UNIVERSITY STAFF SENATE
May 7, 2015
Approved Minutes

The regular meeting of the Staff Senate was called to order on May 7, 2015 at 9:01 in the International Room, Morris University Center by Cindy Cobetto, president elect in absence of John Caupert.

Present: Bartholomew, Cobetto, Trucks, Dain, Dickey, Dusenbery, Fricke, Hunter, Ormesher, Pulley, Welter, Langston, Ex Officio: Manning, Panel: Kershaw, White

Excused: Caupert, Mumphard, Candela

Absent: Cooper

Guests: Melanie Schoenborn term begins Sept. 1, Jamie Goodwin (term begins Sept. 1)

Announcements

All of the announcements on the agenda were announced and a few added by Cindy Cobetto:

- Bob Dixon, ICAC was originally a guest speaker for today, but rescheduled for August
- Please submit names to John or Cindy regarding two seats appointed by the Staff Senate to the UPBC. One is a three year term and the other is to fill the remaining two years of a three year term. It was determined that Norris is still eligible to serve one more term.
- Cindy Cobetto explained why keeping the special meeting makes more sense.
- The results of the Search for Director of Campus Recreation are in and Keith Becherer will be the new director.

Introductions of current and new senators were made.

Speaker: Michael Pulley, SUCSAC gave a report of the last meeting. Michael provided handouts and they are filed with the minutes.

Break: Cindy Cobetto called a break at 10:25 a.m.

The meeting resumed at 10:35 a.m.

Consideration of the Minutes: The April 2, 2015 minutes were approved as submitted (Bartholomew/Dusenbery).

Unfinished Business: None

New Business

A motion to cancel the July meeting was made by Bill Dusenbery and seconded by Clyde Trucks, II. The motion carried.
Kirt Ormesher accepted a nomination for 2015-2016 President-Elect. Voting will take place at the special meeting on August 6

Reports

Panel

Administrative Staff: Gretchen Fricke submitted a report and it is filed with the minutes. Gretchen added that the panel had discussed ‘term employees’ and requested the Senates input on whether they should be included in the Senate. There was a discussion and it was pointed out that the senate requires a person to be employed at SIUE for two consecutive years in order to be eligible to serve on the senate. It was pointed out that many term employees have been employed at SIUE more than two years. Gretchen will take the information back to the panel to determine if a revision to the Constitution and bylaws is in order. If so, Gretchen will bring the changes for a first read in June.

Satellite Campus Reports

Alton: No report.

East St. Louis: Shrylene Langston reported that East St. Louis is busy. A new East St. Louis newsletter has been created. Shrylene will share it with the Senate each month. Shrylene reported they are preparing for many graduations.

Standing Committees

UPBC: Michelle Welter reported for Norris. There is a UPBC meeting scheduled for tomorrow. There is nothing more than what President Dunn has already reported. The Council is prepared to meet in July if the State budget is approved.

UCB: Kirt Ormesher reported that they have not met recently. The recent issue with the Grill Gone Wild will go to the UCB. There was a discussion.

Public Relations Committee: No report.

Other Reports

Parking & Traffic Committee: Bill Dusenbery reported that the committee met last month with various things on the agenda. Bill reported on many of the various reports given at the committee meeting such as the Vadalebene Center to get new siding because of leaks, resurface Circle Dr., reconstruction of the Quad, window replacement in Art building, Zip car report, Rave Guardian, carpooling, carpooling will only be on the Edwardsville campus as a pilot program with priority spaces for carpoolers, registration for carpooling is done through RideFinders. Two people carpooling will each pay half of tag regular price and share one tag. They will be guaranteed 4 rides home a year for unexpected changes in the carpool. Rave mobile app is coming soon. Parkeon mobile app should be here by the Fall of 2015. There will be a cost as a service charge. Cougar card issue not resolved yet. There will be cameras on lots. Soon parking fines can be paid at the Parking Office. Bill reported stats for the following: MAP escorts: 45, jumps: 41,
lockouts: 46, tire problems: 4. Bill reported that they are not able to have lockout service at the Alton campus there is not an officer there and it would not be cost effective to drive to Alton for a lock out. There was a discussion about Circle Drive construction which begins Monday, May 11. There will be notifications on the SIUE Parking Facebook page during the construction time period.

Send any names for UPBC to John Caupert and ‘cc’ Cindy Cobetto and Vicki Kruse.

Public Comments: None

Adjournment: The meeting was adjourned at 11:22 a.m. (Schoenborn/Ormesher).

Approved as submitted June 4, 2015
Vicki Kruse/University Governance

Panel/Committee Name: Professional Staff Panel

Panel/Committee Chairperson: Gretchen Fricke

Panel/Committee Membership (alphabetical order, please, Indicate whether faculty, staff or student):

1) Courtney Breckenridge (Staff)
2) Shrylene Clark Langston (Staff)
3) Dana Dain (Staff)
4) Danita Mumphard (Staff)
5) Chad Verbais (Staff)
6) Angela White (Staff)
7) 
8) 
9) 
10) 

Panel/Committee Charge:

Person submitting report: Gretchen Fricke Extension: 3580

Please use this sheet for your report. Use back if necessary. Return to University Governance Office (Box 1252 or vkruse@siue.edu) as soon as the report is complete.

REPORT

Quarterly meeting held April 21 (Breckenridge, Langston, Verbais, White and Fricke in attendance).

Discussion regarding “term” employees. Should these employees be included in the staff senate and corresponding panels. This is a discussion item for the staff senate.

Panel would like to include a message in the newsletter when it is published next.

Unless the need arises, the panel will not meet next quarter but will meet the final quarter of the 2015 year.
AGENDA FOR THE STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

The State Universities Civil Service Employees' Advisory Committee will convene its quarterly meeting at 10:00 a.m. Thursday, April 16, 2015 and at 9:00 a.m., Friday, April 17, 2015 hosted by Governor's State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item Number</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1. Call to Order – Chair Andy Small
2. Roll Call – Secretary Kim Kirchner
3. Introduction of Guests
4. Report of Designated Employer Representative (DER) of Host Campus – Ms. Joyce Coleman
5. Approval of minutes of the January, 2015 Quarterly Meeting (Action Item) *Committee Members will approve January 22-23, 2015 meeting minutes.*
6. Approval of minutes of Executive Committee meetings held January 23 & February 25, 2015 (Action Item) *Executive Committee Members will approve meeting minutes.*
7. Review of Correspondence
8. Public Comments
9. Report of Chair – Andy Small
   * Merit Board Hearings March 11 & 13, 2015
10. SURS Update – Discussion Item
11. Report of Director –

   1) Update on Rule Change Proposal (Residency)
   2) Update on HB3102 (Rule of Three)
   3) Audit Update
      a. UIUC follow-up
b. WIU follow-up

4) Class Plan Update
   a. Police Sergeant and Police Officer Exam Project
   b. Typing Test
   c. Clerk and Office Support Series revisions
   d. Police Corporals
   e. Deletion of old/unused classes

5) Legal Update

6) Merit Board Activities
   a. Sub-Committee
   b. New U of I Board member

7) Other Activities

12. Report of Executive Committee

13. Report of Legislative Committee

14. Report of Election Committee

15. Other Items as Presented
Rauner: Can't trust Illinois Supreme Court justices 'to be rational'

By Kim Geiger
Chicago Tribune

APRIL 6, 2015, 7:03 AM

Gov. Bruce Rauner, who has been barnstorming the state to promote his message that Illinois government is corrupt and in need of "structural reform," took aim Tuesday at the Illinois Supreme Court, saying he doesn't trust its justices.

The Republican governor has often criticized the state's system of electing judges to the bench and has advocated barring trial lawyers from making campaign contributions to them. But Rauner's remarks Tuesday to a suburban newspaper editorial board took that argument a step further, targeting the high court specifically.

"I don't trust the Supreme Court to be rational in their decisions," Rauner told the Daily Herald. "I think they're activist judges who want to be legislators."

As asked by the newspaper if he believes the state's high court is part of a "corrupt" system, Rauner said: "Yes, correct. Yes. Yes. We have a system where we elect our judges, and the trial lawyers who argue cases in front of those judges give campaign cash to those judges. It's a corrupt system."

Rauner's pointed critique comes as the Supreme Court is reviewing a 2013 law signed by former Democratic Gov. Pat Quinn that would cut benefits to state workers and retirees in an attempt to relieve some of the state's $105 billion government worker pension debt. Rauner told the Chicago Tribune Editorial Board on Monday that he believes the court will find the law unconstitutional because it cuts benefits that already have been accrued by workers.

Rauner, too, has pushed cutting pension benefits to help pull the state out of the red. But in a sign of his distrust of the court, he is talking about seeking a constitutional amendment in an attempt to get around language in the state constitution that holds public pension benefits cannot "be diminished or impaired."

The justices on the high court signaled devotion to that language when they ruled in favor of retirees in a separate case last summer involving an attempt to make retirees pay more for their state-subsidized health care. The court ruled 6-1 that the language in the constitution was "aimed at protecting the right to receive the promised retirement benefits, not the adequacy of the funding to pay for them."

Rauner told the Tribune on Monday he thought the court's ruling in that case was "off base." He said he wants to use a constitutional amendment to "end-run the years of lawsuits" that would come from his plan to reduce pension benefits.
"We can’t just let the Supreme Court decide these issues just with the vague language we’ve got now," Rauner said. "I have no confidence."

Rauner previously said he wanted to wait for the Supreme Court ruling on the 2013 law so that justices could provide guidance on whether pensions could be altered. Rauner has discussed a plan to grant current workers the benefits they are owed until July 1, then shift them all into a pension plan for newer employees with vastly reduced benefits.

The seven justices on the Illinois Supreme Court are elected to 10-year terms and face retention elections when their terms expire. Democrats hold a 4-3 majority on the panel. For decades, pro-business groups have poured millions of dollars into Supreme Court races, as have trial lawyer groups who oppose limits on civil damage awards. Many of the pro-business groups were aligned with Rauner in last year’s governor’s race.

Rauner said he favors a merit-based judicial selection process, something that’s been discussed in the state for more than 30 years but has failed to gain traction, and wants to set up a task force to study how judges are chosen in other states.

"Right now, they’re sort of immersed in politics, and groups that benefit or are impacted by their decisions, or law firms that argue cases in front of them and therefore have their lives and their incomes based upon the decisions, can donate campaign cash to them," Rauner said Tuesday in an interview with the Tribune. "And it’s a conflict of interest, in the whole system. It’s the judicial system. It’s not one particular court."

A Supreme Court spokesman declined to comment on the governor’s remarks.

kgeiger@tribpub.com
Twitter @kimggeiger

Copyright © 2015, Chicago Tribune
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To: Merit Board Subcommittee  
From: Andy Small  
Chair, Employee Advisory Committee  
Subject: Public Comment on State University Civil Service System

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Merit Board subcommittee this morning and look forward to continuing the dialogue on these topics after this hearing has concluded. I will keep my comments brief so there is time to answer any questions that you may have.

I would like to address each individual topic on the agenda:

*Remove “Limiting Language” from the SUCSS Exemption Procedures Manual*

EAC representatives worked with members from the campuses Human Resource’s areas and the members from the system’s office in order to compile a working document that we could all agree on. That document, the Exemption Procedures Manual, was taken to the satisfactory conclusion by the group that worked on it. EAC had an understanding that we were all in agreement with the manual and urged the Merit Board to approve the document. Now, after we were asked to contribute, we have learned that the Human Resources group headed by the representatives from the University of Illinois wants to remove “Limiting Language” from the document without consultation with EAC and the system’s office. We at EAC are confused and frustrated and have not given our approval for the removal of the limiting language nor have we even been consulted as to want the limiting language is or why that group now wants it removed. We humbly ask that if we are going to remove any language from the Exemption Procedures Manual that EAC be consulted and are in agreement with the revision.

*Formalize SUCSS Audit Process/ Create Audit Procedures Manual*
EAC believes that there is a formalized audit process in place. We believe that this was placed on the agenda to actually give the authority to revise the SUCSS audit procedure to limit the audit’s ability to identify jobs that have been filled with the wrong classification of employee. The audit is rooted in state statutes and needs to be complied with. Most universities have been able to work with the current audit procedure. EAC again asks that if the Merit Board deems it appropriate to revise/formalize the audit process, that EAC have a seat at the table and that our input is taken into consideration.

EAC believes that if we are going to create a new Audit Procedures Manual that we take into serious consideration the great work that has been done by the human resources group at the University of Illinois at Chicago. After a non-compliant audit several years ago, the UIC group painstakingly has documented each job description that, with the approval of the system’s office, will have a complete blueprint of job descriptions and identify all jobs that are exempt. We applaud their efforts and suggest that any created Audit Procedures Manual take into serious consideration the work done by the group at UIC.

Expand the “Rule of Three” Demonstration Project

EAC is in total agreement with the expansion of the Rule of Three demonstration project. We feel that this is a win/win for all involved.

Allow Out of State Recruiting for Civil Service Positions

EAC supports recruiting out-of-state employees for the positions requested by the Universities and identified as appropriate by the system’s office with the following reservations;

We would like to see a reasonable time frame identified as appropriate for hired out-of-state employees to move into Illinois,

We would like to identify what will happen to employees that do not comply with that time frame,

We would like to identify what happens to current in state employees that then chose to move out of state.

Allow Campus HR offices to approve specialty factors

EAC does not support the concept that universities have the sole authority to approve specialty factors. We believe that this will lead to modified job descriptions by the universities to specifically exempt jobs that are currently in the civil service classifications. We see this as an attempt to erode the system that currently exists for our job classifications.
In conclusion, we believe that it is in all of our best interests to take a serious look at our civil service system. We understand that pressures revolving around reduced funding and enrollment will require us to keep our system dynamic. We appreciate making sure that our system works for the betterment of university employees BUT, we hope that all understand that the system was designed to provide university employees with benefits and job protection that are extremely important to our constituents in these uncertain times. We hope that current modifications that are being considered now and in the future will have the input and agreement of all who represent state university employees. We also request that we have an agreement that audit finding will be addressed and complied with. We currently do not understand what happens when state statues are not complied with, such as audit findings, and see this as a detriment to our system.

Respectfully submitted

Andy Small

Chair, EAC
University hiring officers call for civil service changes

Christy Levy
March 17, 2015

The state’s civil service statutes should be changed to provide a more diverse applicant pool and greater flexibility in exempting certain positions from civil service classification, university leaders said at a hearing at UIC Friday.

University administrators, faculty and staff spoke in support of five recommendations compiled by human resources directors from all Illinois public universities. The recommendations were presented in November to University Civil Service Merit Board chairman James Montgomery, a University of Illinois trustee.

A subcommittee of Merit Board trustees — chaired by university trustee Karen Hasara — held two hearings on the recommendations, one in Urbana March 11 and the other Friday at UIC with a video conference to speakers in Urbana.

The State Universities Civil Service System statutes — written in the 1960s — should be updated, said Maureen Parks, executive director and associate vice president of human resources.

"There are practices and procedures that are not exactly modern for today’s environment," Parks said. "The HR directors believe there needs to be some reform to make it more efficient, more productive and more fair, and to offer opportunities for growth."

The recommendations call for changing language approved by the Merit Board in 2008. Since then, audits have found a significant number of job misclassifications, the human resources directors said in their recommendations.

"If the language is not taken out, the state universities will continue to have substantial audit findings for misclassification," they write. "It will be virtually impossible for a university to exempt a person from civil service and this will significantly impact the flexibility needed for our campuses to function efficiently."

Their recommendations include:

- remove language that requires a position to be designated civil service if its description matches the specifications for a civil service classification, and that exempts all positions as civil service unless exempted by statute
- create an audit procedures manual and a three-year audit cycle, rather than a two-year cycle
- modify scoring criteria to increase the diversity and size of the candidate pool referred for a position
- allow out-of-state recruiting for civil service positions
- provide flexibility for campus human resources offices to approve "specially labor" that enhance minimum qualifications in the classification specifications, which are sometimes outdated.

Urbana Chancellor Phyllis Wise urged the Merit Board to accept the recommendations and meet with human resources directors from public universities to discuss the proposed changes. The Merit Board will consider the recommendations at its May 20 meeting in Urbana.

The changes would improve the civil service hiring process, Wise said, but there’s still a need for employees to fill other job classifications.

"These changes do not diminish our need for academic professionals," she said. "Our workforce is complex. That means we need people in many job classifications."

Urbana faculty member Matthew Wheeler said he was "seriously concerned" about the language in the civil service statutes that provides few exemptions.

"It puts severe limitations on our ability to recruit and retain talented individuals," said Wheeler, professor of animal sciences and bioengineering.
Wheeler said his particular concern about the requirement that civil service employees must be Illinois residents. In his research lab, Wheeler hired employees from Brazil and Italy who have specialized knowledge of regeneration — "there only may be a few dozen around the world."

"This may force me to leave an academic research institution that I love," he said.

According to the current "Rule of Three" in the statutes, hiring managers must consider the top three candidates who apply for a civil service position. If the candidates do not meet the requirements, the hiring manager must close the search and start the process again, said Susan Key, director of portfolio human resources in the Urbana Office of the Vice Chancellor for Research.

"If hiring positions is kind of part art and part science," she said. "It takes time and effort, and any restrictions we have to find a way to get rid of those restrictions. It shouldn't be based on luck or hope. It should be based on a strategic plan."

The university needs a long-term solution to provide a more efficient civil service hiring and classification system, said Walter Knorr, university vice president and chief financial officer.

"We must have the ability to define our workforce based on the ever-changing needs of the University of Illinois," he said. "Every university in the state is in the same situation."

Providing a larger applicant pool for civil service positions would support the university's commitment to diversity, said Tyrone Forman, UIUC associate chancellor and vice provost for diversity.

"It reflects our goals of being more accessible and inclusive university and reflecting the demographics of the Chicago metropolitan area," said Forman, professor of African American studies.

The civil service statute and rules are online.
99TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
State of Illinois
2015 and 2016
HB3102

Introduced, by Rep. Carol Ammons

SYNOPSIS AS INTRODUCED:

110 ILCS 70/36h from Ch. 24 1/2, par. 38b7
110 ILCS 70/36j from Ch. 24 1/2, par. 38b9

Amends the State Universities Civil Service Act. In provisions concerning appointments and promotions, changes references from the Director of the University Civil Service Merit Board to the Executive Director of the University Civil Service Merit Board. Provides that if a position needs to be filled, the Executive Director shall certify to the employer the names and addresses of the persons with the 3 highest scores on the appropriate register (instead of the names and addresses of the 3 persons standing highest on the appropriate register); makes related changes. Provides that if a superior position in the promotional line is to be filled, the Executive Director shall certify to the employer, in the order of their seniority, the names and addresses of the persons with the 3 highest scores on the appropriate promotional register (instead of the names and addresses of the 3 persons standing highest upon the appropriate promotional register). Removes language that provides that sex shall be disregarded except when the nature of the position requires otherwise.
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FISCAL NOTE ACT MAY APPLY

A BILL FOR

AN ACT concerning education.

Be it enacted by the People of the State of Illinois,
represented in the General Assembly:

Section 5. The State Universities Civil Service Act is
amended by changing Sections 36h and 36j as follows:

(110 ILCS 70/36h) (from Ch. 24 1/2, par. 38b7)
Sec. 36h. Appointment.

(1) Whenever an employer covered by the University System
has a position which needs to be filled, this employer shall
inform the Executive Director of the Merit Board. The Executive
Director shall then certify to the employer the names and
addresses of the three persons with the 3 standing highest
scores on the register for the classification to which the
position is assigned. The employer shall select one of these
persons certified for the position and shall notify the
Executive Director of the Merit Board of the his selection. If
less than 3 scores three names appear on the appropriate
register, the Executive Director shall certify the names and
addresses of all the person or persons on the register. Sex
shall be disregarded except when the nature of the position
required otherwise.

(2) All appointments shall be for a probationary period of
no less than 6 months and no longer than 12 months for each

The service during the probationary period shall be deemed to be a part of the examination. During the probationary period, the employee may be dismissed if the employer determines that the employee has failed to demonstrate the ability and the qualifications necessary to furnish satisfactory service. The employer shall notify the Executive Director in writing of such dismissal. If an employee is not so dismissed during his or her probationary period his or her appointment shall be deemed complete at the end of the period.

(3) No person shall be appointed to any police department of any university or college covered by the University System unless he or she possesses a high school diploma or an equivalent high school education, and unless he or she is a person of good character and is not a person who has been convicted of a felony or a crime involving moral turpitude.

(Source: P.A. 86-708.)

(110 ILCS 70/36j) (from Ch. 24 1/2, par. 38b9)

Sec. 36j. Promotions. The Merit Board shall by rules provide for promotions on the basis of ability and experience and seniority in service and examination and to provide in all cases where it is practicable that vacancies will be filled by promotion. The Merit Board shall by rule fix lines of promotion from such several offices and places to superior offices or places in all cases where, in the judgment of the Merit Board, the duties of such several positions directly tend to fit the incumbent for a superior position.

Employees promoted in the promotional line shall have their seniority for the highest position held on the basis of length of service in that classification. For the next lower classification the employee may add his seniority in the higher classification to that in the lower to determine seniority in the lower classification.

Whenever a superior position in the promotional line in the classified civil service under the University System is to be
filled, the Executive Director shall certify to the employer, in the order of their seniority, the names and addresses of the three persons with the three standing highest scores on the promotional register for the class or grade to which said position belongs. The employer shall appoint one of those three persons whose names were certified by the Executive Director. Exit shall be disregarded except when the nature of the position requires otherwise. Appointments to superior positions in the promotional line shall be on probation for a period of no less than 6 months and no longer than 12 months for each class of positions in the classification plan, the length of the probationary period having been determined by the Executive Director. Persons so appointed may be demoted at any time during the period of probation, if, in the opinion of the employer, they have failed to demonstrate the ability and the qualifications necessary to furnish satisfactory service, but shall not be discharged from the superior position if they have previously completed a probationary period in an inferior position in the promotional line.

Whenever a person is promoted to a superior position in the promotional line prior to the completion of the probationary period in any one of the positions in the classified civil service under the University System, total service in the inferior position and in all such superior positions shall be combined to establish certified status and seniority in the inferior position. (Source: P.A. 82-524.)
The following proposed administrative rule change must be considered upon adoption of HB3102.

Change Section 250.60(d) to read as follows:

d. Certification from Registers

1. Reemployment in positions shall be made in accordance with the register, with highest seniority taking precedence. From a reemployment register, the employer shall certify only one name for appointment.

2. From the promotional register or original entry register, the employer shall certify the names of the persons with the three names standing highest scores on the register at the time the vacancy is declared, or as otherwise provided under subsection(d)(3).

3. 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 ties 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 be required to interview more than once the same candidate, as currently certified from the register, for a position of the same class.

4. If a total of three names is not available from the promotional register and/or original entry register, the employer shall certify those listed, and in addition may refer enough other candidates so that the employing officer has the choice of three candidates for the position. Such additional candidates as are necessary to provide the employing officer with a choice of three must be qualified for the class of the position to which referred and may be employed in accordance with Section 250.70(b)(1) and Section 250.90(b)(6).

5. A promotional register and/or an original entry register becomes closed for the purpose of certification of the names of candidates to a particular vacant position at a time established by the employer. Once this time has been established, it must become a matter of record, and it cannot be changed unless, when this time is reached, the employer is unable to provide to the selecting official three candidates from the promotional register and/or original entry register, and the selecting official wishes to interview three candidates prior to filling a position, whereupon a new date must be established in accordance with the aforementioned procedure. The selecting official shall interview from the registers, for any one vacancy, in accordance with the provisions of subsection(d)(3).
6. Candidates on an eligible register may be referred concurrently to more than one vacancy in the appropriate class, if in the judgment of the employer the procedure is needed to speed up employment transactions. Total referrals to a vacant position are to be limited to the individuals with the top three scores available candidates, or in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d)(3).

7. The name of a candidate on a register, who at the time of induction into military service is an employee of an employer under the University System, shall be placed in suspension until the termination of military service, at which time his/her name shall be reactivated on the appropriate register in the order of his/her score on the original examination, providing the register of the class has not been voided during the period of his/her military leave.

8. In making a selection from among the three names those individuals with the top scores certified standing highest on the register, and in accordance with the provisions of subsection (d)(3), the employer shall not discriminate because of race, color, religious or political affiliation, or because of age or sex, when the reasonable demands of the position do not require such a distinction.

9. The Executive Director may authorize specialized position certification for eligible register candidates who possess special and identified qualifications that previously have been established as job-related requirements for a specific position as well as being fully qualified for the class. In this instance, cCertification from a register shall be made from the individuals with the top three scores top three scoring candidates who possess the established specialized requirements.
STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

1) **Heading of the Part:** State Universities Civil Service System

2) **Code Citation:** 80 Ill. Adm. Code 250

3) **Section Number:** 250.50
   **Proposed Action:** Amendment

4) **Statutory Authority:** 110 ILCS 70

5) **A Complete Description of the Subjects and Issues Involved:** The primary changes to this section of the Code is to allow an expanded pool of candidates for professional positions, consistent with the current employment and occupational trends associated with certain positions, while still requiring specific residency components to be met upon placement into one of these positions. This proposed rulemaking will allow the universities and agencies under the State Universities Civil Service System to consider applicants outside of the state of Illinois for professional, semi-professional, and managerial classifications. This proposed rulemaking will also provide examination accommodation guidelines and a more specific process to close testing for specific classifications when employment registers are sufficient.

6) **Published studies or reports, along with the sources of underlying data, that were used when composing this rulemaking:** None.

7) **Will this rulemaking replace an emergency rulemaking currently in effect?** No.

8) **Does this rulemaking contain an automatic repeal date?** No.

9) **Does this proposed rulemaking contain incorporations by reference?** No.

10) **Are there any other proposed amendments pending on this Part?** No.

11) **Statement of Statewide Policy Objectives:** This proposed amendment will not create or expand a State mandate.

12) **Time, Place, and Manner in which interested persons may comment on this proposed rulemaking:** Interested persons may submit written comments on this proposed amendment within 45 days after the date of publication to the Illinois Register:

    Mari Martinelli
ILLINOIS REGISTER

STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

Legal Counsel Manager
State Universities Civil Service System
1717 Philo Road, Suite 24
Urbana, IL 61802

Phone: 217/278-3150, ext. 226
Email: marim@suess.illinois.gov

13) Initial Regulatory Flexibility Analysis:

A) Types of small businesses, small municipalities and not for profit corporations affected: None

B) Reporting, bookkeeping or other procedures required for compliance: None

C) Types of professional skills necessary for compliance: None

14) Regulatory Agenda on which this rulemaking was summarized: The agency did not anticipate this rulemaking.

The full text of the Proposed Amendment begins on the next page:
STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

NOTICE OF PROPOSED AMENDMENT

TITLE 80: PUBLIC OFFICIALS AND EMPLOYEES
SUBTITLE A: MERIT EMPLOYMENT SYSTEMS
CHAPTER VI: STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

PART 250
STATE UNIVERSITIES CIVIL SERVICE SYSTEM

Section
250.5 Definitions
250.10 Purpose, Adoption, and Amendment of Rules
250.20 The State Universities Civil Service System and its Divisions
250.30 The Classification Plan
250.40 Military Service Preference, Veterans Preference
250.50 Examinations
250.60 Eligible Registers
250.70 Nonstatus Appointments
250.80 Status Appointments
250.90 Probationary Period
250.100 Reassignments and Transfers
250.110 Separations and Demotions
250.120 Seniority
250.130 Review Procedures
250.140 Delegation of Authority and Responsibilities
250.150 Training
250.160 Suspension of Rules

AUTHORIZED: Implementing and authorized by the State Universities Civil Service Act [110 ILCS 70].

Section 250.50 Examinations

a) Kinds of Examinations. Examinations shall be of two kinds: original entry and promotional. Both kinds shall be open and continuous competitive examinations. For the purpose of this Section, an original entry and a promotional examination shall be considered to be one and the same examination.

b) Eligibility to Compete in Examinations

1) Any citizen or resident of the State of Illinois, who applies for examination in a specific class at a constituent place of employment served by the University System, who is not rejected or disqualified under subsection (c), and who meets the minimum qualifications as prescribed in the class specification, shall be admitted to the examination. For classes requiring valid licenses or certificates, an applicant must show possession of the license or certificate at, or prior to, time of taking the examination. Out-of-state applicants may also be admitted for examination in accordance with conditions outlined in subsection (b)(6).

2) A promotional examination shall be open to a status employee in a place of employment, who is not rejected or disqualified under subsection (c), who meets the minimum qualifications specified in the class specification for a higher class in the appropriate promotional line and who, in addition, is working by virtue of a status appointment, in a position of a lower class in the same promotional line, is on leave of absence from such a position, or is on layoff from such a position.

3) An applicant who fails to meet the minimum qualifications established for the class, but who can offer qualifications that in the opinion of the Executive Director are considered to be compensatory, shall be admitted
to the examination for the class. The names of all applicants who pass the
examination shall be placed on the appropriate register in order of score.

4) In the absence of a name of a candidate on any existing register for a class,
an applicant who does not possess the minimum qualifications for the
class and cannot present compensatory qualifications may be admitted
with prior approval of the Executive Director to the examination for the
class for the purpose of attempting to fill a specific vacancy. The name of
an applicant so admitted, and who passes the examination, shall remain on
the register only until the specific vacant position has been filled.

5) In accordance with the Americans With Disability Act (ADA), any
applicant with a recognized disability may receive an accommodation for
any examination maintained by the University System. These
accommodations are to be administered in coordination with requirements
contained in the ADA, the State Universities Civil Service Act [110 ILCS
70] and this Part, and other applicable policies at each employment
location. An applicant with a physical handicap who fails a section or
sections of an original entry examination because of circumstances
directly related to the handicap, who is subsequently employed in the
absence of a register, may, after six months of satisfactory service, upon
recommendation of an employer and written approval of the Executive
Director, be declared exempt from qualifying on the failed section or
sections of the examination, in which case he/she shall become a status
employee in the position in which he/she has been employed or in another
position in the same class.

6) For classes within the professional, semi-professional, or managerial
occupational areas requiring highly technical or professional qualifications
for which a broader recruitment base is typically applied, out-of-state
residents may be admitted to the examination and equally considered
there is an inadequate supply of qualified applicants who are citizens of, or
residents in, the State of Illinois, out-of-state residents may be admitted to
the examination. In these instances when Illinois citizenship or residency requirement is waived, out-of-state candidates must establish
Illinois residency within 90 calendar days after any employment offer
or final appointment. Out-of-state candidates shall be listed on the register ahead
of out-of-state candidates.
7) Any applicant may rewrite an examination for a class three times within any twelve month period, with at least one month time lapse between every rewrite. The candidate's place on the register for the class shall be determined by the highest score achieved on any examination for the class.

A) For the purpose of this Section, an original entry and a promotional examination shall be considered to be one and the same examination.

B) The limitations of this Section do not apply to an applicant who fails the typewriting and transcribing sections of an examination.

c) Rejection or Disqualification of Applicants. The employer may reject any applicant; or, after examination, the Executive Director may refuse to certify any candidate who, in addition to requirements specified in Section 36[f] of the State Universities Civil Service Act [110 ILCS 70/36] and subsection (b), fails to pass a physical examination given to determine his/her physical qualifications for employment, abuses intoxicating substances to excess, uses illegal drugs or narcotics, has been dismissed from either private or public service for a cause detrimental to his/her employment by an employer under the University System, has maintained an unsatisfactory employment record, has practiced deception or fraud in his/her application, examination, or material pertaining to these, or has committed an offense that in the judgment of the Executive Director disqualifies him/her for employment.

d) Character of Examinations

1) Examinations shall consist of one or more of the following: written test; performance test; oral test; physical test; aptitude test; practical test; other appropriate tests; a rating of experience and training.

2) All examination content shall be provided by the staff of the University System.

3) All examination supplies and materials and all examinations are the property of the University System.

4) An original entry or promotional examination may be revised, with the approval of the Executive Director, without affecting existing original
entry or promotional registers for the class, providing the revision does not change the character or weighting of sections of the examination.

5) Upon approval of the Executive Director, the character or weighting of sections of an original entry or promotional examination may be changed, with the approval of the Executive Director, provided providing that there is sufficient evidence that the current examination for the class is not a satisfactory examining instrument; and providing, further, that the character or weighting of the current examination has been in use for a period of at least one year. At least 30 calendar, and providing, further, that 45-days advance notice of the change shall be given to all appropriate employers who shall then communicate the notice in writing to each candidate then on an original entry or promotional register by score and shall further communicate the notice in writing to any applicant who applies for an original entry or promotional examination during the 3045-day notice period. During the 3045-day notice period, qualified applicants and (including candidates whose names are already on the register by score), at their request, will be scheduled for the examination upon his/her request. At the end of the 3045-day period, the previous original entry register; or promotional register registers of candidates by score will be voided, and a new original entry record of promotional registers by score shall be established on the basis of the new examination.

e) Administration of Examinations:

1) As approved by the Executive Director, examinations shall be scheduled and administered by the employer. The examinations shall be conducted on an open and continuous basis. Upon request by the employer and approval by the Executive Director, except for examinations to original entry registers at each place of employment, may be closed up to six calendar months when as requested by the employer and approved by the Executive Director, that have a sufficient number of candidates on the register has been established and that preclude further recruitment and testing is not required for a period of time.

2) In making the determination to close reopen (or close) an original entry examination, the Executive Director will consider requests by the employer or other individuals based on the number of positions in the class, projected new positions, and annual turnover rate. Also, for
examinations that have been closed for six months or more, the Executive Director will review the need for continuing the approval of a closed examination. The employer shall be responsible for the security of all examination materials in the employer's custody; and access to any electronic examination process, as provided supplied to the employer by the University System so long as they are in the employer's custody.

i) Rating of Examinations

1) The Executive Director and the staff of the University System shall use appropriate scientific techniques and procedures in rating tests and in determining resulting rank to the end that all competitors receive uniform and fair treatment.

2) Failure in any portion of a total examination, the passing of which is deemed necessary to qualify for eligibility in the class for which the applicant is being examined, shall eliminate the applicant from passage of the complete examination, regardless of his/her score in other portions of the examination. For each eliminating test and the final average in an examination, the Executive Director shall announce the minimum acceptable rating.

3) The passing score for eligibility for certification shall be determined by the Executive Director. This score shall be the same for all examinations given for a class, but it may be changed if, in the judgment of the Executive Director, the change is for the best interest of the University System, and the change shall be applicable uniformly to all examinations for the class. The passing score shall be made known to all those taking the examination.

4) An applicant who fails to gain eligibility for employment in a higher class may, at the discretion of the Executive Director, elect to accept eligibility for a lower appropriate class, if his/her scores on all appropriate parts of the examination are sufficient to qualify him/her for the lower class.

5) All examination scores shall be on a scale of 1 to 100, with decimal points in examination scores being rounded off to the nearest whole number, i.e., with below .5 having the decimal points dropped and with .5 or above being rounded to the next whole number.
g) Notification and Review of Scores

1) An applicant shall be sent a written notice of the date and results of his/her examination. The notice must indicate whether the score achieved is passing or failing and if it includes credit for Veterans Preference.

2) All requests byex applicants for formal review of examination scores shall be submitted made to the Executive Director.

b) Filing of Examination Records. All examinations, and all examination components, administered by the employer shall be retained by the employer, in accordance with the employer's record retention policy, or in accordance with the University System's record retention policy.

(Source: Amended at 39 Ill. Reg. __________, effective ________________ )
From: Tom Morelock [mailto:Tomm@sucss.illinois.gov]
Sent: Thursday, April 30, 2015 11:55 AM
Subject: A New Journey

Dear Colleagues,

After serious consideration, and many discussions with my family, I have decided to retire at the end of this fiscal year, which is June 30, 2015. I am somewhat saddened to know that this stage of my career will be coming to a close, but also very excited to start a new and joyous journey. I am very proud of the many positive changes we have collectively accomplished over my many years here. I am especially proud of our small staff who have remained truly committed to the work we do, and have accomplished so much for such a small group of people on a ridiculously small budget. They are truly a special group of people and will always remain part of my family.

I promise to continue to assertively promote the many initiatives we have undertaken recently, especially the legislative approval of our FY2016 budget appropriation, the proposed statutory change, and the rule change proposal regarding residency. I will always remain committed to this agency, our staff, and this entire system. It is a true honor and privilege to serve in this capacity for the past several years.

Thank you for your commitment and dedication as well in your role as a voice for employees across our system. Thank you for your support of this office throughout the years. Please remain active in your advisory role and let your voice be heard. I will miss all of this, but it is time for me to turn the page and move forward to a new stage of my life.

Best regards.

Tom

Lewis T. (Tom) Morelock
State Universities Civil Service System
1717 Philo Road, Suite 24
Urbana, IL 61802
Phone: 217-278-3150
Fax: 217-278-3159
TTY: 217-278-3160
Internet Address: www.sucss.illinois.gov
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