

Of particular concern regarding this employment register, Robin Barnes was listed as Promotional with a score of 98, however the Program Services Aide classification is a stand-alone class, therefore this candidate could not have been by definition a Promotional candidate. Instead, the likely transaction was considered a Reallocation and her name would have appeared on this register as an Original Entry candidate and not a Promotional candidate, as noted above.

- The Grounds Worker Original Entry E-Test register was reviewed to validate the employment of Marsean Phillips, hired 11/16/2011 with an examination score of 75. However, the Employer did not save the register at the time candidates were referred and the register obtained by the Auditor did not provide status code information. Among other candidates listed on the register, the following were referred with examination scores as noted:

<i>Robinson, Dajuan</i>	82	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Cardenas, Ismael</i>	77	“
<i>Montgomery, Clifford</i>	76	“
*Phillips, Marsean	75	“
<i>Pyburn, Lance</i>	75	“
<i>Richmond, Lewis</i>	72	“

Based on the limited amount of information contained in this employment register, it appears that other candidates were passed over in favor of another candidate with a lower score. However, without status codes or comments referenced in this register, the Auditor was simply unable to validate compliance in this respect.

- The Housing Officer Original Entry E-Test register was reviewed to validate the employment of Monica Westbrooks, hired 5/16/12 with an examination score of 90. Again, the Employer did not save the appropriate register as of the referral date within the E-Test system. However, in reviewing how the register appeared the day prior to this candidate’s appointment, and comparing the placement among other candidates listed on the register, the following candidates were referred/interviewed with examination scores and comments as noted below:

<i>Davis, Shadonna</i>	100	<i>Interviewed 4/3/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Arnold, Peggy</i>	100	<i>Interviewed 4/3/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>McDowell, Natasha</i>	100	<i>Interviewed 4/2/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Styles, Omega</i>	100	<i>Interviewed 4/3/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Marshall, Tyrone</i>	100	<i>Interviewed 4/2/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Parker, Brandy</i>	100	<i>Interviewed 4/2/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Neal, Maxine</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/10/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Hatchett, Twana</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/9/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Hinton, Gloris</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/9/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Kelly, Kara</i>	95	<i>No Show 4/5/2012</i>
<i>lacey, Laurena</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/9/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Carson, Trachon</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/5/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Bridges, Lorna</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/6/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Griffin, Lillian</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/6/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Randle-Bell, Frances</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/6/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Bunde, Mary</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/11/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Jennings, Sonya</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/9/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Frederick, James</i>	95	<i>Interviewed 4/6/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Steverson, Derek</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>*Westbrooks, Monica</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Selected, Hired</i>
<i>Black, David</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Walker, Charlotte</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Sims, Antionette</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Bruner, Ebony</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Jones, Torrence</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Andrews, Jamarious</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Hedgepeth, Alonzo</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Bryant, Lisa</i>	90	<i>Interviewed 4/16/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Richardson, Maria</i>	85	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Foster, Deorsay</i>	85	<i>No Comments Listed</i>

It should be noted that all of the applicants listed above, with the exception of Deorsay Foster, had examination scores that were effective on 3/26/2012. In this instance, it appears too many candidates were referred to the department for consideration for a vacant position. Additionally, it appears that other candidates were simply passed over in favor of another candidate with a lower score and a candidate that was improperly referred was ultimately selected. This is inconsistent with the standard 'Rule of Three' protocols and is a statutory violation.

7. The Graphic Designer Associate Original Entry E-Test register was reviewed to validate the employment of Nickolas Kurz, hired 5/16/2012 with an examination score of 95. Again, the Employer did not save the appropriate register as of the referral date within the E-Test system. However, in reviewing how the register appeared the day prior to this candidate's appointment, and comparing the placement among other candidates listed on the register,

the following candidates were referred/interviewed with examination scores and comments as noted below:

<i>Marshall, Joseph</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>Retain 3/23/2012</i>
<i>Meeks, Yolanda</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Nichols, Catherine</i>	<i>98</i>	<i>No Comments Listed</i>
<i>Yeboah Jr., Kwasi</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>Interviewed 4/30/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>Williams, Sandra</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>Interviewed 5/1/2012, Not Selected</i>
<i>*Kurz, Nickolas</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>Interviewed 4/30/2012, Not Selected</i> <i>Selected due to decline of Dena Jackson</i> <i>On 5/9/2012</i>
<i>Smith, Ashley</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>No Show</i>
<i>Jackson, Dena</i>	<i>95</i>	<i>Interviewed 4/30/2012, Selected</i> <i>Declined position 5/9/2012 (See above)</i>

It should be noted that all of the applicants listed above, had examination scores that were effective on 4/10/2012. In this instance, it appears too many candidates were referred to the department for consideration for a vacant position. Additionally, it appears that other candidates were simply passed over in favor of another candidate with a lower score and a candidate that was improperly referred was ultimately selected. This is inconsistent with the standard 'Rule of Three' protocols and is a statutory violation.

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

Registers were not properly established, maintained, or documented. Based on what could be reasonably determined through a review of standard registers, as well as those registers utilized within the E-Test system, it appears that qualified candidates at the top of the register were not referred in some cases, and that comments/notations on these registers were either non-existent or simply inadequate.

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

The Employer was unable to demonstrate the validity of their overall employment process. In several cases, testing and register information was either inadequate or unavailable and minimal employment data was found in personnel records. These poor recordkeeping practices resulted in the inability to demonstrate whether candidates were properly referred and/or employed within fundamental statutory guidelines.

Finding from Previous Audit:

During the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor reviewed approximately seven (7) reallocations and nineteen (19) newly employed applicant records and position referrals completed during the audit time frame. Regarding register maintenance, the Auditor determined that the Employer did not properly maintain information components to validate their employment actions. In the register records reviewed by the Auditor, testing and register information was simply handwritten in an employee's personnel record, and information regarding other candidates and their placement on the register was simply unavailable.

Additionally, the Auditor was unable to validate actual referral (freeze) dates in several of these instances, or determine when the applicant register was referred out to departments for interview and consideration. For classifications whose examinations were given through the E-Test system, the Auditor was unable to determine the accuracy of these registers since the Employer failed to save the records when the positions were referred. *[Finding Code CSU FY11-2, pages 11-14].*

Recommendation:

It is recommended that the Employer immediately implement practices and procedures that strictly adhere to employment protocols with respect to proper register maintenance by insuring that all candidates have been referred and employed in accordance with statutory guidelines.

The inability to determine how candidates are referred to departments on the date the register was frozen makes it virtually impossible to validate compliance. 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 Auditor will schedule a supplemental on-site audit in February 2014 to specifically review employment records for Civil Service employees hired from September 1, 2013 through January 31, 2014. The System Office is also available to provide additional resources for training and development of business processes to insure future compliance in this respect.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will implement practices and procedures that adhere to employment protocols with respect to proper register maintenance by insuring that all candidates have been referred and employed in accordance with statutory guidelines.

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

CSU FY13-03 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 70/36e Coverage*
- 2) *Illinois Administrative Code (Code), Section 250.30(a) Coverage*
- 3) *Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 1.1 Overview*
- 4) *Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 3.1 Principal Administrative Appointments*
- 5) *Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 6.3 System Office Review*
- 6) *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 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) of the Act, 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 eighty (80) position descriptions, including on-site interviews with various exempted employees, it was determined that forty-five (45) exempted positions listed in **Appendix A** were performing duties matching the specifications for various Civil Service classifications. Overall, the positions cited in this finding do not appear to contain the duties or level of authority and responsibility that would typically fall outside the specifications of standard professional or technical Civil Service classifications.

It should be noted that standardized protocols related to the Biennial Compliance Audit require the Auditor to analyze and review payroll documents in which to select appropriate exempted position description samples. Based on the content within these documents, the Auditor requested eighty (80) exempted position descriptions as part of this Employer's sampling evaluation. In response, the Employer provided a single electronic document of scanned position description documents, which did include the requested eighty (80) position descriptions; however, it also contained eighty (80) other random position descriptions that were not requested. Additionally, there were two-hundred nine (209) additional position description documents that did not contain any basic or fundamental position components, such as scope/summary, duties/responsibilities, or minimum knowledge or experience elements. Further, none of the position descriptions submitted to the Auditor for review contained evidence that the positions were reviewed/validated by the incumbent or supervisor for currency or content.

As part of the Auditor's review with respect to the exemption topic, it is important to evaluate and determine whether previous audit findings were properly addressed and resolved, consistent with the Employer's Institutional Corrective Action Plans (ICAP). This review provides a baseline assessment with respect to previous commitments made by the Employer, and whether business process changes were adequate in providing a foundation for future compliance in this respect. As part of the current FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor reviewed the exempted positions cited during the previous two audits to determine if vacancies in those positions had in fact occurred since the completion of those audits, and whether those positions had been appropriately analyzed before being exempted again. As a result of this review, the Auditor determined that four (4) positions cited during the FY2009 and FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audits, and listed below, became vacant and again exempted during the current FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit time frame:

- The position of *Residence Hall Coordinator* (A63500) was previously cited in the FY2009 Biennial Compliance Audit and occupied by Alexandra Richmond. However, payroll documents provided by the Employer for the FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit indicate that Raven Curling, with an appointment beginning date of 1/18/2011, currently

occupies this position with the same title and position number (A63500) cited in the previous FY2009 audit.

- The position of Director of Admissions (A31700) was previously cited in the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit and occupied by Addie Epps. However, payroll documents provided by the Employer for the FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit indicate that Matthew Harrison, with an appointment beginning date of 7/1/2011, currently occupies this position with the same title and position number (A31700) cited in the previous FY2011 audit.
- The position of Assistant to the Athletics Director for Sports Information (A55200) was previously cited in the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit and occupied by Corey Miggins. However, payroll documents provided by the Employer for the FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit indicate that Derrick Sloboda, with an appointment beginning date of 8/6/2012, currently occupies this position with the same title and position number (A55200) cited in the previous FY2011 audit.
- The position of Assistant Director for Student Activities (A36500) was previously cited in the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit and occupied by Jonathan Parks. However, payroll documents provided by the Employer for the FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit indicate that Safiya Edwards, with an appointment beginning date of 1/3/2012, currently occupies this position with the same title and position number (A36500) cited in the previous FY2011 audit.

In these instances, the Auditor was unable to conclusively determine whether the Employer remained consistent with their internal protocols in evaluating previously flagged positions prior to employing new incumbents. The Employer's decision to reestablish these exempt positions following an audit citation, without providing validation that exemption is appropriate through a complete position analysis and review, is considered a technical violation of exemption authorization and employment procedures/guidelines.

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

According to the Employer's payroll records, 'standard' titles approved for use by the System Office were applied to the majority of exempted positions. It appears the Employer does not have adequate business processes in place to properly manage employment protocols, designate positions, or maintain accurate position descriptions in order to properly exempt positions in accordance with standardized protocols.

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

Of the exempted positions cited in **Appendix A**, twenty-six (26) appointments were either new or renewed during the FY2013 Biennial Audit time frame and twelve (12) additional appointments began within five years of the beginning of the audit time frame, which accounts for 84% of the total number of positions cited in this finding. This appears to indicate an on-

going failure in understanding or establishing appropriate classification plan management protocols that properly update, analyze and evaluate position descriptions, leading to unauthorized exemption authorizations and non-compliance with the Act, Code and Procedures.

Finding from Previous Audit:

During the FY2009 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor identified eight (8) exempted positions that appeared to be performing duties and responsibilities comparable to those found in Civil Service classification(s).

During the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor reviewed approximately one-hundred (100) position descriptions, including on-site interviews with various exempted employees, and it was determined that twenty-six (26) exempted positions were performing duties matching the specifications for various Civil Service classifications. *[Finding Codes CSU FY09-01, pages 4-6 and CSU FY11-03, pages 15-17].*

Recommendation:

The lack of attention given by the Employer with respect to this portion of the audit is of serious concern. Following the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit regarding this topic, the Employer indicated they were initiating a project (2nd Quarter FY12) to review all position descriptions and titles to ensure proper classification with respect to Principal Administrative Appointments. In addition, the Employer was reviewing and implementing business processes to ensure that cyclic position review standards were to be applied in accordance with required guidelines. It appears that these processes are inadequate and require immediate attention.

Due to the level of non-compliance related to this topic, the Employer is again reminded that exemption authorization is a direct statutory responsibility delegated to the Merit Board, who has specifically empowered Employers through various procedures to make these exemption determinations. The Designated Employer Representative (DER) of each university and affiliated agency has the responsibility to develop and maintain protocols consistent with the statutory and procedural guidelines related to this important delegated authority.

The Illinois Administrative Code, Section 250.30(a) specifically provides that the Merit Board has the authority to determine Principal Administrative Appointments (PAA) at each institution or agency. Specifically, it states that "The Director shall publish guidelines for such exemptions, as approved by the Merit Board." We refer the Employer to these guidelines located in the *Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 3.1, Principal Administrative Appointments and Section 4.1, Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty Appointments*, approved by the Merit Board in June 2009. In accordance with the statutory intent and basic premise contained in these standards, 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. Improper exemptions from Civil Service regulations can lead to a fundamental breakdown of several interrelated human resource

functions; including employment status, position classification, seniority, recruitment, compensation, performance, and benefit administration.

In order to properly regulate and manage these appointments, we request that the Human Resource Office immediately establish additional protocols to routinely review and maintain all exempt position descriptions in accordance with the Exemption Procedures Manual. Based on a regular position review, the Employer should be able to properly identify those positions that truly should be a Civil Service appointment of some type and those positions that truly meet exemption authorization standards.

Specifically regarding the four (4) positions listed above that were cited in the previous audit and exempted again during this audit time frame, without any apparent in-depth job analysis and review, we request they be transitioned at the next contract renewal date to an appropriate Civil Service appointment as previously recommended. Additionally, we strongly recommend that the Employer complete an in-depth review of the position descriptions for the positions listed in **Appendix A** to further determine if they meet the specifications of the recommended Civil Service classifications. *Specifically, positions determined to be inappropriately exempted and flagged through the compliance audit process must be reviewed as a matter of standard protocol at the next contract renewal date.* 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 positions designated to be transitioned to Civil Service appointments be moved as soon as possible, preferably at the next employment contract renewal date, but certainly no later than at such time that these positions become vacant again. 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. ***Again, please note that positions designated for transition through the audit process will be reviewed in the next biennial audit process and must be monitored by the Employer periodically.***

As previously discussed with the Employer, the former Pilot Program classifications (Custom Classifications) have been incorporated into our standardized classification plan and are required to be utilized in accordance with standardized civil service protocols. These classifications provide a more flexible and transparent transition and may be appropriate for several of the positions cited in **Appendix A**. *Again, it is strongly recommended that these positions be moved immediately, or at the next employment contract renewal date if applicable.*

Note: "Custom Classifications" refer to the former Pilot Program designations of Accounting Associate, Human Resource Associate, Business/Administrative Associate, Information Technology Manager/Administrative Coordinator, Information Technology Technical Associate, and Information Technology Support Associate.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

The Employee reviewed positions identified in the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit. Appropriate changes have been made to exempted positions. In addition, as previously stated in the FY2011 corrective action plan, the Employer has begun evaluating all positions for the purpose of creating job descriptions. The Employer has purchased a program which will allow the Employer to validate on an annual basis. The implementation of the system, practices and procedures was not completed by FY2013 audit. However, this substantive initiative is on target for completion for FY2014.

Additional Auditor Comments:

The Employer is reminded that the four (4) positions cited above must be transitioned to proper Civil Service appointments effective on the next contract renewal date. Our office is available for assistance to insure that this transaction is implemented.

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

CSU FY13-04 Employees Paid Outside of Approved Salary Ranges

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

- 1) *State Universities Civil Service Act (Act), Section 70/36d(3) Powers and Duties of the Merit Board*
- 2) *State Universities Civil Service Act (Act), Section 70/36k(1) Regional Compensation and Registers*
- 3) *Pay Administration Procedures Manual, Example 1.1e Statewide Salary Data Processing System*

The Merit Board is empowered to prescribe the range of compensation for each class or to fix a single rate of compensation for employees in a particular class and can prescribe different ranges or rates of compensation for different places of employment within the State. The Statewide Salary Data Processing System, as described in the Pay Administration Procedures Manual, is the instrument by which pay rates and ranges are submitted and authorized. This reconciliation process captures those employees being paid outside of approved salary ranges and lists them in an Exception Report. These Exception Reports are then provided to the appropriate Employer for review and possible action.

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

The Auditor reviewed Civil Service payroll documents submitted by the Employer to determine whether Civil Service employee salary rates were paid within established salary ranges. Upon initial review, it appeared that approximately thirty-eight (38) employees were compensated outside the established rate/range as utilized and approved in both open range and negotiated classifications. Specifically of concern, there appeared to be ten (10) employees compensated below the minimum of the established range for the assigned classification.

Following the on-site audit; specifically, email correspondence submitted to the Employer on 7/6/2013 and 7/19/2013, the Employer was notified of specific discrepancies and instructed to correct the information for those employees whose salary rates/ranges were truly inconsistent with regulatory guidelines. The Auditor was not provided any response in this respect, however it appears that through a current review of data within the Salary Data System that updates were provided only to the following classifications:

Automotive Technician
Grounds Foreman
Maintenance Laborer
Grounds Sub-Foreman

Driver
Security Guard
Grounds Equipment Mechanic
Grounds Worker

*Police Lieutenant
Police Sergeant*

Police Captain

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

Many salary rate/range adjustments were not routinely updated through the Statewide Salary Data Processing System (SSDPS) during the audit time frame to maintain and reconcile approved salary components in accordance with designated procedures. In addition, process changes with the transition of the Statewide Salary Data Processing System from the Employer's location to the System Office may have attributed to these discrepancies.

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

Inaccurate information negatively impacts the credibility and integrity of the Salary Data Processing System, which is utilized by the entire system in their compensation management programs. The Employer risks significant financial liability in the overpayment or underpayment of employees, as well as non-compliance with the Act and its corresponding procedure.

Finding from Previous Audits:

The Auditor reviewed the civil service payroll documents submitted by the Employer to determine whether salary rates were within established salary ranges. Upon review it was determined that approximately seventy (70) employees were paid outside the established rate/range as utilized and approved in both open range and negotiated classifications. During the on-site audit, the Employer was promptly notified of these errors and instructed to correct the information for those employees whose salary rates/ranges were inconsistent with regulatory guidelines. The Employer began updating ranges as requested. *[Finding Code CSU FY11-06, pages 22-23].*

Recommendation:

We strongly recommend that the Employer immediately submit adjustments with respect to those employees paid below the minimum of the established range and retroactive salary adjustments administered accordingly if applicable. In addition, remaining salary range adjustments must be updated through the Salary Data System as soon as possible, in accordance with the *Pay Administration Procedures Manual, Section 1.1.*

The Auditor further recommends that additional business protocols regarding routine salary reconciliation activities be implemented and followed, by reviewing Salary Survey Exception Reports and making salary rate adjustments accordingly. ***In order to validate whether required changes have been made consistent with Auditor recommendations, the Employer is requested to provide the most current Civil Service payroll document to the System Office as part of their Institutional Corrective Action Plan (ICAP) to determine current compliance in this respect.***

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

The Employer agrees with your recommendation on additional business protocols regarding routine salary reconciliations in order to make salary rate adjustments accordingly. The new salary survey system ability to accept future salary ranges, as well as, the ability to adjust retroactive dates, will facilitate the Employer with this process.

In order to validate that changes have been made along with the Auditor's recommendations, the Employer will provide the most current Civil Service Payroll document to demonstrate it is in compliance.

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

**Material Findings, Recommendations, Institutional Corrective Action Plan and
Additional Auditor Comments**

CSU FY13-05 Temporary Upgrades Exceeding Thirty-Day Limitation

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

- 1) *Illinois Administrative Code (Code), Section 250.100 Reassignments and Transfers*
- 2) *Employment and Separation Procedures Manual, Section 4.2 Temporary Downgrading and Upgrading Assignments*

According to Section 250.100(b)(3) of the Illinois Administrative Code, "...temporary upgrading and downgrading assignments must not be for more than 30 consecutive work days duration."

The Employment and Separation Procedures Manual, Section 4.2 states, "...upgrading assignments shall be limited to filling vacancies due to absence of incumbents or when it is necessary because of agreements which require a supervisory employee for a special work assignment or project." Further, "Upgrading is not required when the employee performs only certain duties and/or assumes only partial responsibility for the overall duties of the position to which assigned."

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

The Auditor reviewed approximately thirty-six (36) employees given temporary upgrade assignments within the audit time frame. As documented below, it was discovered that five (5) employees appeared to exceed the thirty day temporary upgrade limitation:

Name	Upgraded Position	Upgraded Timeframe(s)	Total Number of Upgraded Days
Bandy, Kimberly	Benefits Services Supervisor	8/1/2012 – 11/30/2012	88
Dawkins, Hazem	Carpenter Foreman	7/17/2012 – 10/12/2012	64
Harvey, Robert	Electrician Foreman	10/16/2010 – 12/29/2010	59
		4/1/2011 – 8/31/2011	109
		9/16/2011 – 11/15/2011	43
Jackson, Zaneta	Assistant Payroll Manager	7/1/2011 – 9/30/2011	66
Polk, Carolyn	Parking Services Agent III	7/1/2012 – 9/29/2012	65

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

The Employer did not adequately monitor the thirty day temporary upgrade limitation and allowed one (1) employee to be upgraded on a regular and consistent basis for several months without a position audit being initiated for potential reclassification action.

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

The foundation of the Merit System and the primary concept of a classification plan management system are that employees be placed in job classifications based on the prominence of actual duties and level of responsibility. The practice of creating a new job assignment through an extended upgrade is inconsistent with the intent and purpose of the classification plan management system. If a position is upgraded consistently, or is upgraded on a continual basis for an extended period of time, the employee should be reclassified into the classification or a new position posted and filled in the classification. The intent of the Code was never to allow for these extended periods of performing higher level duties without providing the opportunity of a permanent classification assignment.

Finding from Previous Audit:

During the FY2009 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor reviewed four-hundred sixty-nine (469) temporary upgrade transactions within the audit time frame. It was discovered that eight (8) employees exceeded the thirty day temporary upgrade limitation.

During the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit, the Auditor reviewed approximately thirty-one (31) employees given temporary upgrade assignments within the audit time frame. The temporary upgrade data received did not include register or examination information for Michael Jones to validate the proper upgrade assignment from Police Officer to Police Sergeant. Additionally, it was discovered that four (4) employees exceeded the thirty day temporary upgrade limitation. *[Finding Codes CSU FY09-03, pages 10-11 and CSU FY11-08, pages 27-28.]*

Recommendation:

Since this topic has resurfaced as a material finding, we strongly recommend that the Employer conduct an internal review of their processes to identify deficiencies with respect to the utilization of Temporary Upgrade assignments and implement stricter protocols that will adequately monitor and regulate these transactions in accordance with Section 250.100 of the Code. We strongly recommend that the Employer implement additional monitoring standards and notification protocols with respect to these transactions and ensure that these standards have been conveyed to the campus units causing these violations, with an emphasis on compliance and proper position monitoring.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

In accordance to Section 250.100(b)(3) of the Illinois Administrative Code the employees reviewed were not temporarily upgraded for more than 30 consecutive work days. The upgraded time frame identified was based on the pay period dates, not the days of the upgrade. Based on the Employer's records and documentation submitted 23 work days represented the most consecutive work days upgraded.

Additional Auditor Comments:

It is recommended that the Employer again review the provisions regarding the utilization of the Temporary Upgrades in accordance with those established guidelines. The data submitted to the Auditor to determine compliance with respect to this topic did not include specific dates in which employees were in a Temporary Upgrade status. Simply listing the pay periods in which employees may have been upgraded or the number of days worked in an upgrade status does not provide enough detailed information to validate compliance. More specific reporting and monitoring components need to be implemented to properly track this personnel action.

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

CSU FY13-06 Non-Compliance with Extra Help Employment and Position Limitations

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

- 1) *Illinois Administrative Code (Code), Section 250.70(f) Extra Help Appointments*
- 2) *Employment and Separation Procedures Manual, Section 2.5 Extra Help Appointments*

Guidelines for Extra Help positions and Extra Help employees are contained in the Illinois Administrative Code. “An Extra Help appointment may be made by an employer to any position for work which the employer attests to be casual or emergent in nature and that meets the following conditions:

- A) the amount of time for which the services are needed is not usually predictable;
- B) payment for work performed is usually made on an hourly basis; and
- C) the work cannot readily be assigned, either on a straight-time or on an overtime basis, to a status employee.”

“An Extra Help position may be utilized for a maximum of 900 hours of actual work in any consecutive 12 calendar months. The employer shall review the status of the position at least every three calendar months. If at any time it is found that the position has become an appointment that is other than Extra Help, the employer shall terminate the Extra Help appointment. If an Extra Help position has accrued 900 consecutive hours, the position shall not be reestablished until six months have elapsed from the date of the termination of the position.”

For Extra Help employees, the Code requires that “Upon working 900 hours, an Extra Help employee cannot resume employment in any Extra Help appointment at a place of employment until 30 calendar days have elapsed.”

The employer’s responsibility as noted in the Code is that they “... shall review the status of the position at least every three calendar months. If at any time it is found that the position has become an appointment that is other than Extra Help, the employer shall terminate the Extra Help appointment.” Understanding the need for continued temporary assistance, Extra Help extensions are allowed in specific instances in accordance with procedural guidelines.

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

As documented in **Appendix B**, eighteen (18) employees were found to have worked beyond the 900-hour Extra Help limitation without the required 30-day break in service. Additionally, it

was determined that five (5) Extra Help positions, documented in **Appendix C**, were utilized for more than 900 hours of actual work within a 12 month period without a six month lapse.

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

It does not appear that adequate protocols to efficiently and effectively monitor Extra Help limitations were established or maintained.

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

Extra Help appointments appear to be utilized longer than allowed which is inconsistent with the Code and Employment/Separation Procedures Manual.

Finding from Previous Audit:

During the FY2009 Biennial Compliance Audit, it was determined that seven (7) employees were found to have worked beyond the 900-hour extra help limitation without the required 30-day break in service and that twelve (12) extra help positions appeared to have been utilized beyond the 900-hour limitation without the required 6-month break in service.

During the FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit, six (6) employees were found to have worked beyond the 900-hour Extra Help limitation without the required 30-day break in service. It was also determined that sixteen (16) Extra Help positions were utilized for more than 900 hours of actual work within a 12 month period without a six month lapse. Since no position control numbers or other distinguishing information was submitted to the Auditor to determine compliance with this part of the Extra Help rule, it appeared that several incumbents were being employed through the same positions concurrently. *[Finding Codes CSU FY09-02, pages 7-9 and CSU FY11-07, pages 24-26].*

Recommendation:

Since this topic has resurfaced as a material finding, we strongly recommend that the Employer conduct an internal review of their processes to identify deficiencies with respect to the Extra Help monitoring process and implement stricter protocols that will adequately monitor and regulate Extra Help appointments in accordance with Section 250.70(f) of the Code.

The Employer is reminded that while Extra Help appointments are intended to be utilized to assist during position vacancies, leaves of absence, and during peak work periods, position management protocols with respect to the 900-hour limitation must remain in place in accordance with established guidelines. The Employer is encouraged to utilize Extra Help Extensions, when applicable, and/or conduct an operational analysis to determine if there is need for the creation of additional status appointments in instances where there is a long term extensive use of these positions is discovered for similar job assignments.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer has taken an active approach to reduce the number of incumbents working over 900 hours and to monitor positions to adhere to the six month lapse. Processes and protocols have been created to make sure both aspects are monitored. This process utilizes two Human Resources units to monitor and regulate Extra Help appointments: (1) the Employment unit will comply with monitoring employee work hours and (2) Compensation and Classification will regulate position control over extra-help positions.

Chicago State University
Final Audit Report

Material Findings, Recommendations and Institutional Corrective Action Plan

CSU FY13-07 Failure to Provide Verification of Probationary Evaluations

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

- 1) *Illinois Administrative Code (Code), Section 250.90(a) Purpose of Probationary Period*

Section 250.90(a) of the Illinois Administrative Code (Code) outlines the purpose of the probationary period of employment as "...an integral part of the examination process, and shall be utilized by the Employer for close observation and evaluation of the employee's work, for obtaining the most effective adjustment of a new employee to his/her position, and to determine whether an employee demonstrates the ability and qualifications necessary to furnish satisfactory service. Periodically, throughout the probationary period, the Employer should discuss with the employee his/her progress on the job. An employee who is dismissed during a probationary period shall be given the reason for his/her dismissal, with the understanding that the reason is not reviewable."

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

While on-site, the Auditor reviewed approximately thirty-nine (39) employee records to validate residency, examination score, licensure/certification, and minimum acceptable qualifications for employment into status positions. Of these records, fourteen (14) did not contain the necessary probationary evaluations that provide communication to the employee in determining continued status employment.

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

It appears the Employer was not ensuring that probationary evaluations were being conducted consistently for newly employed or reallocated status employees.

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

Failure to ensure that appropriate documentation with respect to employee performance during the probationary period is technically a failure to properly record the final testing element for continued service within a civil service status position. This failure can also lead to other discrepancies related to the continued employment or separation of that employee, such as the utilization of a dismissal during the probationary period. Since the reason for dismissal is not reviewable, it does not necessarily relieve the Employer from communicating progress through the use of a probationary evaluation.

Finding from Previous Audit:

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2011.

Recommendation:

We recommend that the Employer develop a consistent procedure and tracking mechanism with respect to conducting routine probationary evaluations to ensure new status employees are provided the opportunity to understand their expectations on the job and receive regular feedback regarding their progress in accordance with the Code. It also becomes the final record to establish a status appointment.

Institutional Corrective Action Plan—provided by Dr. Renee Mitchell, Director of Human Resources

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer has developed an electronic tracking system for identifying and monitoring the distribution and acceptance of probationary evaluations to ensure new status employees are provided the opportunity to understand their expectations on the job and receive regular feedback.

**State Universities Civil Service System
Chicago State University
FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit**

Appendix A

***Principal Administrative Appointments
Position Descriptions Matching Civil Service Specifications***

Employee Name	Title	Employment Date	Appointment Date	Annual Salary	Position Number	Recommended Civil Service Classification Options
Anguh, Ivonne	Community Health Coordinator/Grant Project Specialist	2/16/2009	2/16/2009	\$50,004.00	A53100	Grants and Contracts Administrator Series or Administrative Assistant
Austin, Tyra	Assistant Director	8/16/2012	8/16/2012	\$62,857.20	A39400	Financial Aid Adviser Series
Bell Griffin, Debra	Certification Counselor	12/1/2006	12/1/2006	\$42,372.00	A52700	Admissions and Records Series or Program/Student Adviser
Blackman, Raymond	Associate Director	4/1/2011	4/16/2012	\$41,196.00	A51900	Financial Aid Series
Bostick, Servelure	Assistant to the Director	1/26/2004	1/1/2012	\$72,000.00	A63300	Program Coordinator or Administrative Assistant
Bush, Kevin	Marketing/Communication Specialist	9/16/2011	10/1/2011	\$39,996.00	A54700	Public Information Series
Castrejon-Uriostegui, Yolanda	Budget & Resource Coordinator	8/1/2002	10/1/2007	\$61,056.00	A41100	Business/Administrative Associate or Administrative Assistant
Cato-Baker, Deidre	Compliance Specialist	1/1/2006	2/16/2012	\$65,004.00	A40200	Institutional Compliance Examiner Series or Compliance Officer
Crawley, Malaika	Project Counselor	6/1/2004	9/1/2012	\$38,172.00	A66400	Program/Student Adviser
Deener, Dawnita	Events Support Specialist	5/5/2010	7/16/2011	\$29,928.00	A66700	Space Administrator Series, Clerk Series or Office Support Series
DuBose, Terri	Coordinator-Student Health Insurance	4/18/2011	7/1/2011	\$38,004.00	A59500	Medical Insurance Series, Office Support Series or Administrative Aide
Ellis, Lynette	Budget Management Specialist	3/16/2008	3/16/2008	\$58,104.00	A48800	Budget Analyst Series, University Budget Officer Series or Business/Administrative Associate
Evelyn, Johnny	Scholarship/VA Coordinator	7/11/2007	7/11/2007	\$44,556.00	A53400	Financial Aid Adviser Series or Program/Student Adviser
Flores, Marlyn	Coordinator	9/8/2005	1/1/2012	\$40,008.00	A43200	Program/Student Adviser
Frazier-Parks, Charon	Asst. Director of Purchasing	2/16/2011	2/16/2011	\$65,004.00	A39500	Purchasing Officer Series or Director of Purchases
Greene, Rochelle	Coordinator, Special Projects	12/1/2002	12/1/2002	\$55,464.00	A58800	Office Support Series
Hampton, Angela	Coordinator, Student Activities Evening/Weekend	2/1/2009	8/1/2011	\$32,496.00	A51500	Special Events Facilitator
Harris, Yolanda	Interim Project Director DCP	7/3/1995	6/20/1999	\$59,160.00	A42600	Program Coordinator Series
Heard, LaShawn	Assistant to the Director	8/31/2006	4/1/2011	\$41,208.00	A56700	Administrative Assistant or Administrative Aide
Hope, Tiffany	Associate Director International Programs	6/1/1996	9/1/2011	\$53,400.00	A43700	Study Abroad Assistant Director
Johnson, Brian	Recruitment Specialist	9/20/1999	9/1/2007	\$39,964.08	A65600	Admissions and Records Series or Program/Student Adviser
Kong, Martin	Coordinator, LISTS Systems	10/16/2005	10/16/2005	\$49,968.00	A59300	Information Technology Technical Associate
Lester, Oscar	Project Coordinator	1/6/2010	1/6/2010	\$50,004.00	A45200	Administrative Assistant or Administrative Aide
Lisy, Sydney	Compliance Coordinator	5/1/2012	5/1/2012	\$35,004.00	A45800	Athletic Business Manager or Administrative Aide
Magallanes, Denise	Budget Tech. Specialist	3/20/2006	11/1/2011	\$33,000.00	A53800	Budget Analyst Series or Office Support Series
Martinez, John	Associate Director	11/1/1988	11/16/2005	\$61,224.00	A33300	Admissions and Records Series
McLean, Barrington	Coordinator, Financial Aid Activity	2/16/2000	2/16/2003	\$48,696.00	A55300	Financial Aid Adviser Series
Morris, Raymond	Admissions Counselor	10/1/2008	10/16/2012	\$28,500.00	A58500	Admissions and Records Series
Oliver, Janet	Project Coordinator	1/16/2008	1/16/2008	\$66,960.00	A40500	Information Technology Manager/Administrative Coordinator
Pempek, Vicki	Assistant to Executive Director	11/3/2003	11/3/2003	\$61,800.00	A58200	Administrative Aide
Phillips, Bonnie	Assistant to the Director	9/1/2010	2/16/2012	\$46,416.00	A60400	Administrative Assistant or Administrative Aide
Sanchez, Nereida	Assistant to Dean	9/8/2003	2/1/2012	\$28,128.00	A66600	Office Support Series
Saunders, Sandra	Abilities Office Coordinator	9/16/1995	1/16/2010	\$48,408.00	A48100	Program/Student Adviser
Scott, Heather	Assistant to the Director	8/2/2010	8/1/2011	\$51,504.00	A67600	Human Resource Associate
Sheridan, Helen	Grants and Financial Account Specialist	2/16/2012	2/16/2012	\$79,999.20	A57000	Grants and Contracts Administrator Series
Simmons, Kelli	Assistant Director, Alumni Affairs	11/11/2003	3/15/2012	\$63,036.00	A43100	Assistant Director of Alumni Relations

**State Universities Civil Service System
Chicago State University
FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit**

Appendix A

***Principal Administrative Appointments
Position Descriptions Matching Civil Service Specifications***

Employee Name	Title	Employment Date	Appointment Date	Annual Salary	Position Number	Recommended Civil Service Classification Options
Sloboda, Derrick	Sports Information Director	8/6/2012	8/6/2012	\$49,999.92	A55200	Sports Information Director Series
Spurlin, Owen	Coordinator, Senior Applications & Developer	9/1/2011	9/1/2011	\$65,004.00	A45000	Information Technology Technical Associate
Starks, Robert	Assistant Director	9/1/2011	9/1/2011	\$68,004.00	A39600	Manager of Sports Facilities
Threatt, Kenika	Grants/Compliance Administrator Specialist	2/1/2012	2/1/2012	\$75,000.00	A54000	Grants and Contracts Administrator Series
Tracy, Rudolph	Grants/Compliance Administrator Specialist	9/15/2010	7/1/2011	\$54,996.00	A55800	Grants and Contracts Administrator Series
Warner, Collage	Certification Counselor	7/6/1999	5/16/2010	\$36,048.00	A53600	Admissions and Records Series or Program/Student Adviser
Williams, Concetta	Director of Composition	7/6/1999	7/16/2008	\$49,872.00	A41600	Program/Student Adviser
Wolfe, Gary	Project Counselor	5/19/1997	5/19/1997	\$55,008.00	A50500	Information Technology Technical Associate
Wright, Latiffany	Assistant to the Director	10/16/2005	3/16/2008	\$44,004.00	A62600	Office Support Series or Administrative Aide

**State Universities Civil Service System
Chicago State University
FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit**

Appendix B

Extra Help Employees Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule

Employee Name	Position Title	Department	Beginning Date	Ending Date	Employee Hours Worked
Adams, William	EH/Clerical	LIS (ARMS)	7/1/11	1/31/12	650.50
"	"	"	2/1/12	6/30/12	627.00
					1277.50
Al-Fraihat, Batool	EH/Research Tech	Biological Sciences	5/16/11	6/15/11	189.00
"	Training Project Facilitator	MBRS-RISE-TILT Program	6/1/11	7/15/11	183.00
"	"	"	7/16/11	8/31/11	264.00
"	"	"	9/16/11	11/15/12	336.00
					972.00
Allen, Charles	EH/Records & Registration Support	Registrar, Evaluation & Advisement	10/3/11	3/31/12	913.75
Bibbs, Tony	EH/Clerical	Registrar/Records & Registration	8/1/10	6/30/11	625.50
"	"	"	7/1/11	1/24/12	881.50
					1507.00
Boykin, Arnold	EH/Distribution Clerk	Mailroom	6/9/11	6/30/11	120.00
"	"	"	7/1/11	12/31/11	855.00
					975.00
Byrd, Deanna	EH/Administrative Assistant	Financial Aid	8/1/11	12/15/11	670.50
"	"	"	12/16/11	3/31/12	545.50
					1216.00
Coleman, Sharon	Community Outreach Worker	Educational Opportunity Center	10/1/11	10/31/11	182.00
"	"	"	11/1/11	4/15/12	803.00
					985.00
Ester, Steven	EH/Cashier	Cashier/Bursar	8/15/11	12/15/11	651.00
"	"	"	1/1/12	6/30/12	779.75
					1430.75
Fletcher, Lynda	EH/Parking Agent I	Parking	4/16/12	9/30/12	906.00
Hampton, Lil' Maurice	EH/Office Assistant	Office of the President	11/1/10	6/30/11	334.25
"	"	President's Account	7/1/11	11/30/12	716.25
					1050.50

**State Universities Civil Service System
Chicago State University
FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit**

Appendix B

Extra Help Employees Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule

Employee Name	Position Title	Department	Beginning Date	Ending Date	Employee Hours Worked
Onisemoh, Kameelah	Office Assistant	President's Account	5/6/11	6/30/11	173.00
"	"	"	7/1/11	2/29/12	899.50
					1072.50
Reed, Carl	EH/Coordinator	Social Work	9/1/11	10/31/11	150.00
"	"	"	11/1/11	8/31/12	868.00
					1018.00
Scully, Yvette	EH/Staff Nurse II	Wellness Center/Health Center	8/16/12	11/30/12	917.00
Smith, Donald	Extra Help	Parking	7/1/11	6/30/12	770.50
"	"	"	7/1/12	11/30/12	526.50
					1297.00
Taylor, Charles	Electrician	Operation Engineer & Tradesman	12/6/10	6/30/11	909.50
"	"	Physical Plant	8/1/11	1/15/12	903.00
Taylor, Milicia	EH/Clerical	Financial Aid	8/1/11	1/31/12	919.00
Traylor, Theodore	EH/Building Service Worker	Building Service & Grounds	11/1/11	4/30/12	943.50
Williams, Edward	EH/Desk Attendant	University Police Department	1/16/12	6/30/12	625.50
"	"	Parking	7/1/12	9/30/12	358.00
					983.50

**State Universities Civil Service System
Chicago State University
FY2013 Biennial Compliance Audit**

Appendix C

Extra Help Positions Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule

Position Number	Position Title	Department	Beginning Date	Ending Date	Employee Hours Worked
XH0215-14	EH/Clerical	ADA	11/1/10	12/1/10	324.00
"	"	"	2/10/11	6/30/11	756.00
					1080.00
XH0669-08	EH/Customer Service Representative	Public Services	11/1/12	11/27/12	96.00
"	"	"	12/1/12	12/31/12	897.50
					993.50
XH3160-04	EH/Shuttle Services	Parking	11/1/10	11/30/12	883.75
"	"	"	8/1/11	6/30/12	650.50
"	"	"	8/1/12	11/30/12	194.50
					1728.75
XH3160-23	EH/Card Attendant	University Police	6/9/11	6/30/11	105.00
"	EH/Desk Attendant	"	9/1/11	12/15/11	524.00
"	"	"	1/16/12	6/30/12	625.50
					1254.50
XH3160-26	EH/Card Attendant	Parking	6/9/11	6/30/11	99.00
"	EH/Desk Attendant	"	9/1/11	8/31/12	853.50
					952.50