COMPLIANCE REVIEW REPORT

FINANCIAL INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR CALIFORNIA

Compliance Review Unit
State Personnel Board
March 11, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1
Executive Summary 1
Background 2
Scope and Methodology 3
Findings and Recommendations 4
Examinations 4
Appointments 7
Equal Employment Opportunity 12
Personal Services Contracts 14
Departmental Response 15
SPB Reply 15

INTRODUCTION

Established by the California Constitution, the State Personnel Board (the SPB or Board) is charged with enforcing and administering the civil service statutes, prescribing probationary periods and classifications, adopting regulations, and reviewing disciplinary actions and merit-related appeals. The SPB oversees the merit-based recruitment and selection process for the hiring of over 200,000 state employees. These employees provide critical services to the people of California, including but not limited to, protecting life and property, managing emergency operations, providing education, promoting the public health, and preserving the environment. The SPB provides direction to departments through the Board's decisions, rules, policies, and consultation.

Pursuant to Government Code section 18661, the SPB's Compliance Review Unit (CRU) conducts compliance reviews of appointing authority's personnel practices in four areas: examinations, appointments, equal employment opportunity (EEO), and personal services contracts (PSC's) to ensure compliance with civil service laws and board regulations. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure state agencies are in compliance with merit related laws, rules, and policies and to identify and share best practices identified during the reviews. The SPB conducts these reviews on a three-year cycle.

The CRU may also conduct special investigations in response to a specific request or when the SPB obtains information suggesting a potential merit-related violation.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The CRU conducted a routine compliance review of Financial Information System for California (FI$Cal) personnel practices in the areas of examinations, appointments, EEO, and PSC's from November 1, 2012, through November 1, 2013. The following table summarizes the compliance review findings.

Area	Finding	Severity
Examinations	Equal Employment Opportunity Questionnaires Were Not Separated from Applications	Very Serious
Examinations	Qualifications Appraisal Team Members Did Not Sign Rating Sheets	Non-serious or Technical
Appointments	Equal Employment Opportunity Questionnaires Were Not Separated from Applications	Very Serious
Appointments	Appointment Documentation Was Not Kept for the Appropriate Amount of Time	Serious

Area	Finding	Severity
Appointments	Probationary Evaluations Were Not Provided for All Appointments	Serious
Equal Employment Opportunity	Equal Employment Opportunity Officer Does Not Monitor the Composition of Oral Panels in Departmental Exams.	Very Serious
Personal Services Contracts	Personal Services Contracts Complied with Procedural Requirements	In Compliance

A color-coded system is used to identify the severity of the violations as follows:

- Red = Very Serious
- Orange = Serious
- Yellow = Non-serious or Technical
- Green = In Compliance

BACKGROUND

The FI$Cal is a business transformation project for state government in the areas of budgeting, accounting, procurement, and cash management. The project will prepare the state systems and workforce to function in an integrated financial management system environment. To ensure the success of the project, the partner agencies have entered into a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) signed by the State Controller (SCO), the State Treasurer (STO), and the Directors of the Departments of Finance (DOF), and General Services (DGS). The MOU demonstrates support for the project at the highest levels of these organizations and provides the framework for this project. The FI$Cal is a historic partnership of the DOF, the SCO, the STO and the DGS.

To serve the best interest of the state and its citizens and to optimize the business management of the state, FI$cal will collaboratively and successfully develop, implement, utilize, and maintain an integrated financial management system. This effort will ensure best business practices by embracing opportunities to reengineer the state's business processes and will encompass the management of resources and dollars in the areas of budgeting, accounting, procurement, cash management, financial management, financial reporting, cost accounting, asset accounting, project accounting, grant accounting. The project staffing level for 2014-15 is 294 positions. This includes 288 authorized positions between the FI$Cal and the 4 partner Agencies, and 6 authorized temporary help positions for the FI$Cal.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY

The scope of the compliance review was limited to reviewing FI$Cal examinations, appointments, EEO program, and PSC's from November 1, 2012, through November 1, 2013. The primary objective of the review was to determine if FI$Cal personnel practices, policies, and procedures complied with state civil service laws and board regulations, and to recommend corrective action where deficiencies were identified.

A cross-section of FI$Cal examinations and appointments were selected for review to ensure that samples of various examinations and appointment types, classifications, and levels were reviewed. The CRU examined the documentation that the FI$Cal provided, which included examination plans, examination bulletins, job analyses, 511b's scoring results lists, notice of personnel action forms, vacancy posting advertisements, application screening criteria, hiring interview rating criteria, certification lists, transfer movement worksheets, employment history records, correspondence, and probation reports.

The review of the FI$Cal EEO program included examining written EEO policies and procedures, the EEO officer's role, duties, and reporting relationship, the internal discrimination complaint process, the upward mobility program, the reasonable accommodation program, the discrimination complaint process, and the Disability Advisory Committee (DAC). The CRU also interviewed appropriate FI$Cal staff.

FI$Cal PSC's were also randomly selected to ensure that various types of contracted services and contract amounts were reviewed.[1] It was beyond the scope of the compliance review to make conclusions as to whether FI$Cal justifications for the contracts were legally sufficient. The review was limited to whether FI$Cal practices, policies, and procedures relative to PSC's complied with applicable statutory law and board regulations.

On February 11, 2015, an exit conference was held with the FI$Cal to explain and discuss the CRU's initial findings and recommendations. The FI$Cal was given until February 25, 2015 to submit a written response to the CRU's draft report. On February

[1]If an employee organization requests the SPB to review any personal services contract during the SPB compliance review period or prior to the completion of the final compliance review report, the SPB will not audit the contract. Instead, the SPB will review the contract pursuant to its statutory and regulatory process. In this instance, none of the reviewed PSC's were challenged.

25, 2015, the CRU received and carefully reviewed the response, which is attached to this final compliance report.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Examinations

Examinations to establish an eligible list must be competitive and of such character as fairly to test and determine the qualifications, fitness, and ability of competitors to perform the duties of the class of position for which he or she seeks appointment. (Gov. Code, § 18930.) Examinations may be assembled or unassembled, written or oral, or in the form of a demonstration of skills, or any combination of those tests. (*Ibid*.) The Board establishes minimum qualifications for determining the fitness and qualifications of employees for each class of position and for applicants for examinations. (Gov. Code, § 18931.) Within a reasonable time before the scheduled date for the examination, the designated appointing power shall announce or advertise the examination for the establishment of eligible lists. (Gov. Code, § 18933, subd. (a).) The advertisement shall contain such information as the date and place of the examination and the nature of the minimum qualifications. (*Ibid*.) Every applicant for examination shall file an application in the office of the department or a designated appointing power as directed by the examination announcement. (Gov. Code, § 18934.) Generally, the final earned rating of each person competing in any examination is to be determined by the weighted average of the earned ratings on all phases of the examination. (Gov. Code, § 18936.) Each competitor shall be notified in writing of the results of the examination when the employment list resulting from the examination is established. (Gov. Code, § 18938.5.)

During the period under review, the FI$Cal conducted four examinations. The CRU reviewed all of these examinations, which are listed below:

Classification	Exam Type	Exam Components	Final File Date	No. of Applications
Career Executive Assignment (CEA) 3, Deputy Director of Administration	Open	Supplemental Application (SA)[2]	10/25/2012	9

[2] In a supplemental application (SA) examination, applicants are not required to present themselves in person at a predetermined time and place. Supplemental applications are in addition to the regular application and must be completed in order to remain in the examination. Supplemental applications are also known as "rated" applications.

Classification	Exam Type	Exam Components	Final File Date	No. of Applications
CEA 2, Deputy Director of Technology	Open	SA	10/18/2012	11
Training Officer I	Open	Qualification Appraisal Panel (QAP)[3]	12/28/2012	48
Training Officer II	Open	QAP	12/28/2012	40

FINDING NO. 1 – Equal Employment Opportunity Questionnaires Were Not Separated from Applications

Summary: Out of four exams reviewed, three exams included applications where EEO questionnaires were not separated from the STD 678 employment application. Specifically, 47 of the 110 applications reviewed included EEO questionnaires that were not separated from the STD 678 employment application.

Criteria: Government Code section 19704 makes it unlawful for a hiring department to require or permit any notation or entry to be made on any application indicating or in any way suggesting or pertaining to any protected category listed in Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a) (e.g., a person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, age, or sexual orientation). Applicants for employment in state civil service are asked to provide voluntarily ethnic data about themselves where such data is determined by the California Department of Human Resources (CalHR) to be necessary to an assessment of the ethnic and sex fairness of the selection process and to the planning and monitoring of affirmative action efforts. (Gov. Code, § 19705.) The EEO questionnaire of the state application form (STD 678) states, "This questionnaire will be separated from the application prior to the examination and will not be used in any employment decisions."

Severity: Very Serious. The applicants' protected classes were visible, subjecting the agency to potential liability.

[3] The Qualification Appraisal Panel (QAP) interview is the oral component of an examination whereby competitors appear before a panel of two or more evaluators. Candidates are rated and ranked against one another based on an assessment of their ability to perform in a job classification.

Cause: During the review period, the FI$Cal Human Resources Office went through a transition due to staff turnover. In prior practice, it was the sole responsibility of the Classification and Pay (C&P) Analyst to remove the EEO questionnaires. Due to the lack of resources and training, unfortunately there was oversight in processing the removal of the EEO questionnaires.

Action: It is recommended that within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval of these findings and recommendations, the FI$cal submit to the CRU a written corrective action plan that the department will implement to ensure conformity with in the future that EEO questionnaires are separated from all applications. Copies of any relevant documentation should be included with the plan**.**

FINDING NO. 2 – Qualifications Appraisal Panel Members Did Not Sign Rating Sheets

Summary: For both the Training Officer I and II examinations, rating sheets were not signed by the panel members. Rating sheets did include the rater's name but did not include the rater's signature.

Criteria: California Code of Regulations, title 2, section 199 (Rule 199) mandates that panel members rate each applicant on forms prescribed by the Department. The panel members are also required to sign the forms. (Ibid.)

Severity: Non-serious or Technical. The regulation was established to ensure the accountability of panel members. Technical compliance is not essential to preserve the integrity of the examination process.

Cause: The Human Resources Office did not conduct briefings with the exam Chairperson to review the necessary requirements for each exam.

Action: It is recommended that within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval of these findings and recommendations, the FI$Cal submit to the CRU a written corrective action plan that addresses the corrections the department will implement to ensure conformity with

Rule 199. Copies of any relevant documentation should be included with the plan.

Appointments

In all cases not excepted or exempted by Article VII of the California Constitution, the appointing power must fill positions by appointment, including cases of transfers, reinstatements, promotions, and demotions in strict accordance with the Civil Service Act and Board rules. (Gov. Code, § 19050.) Appointments made from eligible lists, by way of transfer, or by way of reinstatement, must be made on the basis of merit and fitness, which requires consideration of each individual's job-related qualifications for a position, including his or her knowledge, skills, abilities, experience, and physical and mental fitness. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 250, subd. (a).)

During the compliance review period, the FI$Cal made 72 appointments. The CRU reviewed 43 of those appointments, which are listed below:

Classification	Appointment Type	Tenure	Time Base	No. of Appointments
Accounting Administrator II	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	1
Administrative Assistant I	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	1
Associate Governmental Program Analyst	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	2
Associate Information Systems Analyst (Specialist)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	3
Associate Systems Software Specialist (Technical)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	2
Data Processing Manager III	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	2
Senior Information Systems Analyst (Specialist)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	2
Staff Information Systems Analyst (Specialist)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	5
Staff Information Systems Analyst (Specialist)	Certification List	Limited Term	Full Time	1

Classification	Appointment Type	Tenure	Time Base	No. of Appointments
Staff Services Manager II (Managerial)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	1
Systems Software Specialist II (Supervisory)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	1
Systems Software Specialist II (Technical)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	3
Systems Software Specialist III (Technical)	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	1
Training Officer II	Certification List	Permanent	Full Time	2
Accounting Administrator II	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	2
Associate Accounting Analyst	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	1
Associate Governmental Program Analyst	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	2
Associate Personnel Analyst	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	2
Office Technician (Typing)	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	2
Staff Services Analyst (General)	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	2
Staff Services Manager II (Managerial)	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	1
Training Officer I	Transfer	Permanent	Full Time	2
Associate Governmental Program Analyst	Permissive Reinstatement	Permanent	Full Time	1
Special Consultant	Retired Annuitant	Temporary	Intermittent	1

FINDING NO. 3 – Equal Employment Opportunity Questionnaire Were Not Separated from Applications

Summary: Out of 43 appointments reviewed, 37 appointment files included applications where EEO questionnaires were not separated from the STD 678 employment application. Specifically, 172 of the 997 applications reviewed included EEO questionnaires that were not separated from the STD 678 employment application.

Criteria: Government Code section 19704 makes it unlawful for a hiring department to require or permit any notation or entry to be made on

any application indicating or in any way suggesting or pertaining to any protected category listed in Government Code section 12940, subdivision (a) (e.g., a person's race, religious creed, color, national origin, age, or sexual orientation). Applicants for employment in state civil service are asked to provide voluntarily ethnic data about themselves where such data is determined by the California Department of Human Resources (CalHR) to be necessary to an assessment of the ethnic and sex fairness of the selection process and to the planning and monitoring of affirmative action efforts. (Gov. Code, § 19705.) The EEO questionnaire of the state application form (STD 678) states, "This questionnaire will be separated from the application prior to the examination and will not be used in any employment decisions."

Severity: Very Serious. The applicants' protected classes were visible, subjecting the agency to potential liability.

Cause: During the review period, the FI$Cal Human Resources Office went through a transition due to staff turnover. In prior practice, it was the sole responsibility of the C&P Analyst to remove the EEO questionnaires. Due to the lack of resources and training, unfortunately there was oversight in processing the removal of the EEO questionnaires.

Action: It is recommended that within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval of these findings and recommendations, the FI$cal submit to the CRU a written corrective action plan that the department will implement to ensure conformity with in the future that EEO questionnaires are separated from all applications. Copies of any relevant documentation should be included with the plan**.**

FINDING NO. 4 – Appointment Documentation Was Not Kept for the Appropriate Amount of Time

Summary: Specifically, of the 43 appointments reviewed, the FI$Cal did not retain 35 screening criteria and 28 rating criteria.

Criteria: In relevant part, civil service laws require that the employment procedures of each state agency shall conform to the federal and

state laws governing employment practices. (Gov. Code, § 18720.) State agencies are required to maintain and preserve any and all applications, personnel, membership, or employment referral records and files for a minimum period of two years after the records and files are initially created or received. (Gov. Code, § 12946.) State agencies are also required to retain personnel files of applicants or terminated employees for a minimum period of two years after the date the employment action is taken. (*Ibid*.)

Severity: Serious**.** Without documentation, the CRU could not verify if the appointments were merit based.

Cause: Lack of updated policies and procedures to ensure that records are retained for the appropriate periods of time.

Action: It is recommended that within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval of these findings and recommendations, the FI$Cal submit to the CRU a written corrective action plan that addresses the corrections the department will implement to ensure conformity with the record retention requirements of Government Code section 12946. Copies of any relevant documentation should be included with the plan**.**

FINDING NO. 5 – Probationary Evaluations Were Not Provided for All Appointments

Summary: The FI$Cal did not prepare, complete, and/or retain required probationary reports of performance for 20 of the 43 appointments reviewed by the CRU.

Classification	Appointment Type	No. of Appointments	No. of Uncompleted Prob. Reports
Administrative Assistant I	Certification List	1	1
Associate Information Systems Analyst (Specialist)	Certification List	1	1
Associate Systems Software Specialist (Technical)	Certification List	1	1
Data Processing Manager III	Certification List	1	2
Senior Information Systems	Certification List	1	1

Classification	Appointment Type	No. of Appointments	No. of Uncompleted Prob. Reports
Analyst (Specialist)			
Staff Information Systems Analyst (Specialist)	Certification List	1	1
Staff Services Manager II (Managerial)	Certification List	1	2
Systems Software Specialist II (Technical)	Certification List	2	2
Systems Software Specialist III (Technical)	Certification List	1	2
Training Officer II	Certification List	1	1
Accounting Administrator II	Transfer	1	2
Associate Accounting Analyst	Transfer	1	1
Associate Governmental Program Analyst	Transfer	1	1
Associate Personnel Analyst	Transfer	1	1
Office Technician (Typing)	Transfer	2	4
Staff Services Analyst	Transfer	2	4
Training Officer I	Transfer	1	1
Total		20	28

Criteria: A new probationary period is not required when an employee is appointed by reinstatement with a right of return. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 322, subd. (d)(2).) However, the service of a probationary period is required when an employee enters state civil service by permanent appointment from an employment list. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 322, subd. (a).) In addition, unless waived by the appointing power, a new probationary period is required when an employee is appointed to a position under the following circumstances: (1) without a break in service in the same class in which the employee has completed the probationary period, but under a different appointing power; and (2) without a break in service to a class with substantially the same or lower level of duties and responsibilities and salary range as a class in which the employee has completed the probationary period. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 322, subd. (c)(1) & (2).)

During the probationary period, the appointing power is required to evaluate the work and efficiency of a probationer at sufficiently

frequent intervals to keep the employee adequately informed of progress on the job. (Gov. Code, § 19172; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 599.795.) The appointing power must prepare a written appraisal of performance each one-third of the probationary period. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 2, § 599.795.)

Severity: Serious. The probationary period is the final step in the selection process to ensure that the individual selected can successfully perform the full scope of their job duties. Failing to use the probationary period to assist an employee in improving his or her performance or terminating the appointment upon determination that the appointment is not a good job/person match is unfair to the employee and serves to erode the quality of state government.

Cause: Supervisors and managers were sent probationary evaluation reminders on a monthly basis by the Human Resources Office, however, a follow up process was not in place.

Action: It is recommended that within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval of these findings and recommendations, the FI$cal submit to the CRU a written corrective action plan that addresses the corrections the department will implement to ensure conformity with the probationary requirements of Government Code § 19172.

Equal Employment Opportunity

Each state agency is responsible for an effective EEO program. (Gov. Code, § 19790.) The appointing power for each state agency has the major responsibility for monitoring the effectiveness of its EEO program. (Gov. Code, § 19794.) To that end, the appointing power must issue a policy statement committed to equal employment opportunity; issue procedures for filing, processing, and resolving discrimination complaints; issue procedures for providing equal upward mobility and promotional opportunities; and cooperate with the California Department of Human Resources by providing access to all required files, documents and data. (*Ibid*.) In addition, the appointing power must appoint, at the managerial level, an EEO officer, who shall report directly to, and be under the supervision of, the director of the department to develop, implement, coordinate, and monitor the department's EEO program. (Gov. Code, § 19795.)

Each state agency must establish a separate committee of employees who are individuals with a disability, or who have an interest in disability issues, to advise the head of the agency on issues of concern to employees with disabilities. (Gov. Code, § 19795, subd. (b)(1).) The department must invite all employees to serve on the committee and take appropriate steps to ensure that the final committee is comprised of members who have disabilities or who have an interest in disability issues. (Gov. Code, § 19795, subd. (b)(2).)

The CRU reviewed the FI$Cal's EEO program that was in effect during the compliance review period. In addition, the CRU interviewed appropriate FI$Cal staff.

FINDING NO. 6 – Equal Employment Opportunity Officer Does Not Monitor the Composition of Oral Panels in Departmental Exams

Summary: Among other duties, the EEO Officer must analyze and report on appointments of employees, bring issues of concern regarding equal employment opportunity to the appointing power and recommend appropriate action, submit an evaluation of the effectiveness of the total equal employment opportunity program to the department annually by July 1, monitor the composition of oral panels in departmental examinations, and perform other duties necessary for the effective implementation of the agency EEO plans. (Gov. Code, § 19795, subd. (a).)

Criteria: The EEO officer at each department must monitor the composition of oral panels in departmental examinations (Gov. Code, § 19795, subd. (a)).

Severity: Very Serious. Requiring the EEO Officer to monitor oral panels is intended to ensure protection against discrimination in the hiring process.

Cause: The EEO Officer role was in transition, and therefore, the EEO Officer was not available to monitor the composition of oral panels.

Action: It is recommended that within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval of these findings and recommendations, FI$Cal submit to the CRU a written corrective action plan that addresses the corrections the department will implement to ensure conformity with

the requirements of Government Code section 19795. Copies of any relevant documentation should be included with the plan.

Personal Services Contracts

A PSC includes any contract, requisition, or purchase order under which labor or personal services is a significant, separately identifiable element, and the business or person performing the services is an independent contractor that does not have status as an employee of the State. (Cal. Code Reg., tit. 2, § 547.59.) The California Constitution has an implied civil service mandate limiting the state's authority to contract with private entities to perform services the state has historically or customarily performed. Government Code section 19130, subdivision (a), however, codifies exceptions to the civil service mandate where PSC's achieve cost savings for the state. PSC's that are of a type enumerated in subdivision (b) of Government Code section 19130 are also permissible. Subdivision (b) contracts include private contracts for a new state function, services that are not available within state service, services that are incidental to a contract for the purchase or lease of real or personal property, and services that are of an urgent, temporary, or occasional nature.

For cost-savings PSC's, a state agency is required to notify the SPB of its intent to execute such a contract. (Gov. Code, § 19131.) For subdivision (b) contracts, the SPB reviews the adequacy of the proposed or executed contract at the request of an employee organization representing state employees. (Gov. Code, § 19132.)

During the compliance review period, the FI$Cal had four PSC's that were in effect. All four were subject to Department of General Services (DGS) approval and thus our procedural review, which are listed below:

Vendor	Services	Contract Dates	Contract Amount	Justification Identified
Eclipse Solutions, Inc.	Independent Verification and Validation Services	11/05/2012 - 12/31/2016	$4,212,000	Yes
Visionary Integration Professionals	Project Management Services	03/20/2013 - 06/30/2015	$1,112,800	Yes
Techaris Consulting, Inc.	Quality Assurance Services	04/15/2013 - 06/30/2014	$365,310	Yes

Vendor	Services	Contract Dates	Contract Amount	Justification Identified
CherryRoad Technologies	Legacy Systems Services	03/31/2013 - 06/30/2017	$25,930,000	Yes

FINDING NO. 7 – Personal Services Contracts Complied with Procedural Requirements

When a state agency requests approval from the Department of General Services (DGS) for a subdivision (b) contract, the agency must include with its contract transmittal a written justification that includes *specific and detailed factual information* that demonstrates how the contract meets one or more conditions specified in Government Code section 19131, subdivision (b). (Cal. Code Reg., tit. 2, § 547.60.)

The total amount of all the PSCs reviewed was $31,620,110. It was beyond the scope of the review to make conclusions as to whether FI$Cal justifications for the contract were legally sufficient. For all PSC's reviewed, the FI$Cal provided specific and detailed factual information in the written justifications as to how each of the contracts met at least one condition set forth in Government Code section 19131, subdivision (b). Accordingly, FI$Cal's PSC's complied with civil service laws and board rules.

DEPARTMENTAL RESPONSE

The FI$Cal agrees with the findings and have taken actions to ensure compliance in future reviews. (Attachment 1)

SPB REPLY

Based upon the FI$cal's written response, the FI$cal will comply with the CRU recommendations and findings and provide the CRU a Corrective Action Plan.

It is further recommended that the FI$cal comply with the afore-stated recommendations within 60 days of the Executive Officer's approval and submit to the CRU a written report of compliance.

Attachment 1

Memorandum

DATE: February 25, 2015

TO: Benjamin Platt
Compliance Review Manager

FROM: Gam Thai
Chief, Human Resources
Financial Information System for California (FI$Cal)

SUBJECT: State Personnel Board Compliance Review – Departmental Response

---

In response to the six findings identified in the January 27, 2015, State Personnel Board (SPB) Compliance Review Report, please find Financial Information System for California's responses below.

FINDING 1

Equal Employment Opportunity Questionnaires Were Not Separated from Applications.

Each C&P Analyst will assure compliance with the separation of the EEO questionnaire from the applications. Applications received have been going through two reviews to ensure that the EEO questionnaire have been removed. The first review is conducted by the receptionist and the second review is being conducted by the C&P Analyst.

FINDING 2

Qualifications Appraisal Panel Members Did Not Sign Rating Sheets.

The HR Office now conducts briefings with the exam chairperson to review necessary requirements for each exam. After the return of the exam materials, the exam analyst will review all returned materials for completeness and compliance with SPB regulations.

FINDING 3

Equal Employment Opportunity Questionnaires Were Not Separated from Applications.

Each C&P Analyst will assure compliance with the separation of the EEO questionnaire from the applications. Applications received have been going through two reviews to ensure that the EEO questionnaire have been removed. The first review is conducted by the receptionist and the second review is being conducted by the C&P Analyst.

FINDING 4

Appointment Documentation Was Not Kept for the Appropriate Amount of Time.

The Project acknowledges the finding and is aware of the necessary retention time requirements. In addition, in an effort to ensure compliance, FI$Cal has implemented a Recruitment Checklist (see

attached) to be included in each recruitment folder. With sufficient staffing and the implementation of additional training, we believe this finding to be resolved.

FINDING 5

Probationary Evaluations Were Not Provided for All Appointments.

The Human Resources Office will continue to send out Probation Evaluation reminders to supervisors/managers of probationary employees. An additional follow up reminder will be sent to the Deputy Directors on a monthly basis to ensure compliance. The importance of this finding is now a part of regular discussions within executive staff meetings.

FINDING 6

EEO Officer Does Not Monitor the Composition of Oral Panels in Departmental Exams.

FI$Cal is in the process of revising the Qualifications Appraisal Interview Panel form to include the signature of the EEO Officer, signifying his/her approval. The EEO Officer will review and sign the form as part of the oral examination process.

SUMMARY

The findings of this audit occurred during a transitional period for the Project. Most notably, the Project was in the process of selecting a new Deputy Director for Administration. Because of the necessary time requirements in the CEA examination and selection process, a substantial amount of time passed prior to the selection and until the new incumbent became familiar with the job setting.

In addition, the Human Resources Office was understaffed which included both support staff and analysts. Due to the limited number of resources available, the HR manager was performing a range of managerial, supervisory, analytical and support functions. These two elements combined with the ambitious time requirements to implement the various phases of the Project, left the HR Office vulnerable to lapses in administrative compliance.

In the interim, the Deputy Director of Administration has established a more rigorous program of oversight and leadership within the Administration Division. The Human Resources Office staffing has stabilized and now provide more support to the Project while implementing a more standardized and civil service compliant recordkeeping program.

If you have additional questions or need additional information, please contact Gam Thai at (916) 576-5249 or Gam.Thai@fiscal.ca.gov.