

## 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*

August 16, 2011

Dr. Wayne D. Watson  
President  
Chicago State University

Mr. Glenn Meeks  
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

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

Ms. Betsy Hill  
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, 2008 through October 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 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.

Lewis T. (Tom) Morelock  
Executive Director

---

---

# Chicago State University Final Audit Report

---



## State Universities Civil Service System Compliance Audit

August 16, 2011

Audit Period

November 1, 2008 to October 31, 2010

---

Prepared by:

A handwritten signature in blue ink, reading "Lucinda M. Neitzel", is written over a horizontal line.

Lucinda M. Neitzel  
Audit and Advisory Services Manager

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Table of Contents**

<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Material Findings, Recommendations, Institutional Corrective Action Plans and Additional Auditor Comments .....</b>	<b>5</b>
 <b>Appendices</b>	
Appendix A: Principal Administrative Appointments Position Descriptions Matching Civil Service Specifications	
Appendix B: Principal Administrative Appointments Position Descriptions Not Compliant with Triennial Review Standards/Not Received	
Appendix C: Principal Administrative Appointments Inaccurate Position Exemption Authorization Applied	
Appendix D: Extra Help Employees Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule	
Appendix E: Extra Help Positions Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule	
Appendix F: Civil Service Position Descriptions Not Compliant with Cyclic Review/Not Received	

## 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 23-25, 2011.

#### **OVERVIEW**

The following Human Resource activities were reviewed and utilized in identifying the Material Findings:

- **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](#)  
[Paula Mitchell, Human Resource Assistant](#)

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Executive Summary**  
**YEAR ENDED – FY 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**

<b><u>Number of</u></b>	<b><u>This Report</u></b>
Findings	9
Repeated findings from previous audit®	4®

**SCHEDULE OF MATERIAL FINDINGS**

<b><u>Item Number</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>	<b><u>Description</u></b>
<b>FINDINGS (STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE ACT)</b>		
CSU FY11-01	5	Failure to Follow Regulatory Guidelines in Layoff Transactions
CSU FY11-02	11	Improper Register Maintenance and Referral of Candidates
CSU FY11-03	15	Exemption Authorization Applied to Positions That Match Civil Service Classification Specifications®
CSU FY11-04	18	Principal Administrative Appointments – Non-Compliance with Triennial Review Standard for Position Descriptions
CSU FY11-05	20	Inaccurate Exemption Authorization Applied®
CSU FY11-06	22	Employees Paid Outside of Approved Salary Ranges
<b>FINDINGS (ILLINOIS ADMINISTRATIVE CODE)</b>		
CSU FY11-07	24	Non-Compliance with Extra Help Employment and Position Limitations®
CSU FY11-08	27	Temporary Upgrades Exceeding Thirty-Day Limitation®

CSU FY11-09	29	<b>FINDINGS (SUCSS PROCEDURES MANUALS)</b> Civil Service Appointments – Non-Compliance with Cyclic Review Standard for Position Descriptions
-------------	----	--

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

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

**CSU FY11-01**      Failure to Follow Regulatory Guidelines in Layoff Transactions

**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](#)
- 3) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.110\(d\) Layoff](#)
- 4) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.120 Seniority](#)
- 5) [Employment Procedures Manual, Section 4.7 Layoff](#)
- 6) [Employment Procedures Manual, Section 6.2 Service and Seniority Accrual](#)

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

As further captured in the Illinois Administrative Code and Employment Procedures Manual, specific actions with respect to layoffs are clearly defined. It states in part, “The Executive Director shall be promptly notified of all employees on layoff status, together with the dates of the beginning of layoff and of return to employment from layoff status, when the layoff exceeds 30 consecutive work days.”

Whenever it becomes necessary to layoff one or more employees, the employee who has the least amount of service in the class shall be laid off first, and additional layoffs shall be made in the ascending order of the place of the employee on the service and seniority lists for that class. Whenever it becomes necessary to reemploy one or more employees in a class, the employee last laid off by seniority shall be reemployed first, and further reemployment shall be made in the order of seniority until the reemployment register for that class is exhausted.

Seniority, once earned in a class, is retained during any period of continuous employment. Seniority or service in a higher class in a promotional line may be added to seniority or service earned in a lower class in the same line to compute total seniority or service in the lower class. Seniority earned in a class shall be counted toward seniority in a lower class in the same promotional line even though the employee may not have served in the lower class.

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

Consistent with standard reporting protocols for the biennial compliance audit, the Employer submitted a list of employees laid off during the audit time frame. Upon our on-site review of these layoff actions, the Auditor discovered several discrepancies in the processing of these layoffs, specifically the miscalculation of seniority within the promotional line of several classifications, the failure to properly capture accrued employee seniority in other held classifications outside of the immediate promotional line, and the improper application of bumping sequences associated with an employee’s right to exercise this option. These irregularities have significant consequences and increased liability risk for the Employer, potentially resulting in the improper layoff of more senior employees.

The Employer was made aware of these issues while on-site and immediately following this portion of the audit. A follow-up visit was required to gather necessary information for the Auditor to adequately assess the magnitude of these issues. Following this visit, additional discussions were held with the Employer in an attempt to obtain further documentation and insight regarding the specific circumstances of each layoff situation in order to reconcile each instance. In the majority of cases, the documentation provided to the Auditor did not sufficiently address or mitigate the following regulatory violations as described below:

1. The employment records of Rachel Branton, Chief Clerk, were reviewed to validate a layoff transaction with an effective date of 4/30/10. It was determined that she should have been allowed to bump Victor Moy, who was least senior and in the Clerk classification. The Employer submitted additional documentation to reflect that Rachel Branton returned to employment on 1/1/11. Since she was not allowed to bump at the time of layoff, she should be credited with the appropriate seniority and benefits/compensation adjusted as necessary.
2. The employment records of Edgar Buck, Program Services Specialist, were reviewed to validate a layoff transaction with an effective date of 10/15/09. It was determined that two new employees, Rita Marshall and Linda Copening with hire dates of 4/2/10 and 4/1/10 respectively, were appointed to the Program Services Specialist classification following the layoff of Edgar Buck. Based on records reviewed, it is unclear whether Edgar Buck was offered to return to employment at any time following his layoff on 10/15/09.

Edgar Buck should possibly be allowed to return to employment at Chicago State University to the position currently occupied by the employee that is least senior in the Program Services Specialist classification, or to a newly created position, and be credited with the appropriate seniority and benefits/compensation adjusted as necessary.

3. The employment records of Tisa Charles, Accountant IV, were reviewed to validate a layoff transaction with an effective date of 4/30/10. It was determined that she should have been allowed to bump Ma. Feliciadad Vidad, who was least senior and in the Accountant III classification. The Employer indicated that both Ma. Feliciadad Vidad and Norman Erazo occupied Accountant III positions which required a specialization. However, a Specialty Factor was not formally requested by the Employer or approved by the System Office.

Tisa Charles should possibly be allowed to return to employment at Chicago State University to the position currently occupied by the employee that is least senior in the Accountant classification series, or to a newly created position, and be credited with the appropriate seniority and benefits/compensation adjusted as necessary.

4. The employment records of Chievas White, Office Administrator, were reviewed to validate a layoff transaction with an effective date of 4/30/10. It was determined that she should have been allowed to bump Sharon Alves, who was least senior in the Office Administrator classification. The Employer provided documentation to indicate that Sharon Alves retired on 1/31/11, which is nine months following the layoff of Chievas White. Based on records reviewed, it is unclear whether Chievas White was offered to return to employment at any time following her layoff on 4/30/10.
5. The employment records of Rolando Gatmatian, Network Specialist II, were reviewed to validate a layoff transaction with an effective date of 4/30/10. It was determined that the reclassification/reallocation log submitted by the Employer confirms that Reginald Granjean was reclassified from the Network Specialist II to the Network Engineer II classification one day prior to the layoff of Rolando Gatmatian.

Based on inquiries received from the System Office, as well as other supporting documentation, there appeared to be conflicting information communicated to the UPI Local 4100 grievance officer from Human Resources regarding the actual seniority of Reginald Granjean in the Network Specialist II classification. This correspondence, dated 5/18/10, indicates that Reginald Granjean was still a Network Specialist II with a date in class of 7/16/00. This was not only after the layoff of Rolando Gatmatian, but inconsistent with personnel records reviewed on-site.

Discussions with the Employer indicate that Rolando Gatmatian appeared to be technically laid off properly, but that correspondence sent to the grievance officer was taken from note card files in Human Resources, and not from the personnel record. The Auditor requested validation of the classification and seniority of both Rolando Gatmatian and Reginald Granjean, which has not been received by the System Office.

6. The employment records of Alicia Dace, Payroll Manager, were reviewed to validate a layoff transaction with an effective date of 4/30/10. It was determined that she should have been allowed to bump Zaneta Jackson, who was least senior and in the Payroll Specialist II classification. The Employer provided documentation to indicate that Alicia Dace resigned during layoff on 12/31/10, which is eight months following the date of the layoff transaction. Based on records reviewed, it is unclear whether Alicia Dace was offered to return to employment at any time following her layoff from 4/30/10 to the date of resignation on 12/31/10. However, a newly appointed position was filled on 9/1/10 by Tracy Houston in the Assistant Payroll Manager classification.

The Employer indicates that Alicia Dace was provided verbal notice of whether to exercise her bumping rights. However, the Employer could not validate this assertion through documentation. Additionally, although Alicia Dace submitted her resignation on 12/31/10, it remains unclear whether she was offered a position in the eight months following the layoff and until the resignation was processed.

Alicia Dace should possibly be allowed to return to employment at Chicago State University to the position currently occupied by the employee that is least senior in the Payroll series, or to a newly created position, and be credited with the appropriate seniority and benefits/compensation adjusted as necessary.

It should be noted that several other layoff actions appeared to be conducted properly. It was also noted in some instances that resignations were processed at different stages following the actual layoff. There is some concern that many employees may have been compelled to submit their resignation in order to access other monetary benefit options. A formal resignation would eliminate any re-employment rights for those employees.

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

A specific cause was not immediately identified. However, basic and fundamental recordkeeping practices were either severely lacking or not in place. Additionally, representatives of the CSU Human Resources Office believed that the transactions had been completed correctly.

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

In many instances, the Employer was unable to demonstrate the validity of their overall layoff process or administer it satisfactorily, resulting in employees being laid off improperly and/or being unable to exercise their bumping rights in accordance with the Illinois Administrative Code and System Office Procedures.

**Finding from Previous Audit:**

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2009.

**Recommendation:**

The Auditor recommends that the Employer conduct an internal review of their business processes and develop additional protocols to prevent these types of errors from occurring again. Additionally, if the Employer determines that further layoffs may be required in the future, the System Office should be consulted during the process to ensure that these transactions are conducted properly. The Employer is asked to also review the specific actions mentioned above and provide the System Office with an update on their investigation and reconciliation of these matters.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will review business processes and develop additional protocols in the area of classification. In addition, the Employer will seek training through the State Universities Civil Service System regarding statutes, protocols,

and best practices. The Employer has reviewed the specific actions mentioned above and updates will be provided under separate cover.

**Additional Auditor Comments:**

The Auditor recognizes the Employer's commitment to addressing this critical topic. However, it is requested that the Employer submit the corrective actions taken to reconcile each instance pursuant to the Auditor's recommendation no later than September 7, 2011.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan**

**CSU FY11-02**      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 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.

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 issues. The following observations were noted below:

1. The Building Service Worker Original Entry E-Test Register was reviewed to validate the employment of Willie Tyler, hired 9/1/10, with an examination score of 105. A referral date was not provided by the Employer and the frozen register was not saved in the E-Test system. Therefore, the Auditor could not validate accurate register placement and referral. In addition, the DD214 for Mr. Tyler, or any other veteran's documentation, was unavailable to substantiate the point preference given to this candidate.
2. The Electrician Original Entry E-Test Register was reviewed to validate the employment of Alfred Cherry III, hired 3/1/10, with an examination score of 79. A referral date was not provided and the frozen register was not saved in the E-Test system. Therefore, the Auditor could not validate accurate register placement and referral. However, in reviewing how the register looked one day prior to this candidate's appointment, and comparing the placement among other candidates listed on the register, the following candidates were referred with examination scores and comments as noted below:

<i>O'Neal, Alan</i>	<i>87</i>	<i>Removal/Interest Letter Generated</i>
<i>Saverson, Kevin</i>	<i>85</i>	
<i>Brooks, Dennis</i>	<i>82</i>	
<i>Jones, James</i>	<i>81</i>	
<i>Harvey, Robert</i>	<i>81</i>	<i>Removal/Interest Letter Generated</i>
<i>Taylor, Charles</i>	<i>79</i>	
<i>Leyden, David</i>	<i>79</i>	
<b><i>*Cherry III, Alfred</i></b>	<b><i>79</i></b>	

In this instance, it appears that too many candidates were referred to the department for consideration for a vacant position and a candidate that was improperly referred was ultimately selected. Without comments noted for any other candidate, it would appear that this is inconsistent with the standard 'Rule of Three' protocols and is a statutory violation.

3. The Electrician Foreman Original Entry E-Test register was reviewed to validate the employment of Alan O'Neal, hired 4/16/09, with an examination score of 90. Upon review of this register and other records within the E-Test system, it was determined that this candidate did not take the examination for this classification. However, the candidate's score of 90 was listed on the promotional register under the Electrician General Foreman classification. The Auditor was unable to locate any examination or employment action regarding the Electrician Foreman register for this candidate and personnel records indicated that this employee was in this classification.
4. The Library Specialist Original Entry E-Test register was reviewed to validate the employment of Carol Honore, hired 4/1/09 with an examination score of 80. A referral date was not provided and the frozen register was not saved in the E-Test system. Therefore, the Auditor could not validate accurate register placement and referral. However, in reviewing how the register looked one day prior to this candidate's appointment, and comparing the placement among other candidates listed on the register, it was observed that seven (7) other candidates were listed on the register as promotional with examination scores as noted below:

<i>Jones, Diane</i>	<i>85 (PR)</i>	
<i>Jones, Kay</i>	<i>85 (PR)</i>	
<i>Banks, Joslyn</i>	<i>85 (PR)</i>	
<i>McClam, Edmund</i>	<i>85 (PR)</i>	
<i>Anderson, Valerie</i>	<i>85 (PR)</i>	
<i>Roscoe, Janice</i>	<i>85 (PR)</i>	
<i>Hoover, Dian</i>	<i>80 (PR)</i>	
<i>Richards, Vickie</i>	<i>85</i>	
<b><i>*Honore, Carole</i></b>	<i>85</i>	<i>Hired</i>

In this instance, it appears several candidates were passed over for consideration into a vacant position and that the selected candidate was improperly referred and ultimately selected. Since there were no 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.

In general, after a thorough review of the employment registers for this Employer, several other observations and discrepancies were noted. Without accurate notations in the comments sections on the E-Test employment registers, the documents were essentially useless in validating employment decisions and indicate some potentially significant statutory violations.

In virtually every instance, it simply was not possible to determine exactly how the register looked at the time it was frozen or how applicants were referred. Additionally, it appears in some instances that more candidates were being referred for 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):**

Registers were not properly established, maintained, or documented. Based on what could be reasonably determined through a review of registers 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 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:**

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2009.

**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 hired 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 Employer is asked to provide follow-up quarterly reports regarding new civil service employment actions and provide register documentation to validate their employment decision in each case. The System Office can also provide additional resources for training and development of business processes to insure compliance in this respect.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will suspend testing for original entrance until training is properly received by the State Universities Civil Service System. The System has been contacted and a training date has been identified.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan**

**CSU FY11-03**      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 70/36\(e\)](#)
- 2) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.30\(a\) Coverage](#)
- 3) [Classification Procedures Manual, Section 2.2 Job Descriptions](#)
- 4) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 1.1 Overview](#)
- 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 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 one-hundred (100) position descriptions, including on-site interviews with various exempted employees, it was determined that twenty-six (26) exempted positions listed in **Appendix A** were performing duties matching the specifications for various Civil Service classifications.

**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 eight (8) exempted positions that appeared to be performing duties and responsibilities comparable to those found in Civil Service classification(s) in the FY2009 compliance audit. *[Finding Code CSU FY09-01, pages 4-6].*

**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 Renee D. Mitchell, Director of Human Resources**

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer is initiating a project (2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter FY12) to review all position descriptions and titles to ensure proper classification and civil service/principal administrative appointments. In addition, the Employer will review and implement business processes to ensure that cyclic position review standards are applied in accordance with required guidelines. The employer will seek consultation from the State Universities Civil Service System when clarification is needed.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

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

**CSU FY11-04**      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 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 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):**

The Auditor requested approximately one-hundred (100) Principal Administrative Appointment position descriptions as the test sample for compliance with triennial review standards. Upon initial review and check-in of the audit materials, it was determined that twenty-eight (28) position descriptions requested, listed in **Appendix B**, were either not received by the auditor or did not appear to be updated or reviewed for currency or content in accordance with established guidelines.

**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:**

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2009.

**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 review the position descriptions listed in **Appendix B** and provide an update by July 8, 2011 regarding this activity. As necessary, the Employer is requested to contact the incumbent and departmental representatives for the listed positions and request an updated/authenticated position description.

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 Renee D. Mitchell, Director of Human Resources**

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer is initiating a project (2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter FY12) to review all position descriptions and titles to ensure proper classification and civil service/principal administrative appointments. In addition, the Employer will review and implement business processes to ensure that cyclic position review standards are applied in accordance with required guidelines.

**Additional Auditor Comments:**

The Auditor recognizes the Employer's commitment to addressing this finding by reviewing and implementing business processes to insure triennial position reviews are conducted according to established guidelines. However, it is requested that the Employer submit specific updates to the position descriptions identified in **Appendix B** pursuant to the Auditor's recommendation no later than September 7, 2011.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan**

**CSU FY11-05**      Inaccurate Exemption Authorization Applied

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

- 1) [State Universities Civil Service Act \(Act\), Section 70/36\(e\)](#)
- 2) [Illinois Administrative Code \(Code\), Section 250.30\(a\) Coverage](#)
- 3) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 1.1 Overview](#)
- 4) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 6.2 Internal Review](#)
- 5) [Exemption Procedures Manual, Section 6.3 System Office Review](#)

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 is required to confirm that these exemption authorizations remain valid.

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):**

Through a standard review of payroll documents, the Auditor determined that sixty-eight (68) positions/titles listed in **Appendix C** may be more appropriately categorized as exempt under either Section 36e(2) or 36e(4) of the Act.

**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 exempt position descriptions, including a determination of the

proper exemption standard to be applied, may lead to unauthorized exemption authorizations, utilization of inappropriate employment protocols, and non-compliance with the Act, Code and Procedures.

**Finding from Previous Audit:**

A review of approximately one-hundred (100) position descriptions, including on-site interviews with various exempted employees revealed that five (5) exempt positions categorized as 36e(3) exemptions may be more appropriately categorized under 36e(4) of the Act. *[Finding Code NMCSU FY09-01, pages 1-2]*.

**Recommendation:**

We recommend that the University complete a review and update its payroll records for the positions listed in **Appendix C** in order to validate the exemption authorization in accordance with either Section 36e(2) or 36e(4) of the Act, and update those records accordingly. This review should specifically include an evaluation of the type of exemption authorization to be applied in each instance. Please provide a final report of the exemption status of each of these positions. It is strongly recommended that these updates be completed prior to the Employer submitting their next Quarterly Report of Employee Served information to the System Office.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will review and update its position records in order to validate the exemption authorization in accordance with either Section 36e(2) or 36e(4) of the Act, and update those records accordingly.

**Additional Auditor Comments:**

The Employer provided documentation that outlines the categories of exempted positions employed at Chicago State University, as well as an update to the Quarterly Report of Employee Served, dated June 30, 2011. The Auditor will follow up again on this topic during the next audit period.



**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan**

**CSU FY11-06**      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 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, however this process has yet to be completed.

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

Salary rate/range adjustments were not routinely submitted during the audit time frame to reconcile and update approved salary components in accordance with designated procedures. In the majority of instances, the rates/ranges in SSDPS were not updated upon settlement of collective bargaining agreements.

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

Inaccurate information negatively impacts the credibility and integrity of the Statewide 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 along with non-compliance of the Act and its corresponding procedure.

**Finding from Previous Audit:**

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2009.

**Recommendation:**

Since the on-site audit, the Employer has updated some ranges, but as noted above many employees are still paid outside the established rate/range. With respect to negotiated rates/ranges, it is imperative that salary modifications are promptly entered at the conclusion of the collective bargaining process to accurately reflect any rate/range changes.

We recommend that the Employer continue to submit salary range adjustments as soon as possible to the Statewide Salary Data Processing System, in accordance with the [Pay Administration Procedures Manual, Section 1.1 Introduction](#), to alleviate all of these discrepancies. The Auditor further recommends that proper business protocols regarding routine salary reconciliation activities be implemented and followed, by reviewing Salary Survey Exception Reports and making salary rate adjustments accordingly.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer has corrected the discrepancies identified by the State Universities Civil Service System and will continue to monitor and submit salary range adjustments as soon as possible to the Statewide Salary Data Processing System.

**Additional Auditor Comments:**

As of the date of this report, approximately thirty (30) employees previously noted and communicated to the Employer as requiring salary rate/range adjustments remain inaccurate. It is requested that the Employer conduct an internal review and submit salary adjustments pursuant to the Auditor's recommendation no later than September 7, 2011.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan**

**CSU FY11-07**      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 D**, six (6) employees were found to have worked beyond the 900-hour Extra Help limitation without the required 30-day break in service.

As further documented in **Appendix E**, 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 appears that several incumbents were being employed through the same positions concurrently.

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

Adequate protocols to efficiently and effectively monitor Extra Help limitations were not established or maintained, especially related to the 900-hour position utilization component. This is inconsistent with the Employer's response regarding this topic during the FY2009 compliance audit. Furthermore, the process of pooling extra help positions, or otherwise allowing one extra help position to be shared by an indefinite number of employees concurrently lends an additional layer of complexity and does not allow for proper position monitoring and regulating of employee work times in accordance with the Illinois Administrative Code and System Office Procedures referenced above. The required six month lapse before a position can be reestablished does not appear to have been followed in many instances, resulting in the extended use of positions beyond the 900 hour limitation.

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

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

**Finding from Previous Audit:**

The Auditor reviewed approximately three-hundred fifty-three (353) Extra Help appointments during the audit period and 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. *[Finding Code CSU FY09-02, pages 7-9]*

**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 their deficiencies with respect to the Extra Help monitoring process and implement stricter position management protocols that will adequately monitor and regulate Extra Help positions, and employees assigned to those positions, in accordance with Section 250.70(f) of the Code.

Additionally, to reduce the frequency of these findings, the Employer may be able to further 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 for similar job assignments.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will develop an intranet web-page to advise the campus of the policies and protocols necessary for compliance and monitoring. In addition, the Employer will monitor the process and implement stricter protocols that will alleviate further potential occurrences of non-compliance.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

**Material Findings, Recommendations, and Institutional Corrective Action Plan**

**CSU FY11-08** 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-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 listed below exceeded the thirty day temporary upgrade limitation.

Name	Upgraded Position	Upgraded Time Frame	Total Number of Upgraded Days
Phillips, Carolyn	Building Service Foreman & Sub-Foreman	2/16/2010 – 4/30/2010	53
Davidson, Diana	Building Service Worker Sub-Foreman	2/1/2010 – 4/28/2010	62
Thomas, Kenny	Chief Plant Operating Engineer	5/16/2009 – 7/14/2009	40
Redmond, Stanley	Painter Foreman	5/2/2010 – 6/30/2010	42

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

The Employer did not adequately monitor the thirty day temporary upgrade limitation and allowed the Facilities Management Department to upgrade two employees on a regular and

consistent basis for several months without position audits 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:**

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. *[Finding Code CSU FY09-03, pages 10-11]*

**Recommendation:**

We recommend that the Employer confirm that monitoring standards and notification protocols have been conveyed to the campus units causing these violations, with an emphasis on compliance and proper position monitoring. Additionally, the positions noted in this finding should be reviewed and considered for permanent upgrade either through reclassification or position posting.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer will develop an intranet web-page to advise the campus of the policies and protocols necessary for compliance and monitoring. In addition, the Employer will monitor the process and implement stricter protocols that will alleviate further potential occurrences of non-compliance.

**Chicago State University**  
**Final Audit Report**

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

**CSU FY11-09**      Civil Service Appointments – Non-Compliance with Cyclic Review Standard  
for Position Descriptions

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

- 1) [Classification Procedures Manual, Section 2.2 Job Descriptions](#)

Proper administration and communication of position descriptions is a fundamental element in any human resource program and the precursor to many ‘best practice’ human resource policies and procedures, particularly those related to classification plan management and performance evaluation. [Classification Procedures Manual, Section 2.2 Job Descriptions](#) requires that “All job descriptions shall be reviewed and updated at least every three years, *including the signatures of the incumbent and supervisor.*” Our biennial audit process includes both a general review of all descriptions and a comprehensive review of a random sample of position descriptions.

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

The Auditor reviewed a sample of approximately 90 Civil Service position descriptions for compliance with the triennial review standard. Twenty-seven (27) position descriptions, listed in **Appendix F**, were either not received by the auditor or did not appear to be updated or reviewed for currency or content in accordance with established guidelines.

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

The Employer did not follow routine protocols in securing current and updated position descriptions assuring compliance with the triennial review standard.

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

Incomplete or outdated position descriptions may cause misunderstandings between supervisors and employees related to performance expectations. Incomplete or outdated descriptions do not allow for the proper designation of work duties and can result in erroneous classification designations that unfavorably affect employee compensation and seniority benefits. Incomplete or outdated position descriptions may also compromise the integrity of the performance review and disciplinary process.

**Finding from Previous Audit:**

No findings in this topic area were made during the last operational audit in FY2009.



**Recommendation:**

The Employer is asked to review the position descriptions listed in **Appendix F** and provide an update by September 7, 2011, regarding this activity. As necessary, the Employer is requested to contact the incumbent and departmental representatives for the listed positions and request an updated/authenticated position description.

The Employer is also asked to review and implement business processes to insure that cyclic position review standards are applied in accordance with required guidelines.

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

The Employer agrees with the recommendation. The Employer is initiating a project (2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter FY12) to review all position descriptions and titles to ensure proper classification and civil service/principal administrative appointments. In addition, the Employer will review and implement business processes to ensure that cyclic position review standards are applied in accordance with required guidelines.

**Additional Auditor Comments:**

The Auditor recognizes the Employer's commitment to addressing this finding by reviewing and implementing business processes to insure cyclic position reviews are conducted according to established guidelines. However, it is requested that the Employer submit specific updates to the position descriptions identified in **Appendix F** pursuant to the Auditor's recommendation no later than September 7, 2011.

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix A**

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

Employee Name	Title	Employment Date	Position Number	Recommended Civil Service Classification
Alexander, Victor	Technical Support Coordinator	7/16/1998	A41400	Information Technology Management Series or Information Technology Technical Associate
Asadi, Fatemeh	Director of Library & Public Services	3/1/2005	A33800	Library Operations Associate or Series
Belisle, Barbara	Assistant Director of Teacher Certification	7/9/2001	A51100	Program Adviser
Bibbs, Tracy	Counseling Graduate Program Coordinator	6/21/1999	A51400	Graduate School Specialist
Biller, Jason	GIS Lab Coordinator	1/1/2003	A58000	Computer Lab Coordinator or Information Technology Support Associate
Burkett, Anitra	Special Assistant to the Provost	1/24/2005	A46000	Administrative Assistant Series, Executive Secretary, or Administrative Aide
Cook, Vanessa	Banner System User Coordinator	4/1/1985	A45500	Applications Programmer Series or Information Technology Support Associate
Cotton, Anthony	Admissions Counselor/Recruiter	8/7/2000	A50700	Admissions & Records Series or Admissions/Records Specialist Series
Epps, Addie	Director of Admissions	11/16/1990	A31700	Admissions & Records Supervisor or Deputy Director
Esparza, Andriana	Admissions Counselor	2/16/2005	A50300	Admissions & Records Series or Admissions/Records Specialist Series
Faria, Jose	Assistant to Director of Accounting	2/16/1989	A55100	Accountant Series or Accounting Associate
Hampton, David	Coordinator of Examinations	7/1/2003	A31800	Test Specialist or Program Adviser
Horton, Felicia	Associate Director, Internal Communications	2/2/2004	A38100	Publications Series, Publicity-Promotion Specialist, or Community Affairs Specialist Series
Horton, Monique	Facilities Project Specialist	1/5/2005	A34800	Construction Superintendent or Construction Project Coordinator Series
Ishowo, Muinat	Program Advisor	9/23/2009	A52600	Program Adviser
Jackson, Jerome	Facility Specialist	2/27/2006	A45900	Special Events Facilitator
Jones-Tate, Shartia	Project Coordinator: Grow Your Own/TARGET	7/1/2006	A54800	Program Coordinator Series
Long, Mary	Banner Finance Administrative Coordinator	10/16/2008	A48600	Information Technology Manager/Administrative Coordinator or Information Technology Management Series
Lucas, Matthew	Assistant Director of Development	11/16/2000	A50400	Administrative Assistant Series
Miggins, Corey	Assistant to the Athletics Director for Sports Information Director	6/27/2002	A55200	Sports Information Director Series
Morgan, Octavia	Admissions Counselor	1/19/2005	A51000	Admissions & Records Series or Admissions/Records Specialist Series
Parks, Jonathan	Assistant Director for Student Activities	10/1/2010	A36500	Program Director Series
Powenski, Stephen	Coordinator of Transfer Student Relations	6/1/1999	A40400	Admissions & Records Series or Admissions/Records Specialist Series
Saheed, Ganiyu	Program and Logistic Coordinator	9/26/2006	A46600	Program Coordinator Series
Whittaker, Lawanda	Organizational Planning Coordinator	11/1/2004	A64100	Program Coordinator Series
Williams, Fred	Life Safety Specialist	4/1/2007	A46400	Safety Officer Series

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix B**

***Principal Administrative Appointments  
Position Descriptions Not Compliant With Triennial Review Standards/Not Received***

<b>Position Control Number</b>	<b>Current PAA Classification Title</b>	<b>Date of Last Review</b>
A25800	Director, Network Infrastructure	Not Received
A30000	Director of Counseling Center	Not Received
A30100	Interim Director of Events	Not Received
A33500	Associate Director--Illinois LSAMP	Not Received
A33700	Interim Director of Purchasing	Not Received
A35000	Academic Chairperson	Not Received
A37600	Coordinator of Intro Pharmacy Practical Experience	Not Received
A40800	Coordinator of Field Placement and Community Outreach	Not Received
A43900	Coordinator, Veterans & Military Service	Not Received
A44400	Project Coordinator	Not Received
A44500	Coordinator of Financial Management	Not Received
A45600	Coordinator, Athletic Facilities/Equipment	Not Received
A46100	Associate Athletics Director	Not Received
A47200	Associate General Counsel	Not Received
A48300	Chicago State University Foundation Coordinator	Not Received
A48500	Director, Business Affairs Athletics	Not Received
A49400	Learning Collaboration Coordinator	No Date
A50400	Assistant Director of Development	5/11/2004
A51200	Compliance and Business Specialist	Not Received
A51600	Outreach Coordinator	Not Received
A51800	Assistant Athletic Director/Compliance	Not Received
A53700	Moodle Transition Specialist	Not Received
A56600	Outreach Coordinator	Not Received
A58400	Business Support Specialist	Not Received
A61100	Director of Instruction Media Systems Engineering	Not Received

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix B**

***Principal Administrative Appointments  
Position Descriptions Not Compliant With Triennial Review Standards/Not Received***

<b>Position Control Number</b>	<b>Current PAA Classification Title</b>	<b>Date of Last Review</b>
A61600	Radio Production Coordinator	Not Received
A63100	Retention Outreach Specialist	Not Received
A66500	Field Support Specialist	Not Received

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix C**

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

<b>Position Number</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Recommended Exemption</b>
A10200	Interim Vice President for Enrollment Management	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A24500	Interim Associate Vice President Special Programs	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A22000	Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A24900	Associate Vice President, Administration & Finance	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A11100	Vice President of Administration & Finance	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A00100	President	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A10600	Provost & Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A46100	Associate Athletics Director	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A23300	Chief Information Officer	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A22300	Chief of Police	36e(2) Exemption: Primary Administrator Appointment
A49000	Director, Pre-Health Professions Programs	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A38000	Director, LIMS	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A20600	Dean of Graduate Studies	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A52200	Academic Coordinator/Recruiter	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A62200	Research Scientist, HIV/AIDS	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35000	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A20100	Dean of the College of Health Science	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35200	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A37000	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35100	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix C**

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

<b>Position Number</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Recommended Exemption</b>
A21100	Dean of Continuing Education and Nontraditional Programs	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A56300	Assistant Director, Engineering Studies Program	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35700	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A30600	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A31300	Coordinator, Adv. Pharmacy Practice	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35600	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36200	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36000	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A37500	Director, Field Education	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A22900	Acting Dean, College of Business	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A34700	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A20700	Associate Dean, Library & Instruction	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36900	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A51700	Head Men's Basketball Coach	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35500	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A34400	Assistant Dean	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36700	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A39000	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A20300	Dean, College of Education	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A20800	Dean of Freshman Year Experience	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix C**

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

<b>Position Number</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Recommended Exemption</b>
A30800	Associate Dean	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A32200	Director of Assessment/Program Quality	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A64300	Field Support Specialist	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A65500	Senior Learning Collaboration Program Coordinator	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A49400	Learning Collaboration Coordinator	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A42800	Director of Experiential Education	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A37200	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A46800	Director of Project Fame/Upward Bound	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36400	Assistant to the Dean of Certification and Accreditation	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A20000	Dean, College of Arts & Science	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35900	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A38900	Statewide Director, TIPP	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A30300	Assistant Dean	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A24400	Dean of the Honors College	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A30900	Associate Dean	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A46200	CITE Director	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A32100	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A48400	Trauma Trainer Specialist	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36600	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A35400	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix C**

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

<b>Position Number</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Recommended Exemption</b>
A34000	Director, Non-Traditional Degree Programs	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A37800	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A36100	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A37300	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A43600	Trauma Trainer Specialist	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A37700	Academic Chairperson	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A44900	Professional Development Specialist	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty
A42000	Director, Engineering Studies	36e(4) Exemption: Teaching, Research, and Extension Faculty



**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix D**

***Extra Help Employees Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule***

Employee Name	Department	Beginning Pay Period Date	Ending Pay Period Date	Employee Hours Worked
Lee, Lasandra	Financial Aid	8/1/10	6/30/11	<b>1342.00</b>
Payne, Icey	Facilities Support	7/1/10	10/30/10	<b>1259.50</b>
Reid, Kevin	Facilities Support	8/18/09	10/15/10	<b>1120.00</b>
Robinson, Dajuan	Facilities Support	7/1/10	9/30/10	<b>1177.00</b>
Smith, Crystal	Enrollment Services	8/24/09	5/31/10	617.50
"	"	6/1/10	11/23/10	473.50
				<b>1091.00</b>
Smith, Donald	Parking	11/3/09	6/30/10	542.00
"	"	7/1/10	6/30/11	448.00
				<b>990.00</b>

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix E**

***Extra Help Positions Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule***

<b>Employee Name</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Beginning Pay Period Date</b>	<b>Ending Pay Period Date</b>	<b>Employee Hours Worked</b>
Smith, Leonard	Cashier	Bursar	8/17/09	9/30/10	335.75
Holmes, Shavanna	"	"	1/6/10	6/30/10	525.00
Wiley, Pearleen	"	"	8/5/10	12/31/10	509.75
					<b>1370.50</b>
Johnson, Dorwhitem	Clerical	Admissions	1/9/09	12/31/09	586.00
Lee, Shane	"	"	3/5/09	9/30/09	190.50
McKenzie, Lois	"	"	10/30/09	1/31/10	400.75
Johnson, Dorwhitem	"	"	1/1/10	5/15/10	194.00
McKenzie, Lois	"	"	2/1/10	6/16/10	400.75
Lee, Shane	"	"	2/22/10	3/31/10	95.25
					<b>1867.25</b>
Eli, Angela	Clerical	Bursar	8/17/09	9/30/10	75.00
Plair-Jones, Dennetta	"	"	8/17/09	9/30/10	173.00
Marshall, Joseph	"	"	1/6/10	6/30/10	70.00
Deener, Dawnita	"	"	5/5/10	12/31/10	834.25
Melendrez, Christina	"	"	8/2/10	12/31/10	264.00
Haskell, Byron	"	"	8/5/10	11/30/10	518.25
Washington, Litoria	"	"	8/5/10	11/30/10	339.50
Chapman, Bruce	"	"	8/11/10	9/30/10	312.25
Harris, Bryanna	"	"	8/11/10	11/30/10	463.00
Thurman, Aaron	"	"	8/11/10	12/31/10	420.50
					<b>3469.75</b>
Lane, Tiffany	Clerical	Chemistry & Physics	3/16/10	7/31/10	806.50
Fenner, Kiara	"	"	6/1/10	7/31/10	290.00
Goodman, Amber	"	"	6/1/10	7/30/10	210.00
Gutierrez, James	"	"	6/1/10	7/31/10	300.50
Clanton, Ryan	"	"	6/7/10	7/31/10	240.00
Smith-Hart, Deonna	"	"	9/16/10	11/1/10	424.00
					<b>2271.00</b>
McKenzie, Bennet	Clerical	Continuing Education	1/16/09	6/30/10	619.00
	"	"	10/1/10		484.00
					<b>1103.00</b>
Siddiqui, Erum	Clerical	Dean of the College of Pharmacy	6/12/09	6/30/10	120.00
Fanouth-Nguessa, Wenceslas	"	"	6/7/10	7/31/10	270.00
Ariwodo, Kimberlyn	"	"	6/9/10	7/31/10	216.00

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix E**

***Extra Help Positions Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule***

<b>Employee Name</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Beginning Pay Period Date</b>	<b>Ending Pay Period Date</b>	<b>Employee Hours Worked</b>
Thomas, Kecia	"	"	6/10/10	7/31/10	310.00
Siddiqui, Erum	"	"	7/1/10	7/31/10	120.00
					<b>1036.00</b>
Lee, Lasandra	<b>Clerical</b>	Financial Aid	8/1/10	6/30/11	1342.00
Hooker, Marshon	"	"	9/2/10		362.00
					<b>1704.00</b>
McCray, Brandon	<b>Clerical</b>	Office of the President	9/16/10	11/5/10	165.00
Hampton, Maurice	"	"	9/16/10		355.00
Hubbard, Kamillah	"	"	9/16/10		825.50
					<b>1345.50</b>
Diaz, Beatriz	<b>Clerical</b>	Pharmacy Academic Support	2/22/10	6/30/10	639.50
Smith, Quinn	"	"	6/7/10	8/6/10	294.00
Walker, Kyle	"	"	6/7/10	8/6/10	563.50
					<b>1497.00</b>
Warren, Candies	<b>Clerical</b>	Registrar	4/16/09		625.00
Bibbs, Tony	"	"	10/1/09	12/31/09	808.00
					<b>1433.00</b>
Koroma, Lesley	<b>Clerical</b>	University Postal Service	7/1/10	10/15/10	508.00
Terrell, Richard	"	"	7/1/10		595.50
					<b>1103.50</b>
Holmes, Tiffany	<b>Custodial</b>	O & M Plant	11/3/08	6/30/09	165.00
Terry, Darien	"	"	11/7/08	6/30/09	197.50
Gipson, Alan	"	"	11/16/08	6/30/09	142.25
Newcomb, Ramon	"	"	11/24/08	6/30/09	101.75
Brown, Tawana	"	"	2/5/09	6/30/09	608.00
					<b>1214.50</b>
Steward, Lavon	<b>Custodial</b>	O & M Plant	6/16/10	12/31/10	654.00
Caldwell, Shamika	"	"	10/7/10		37.50
Brown, Tawana	"	"	10/12/10		382.50
					<b>1074.00</b>
Walton, Paulette	<b>Professional</b>	Student Health Services	1/8/09		695.50
Davis-Hunter, Erica	"	"	7/6/09		550.00

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix E**

***Extra Help Positions Exceeding the 900-Hour Rule***

<b>Employee Name</b>	<b>Position Title</b>	<b>Department</b>	<b>Beginning Pay Period Date</b>	<b>Ending Pay Period Date</b>	<b>Employee Hours Worked</b>
Goodrich-Hester, Yvette	"	"	4/5/10	6/30/11	465.00
Davis-Hunter, Erica	"	"	7/1/10		480.00
					<b>2190.50</b>
Holmes, John	<b>Shuttle Bus Driver</b>	Parking	10/23/09	6/30/10	489.50
Davis, Theodore	"	"	10/26/09	6/30/10	150.00
Ray, Michael	"	"	10/26/09	6/30/10	471.00
Sneed, Milton	"	"	10/26/09	6/30/10	221.00
Smith, Donald	"	"	11/3/09	6/30/10	542.00
Hayes, Alonzo	"	"	4/16/10		482.00
Dickerson, Eddie	"	"	5/1/10		246.00
Holmes, John	"	"	7/1/10		385.50
Ray, Michael	"	"	7/1/10		384.00
Smith, Donald	"	"	7/1/10	6/30/11	448.00
Sneed, Milton	"	"	7/1/10	11/22/10	221.00
Russell, Curley	"	"	9/16/10		67.00
Topps-Watson, Lou	"	"	9/16/10		48.00
					<b>4155.00</b>
Onatoye, Olumide	<b>Technical</b>	Chemistry & Physics	6/1/09	5/15/10	484.00
Burts, Alan	"	"	10/28/09	5/10/10	343.00
Hodges, Brian	"	"	2/1/10		822.50
Arellano, Saul	"	"	10/1/10	12/31/10	780.03
					<b>2429.53</b>

**State Universities Civil Service System  
Chicago State University  
FY2011 Biennial Compliance Audit**

**Appendix F**

***Civil Service Position Descriptions  
Not Compliant With Cyclic Review/Not Received***

<b>Position Control Number</b>	<b>Classification Title</b>	<b>Date of Last Review</b>
51	Assembly Hall Attendant	3/30/2004
71	Building Service Foreman	Not Received
91	Route Driver	Not Received
115	Television Director/Producer	Not Received
118	Program Adviser	Not Received
130	Account Technician II	Not Received
142	Benefits Counselor	Not Received
144	Grants/Contracts Administrator I	Not Received
158	Manager of University Cashiering Operations	Not Received
170	Police Telecommunicator	Not Received
186	Inventory Clerk	Not Received
268	Assistant Payroll Manager	Not Received
275	Police Sergeant	Not Received
280	Benefits Manager	Not Received
311	Administrative Clerk	Not Received
340	General Foreman Electrician	Not Received
346	Office Support Associate	Not Received
361	Plant Operating Engineer	Not Received
373	Lab Animal Care Specialist	Not Received
406	Building Service Worker	Not Received
408	Building Service Sub-Foreman	Not Received
435	Assistant Records Management Officer	Not Received
475	Copy Center Operator II	Not Received
492	Office Support Specialist	Not Received
704	Library Operations Associate	11/4/2004
789	Program Services Aide	Not Received
802	Information Technology Support Associate	Not Received