

IN THE EXECUTIVE ETHICS COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF ILLINOIS

In re: CLYDE REDFIELD and)
BARBARA PINDER) OEIG Case #10-00649

OEIG FINAL REPORT (REDACTED)

Below is a final summary report from an Executive Inspector General. The General Assembly has directed the Executive Ethics Commission (Commission) to redact information from this report that may reveal the identity of witnesses, complainants or informants and “any other information it believes should not be made public.” 5 ILCS 430/20-52(b).

The Commission exercises this responsibility with great caution and with the goal of balancing the sometimes-competing interests of increasing transparency and operating with fairness to the accused. In order to balance these interests, the Commission may redact certain information contained in this report. The redactions are made with the understanding that the subject or subjects of the investigation have had no opportunity to rebut the report’s factual allegations or legal conclusions before the Commission.

The Commission received a final report from the Governor’s Office of Executive Inspector General (“OEIG”) in this matter. The Commission, pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52, redacted the final report and mailed copies of the redacted version and responses to the Attorney General, the Executive Inspector General for Agencies of the Governor, and to Clyde Redfield and Barbara Pinder at their last known addresses.

Mr. Redfield was the subject of a complaint (14-EEC-004) filed by the Office of the Attorney General for conduct related to this report. The Commission entered a final decision in that matter on December 18, 2013.

The Commission reviewed all suggestions received and makes this document available pursuant to 5 ILCS 430/20-52.

FINAL REPORT

I. ALLEGATIONS

The Office of Executive Inspector General (“OEIG”) received a complaint alleging that Illinois Department of Employment Security (“IDES” or “Department”) employee Clyde Redfield misused State time and equipment, and abused his authority as a manager, by directing subordinates to complete his college schoolwork assignments.¹

¹ The OEIG previously made findings against Mr. Redfield in OEIG Case No. 06-00964. In the prior investigation, the OEIG concluded that Mr. Redfield conducted personal business on State time, falsified timekeeping records, failed to work his scheduled hours, and failed to cooperate with the OEIG. The OEIG recommended that Mr. Redfield be disciplined. IDES chose to counsel him, which took place by October 2008.

As set out below, the OEIG concludes that Mr. Redfield abused State time by directing numerous IDES employees to complete his schoolwork assignments between August 2008 and August 2010, some of whom worked on his school assignments during State time and State overtime.² Mr. Redfield also refused to cooperate with the OEIG by making false statements.

During the course of the investigation, the OEIG also discovered that IDES Regional Manager Barbara Pinder, Mr. Redfield's supervisor, was aware of his activities, because she too worked on Mr. Redfield's school assignments on State time. She failed to take any action.

II. BACKGROUND

Clyde Redfield has been an IDES employee for approximately 37 years and has held various IDES positions. During the relevant time period, he served as Local Office Manager in Harvey, IL, and beginning in January 2010, Mr. Redfield has been an IDES Assistant Regional Manager. IDES Regional Manager Barbara Pinder is Mr. Redfield's direct supervisor.

From August 2008 to August 2010, Mr. Redfield was enrolled as a part-time evening student at Benedictine University. In 2010, Mr. Redfield received a management degree.

III. INVESTIGATION

A. Interviews of [IDES Employee 1]

On August 17 and December 6, 2010, and April 17, 2012, investigators interviewed [IDES Employee 1]. [Identifying sentence redacted.] When [Employee 1] began working at the Harvey Office, she was supervised by Mr. Redfield. [Employee 1] said that approximately two to three times per week, Mr. Redfield asked her to review his college schoolwork for accuracy. She said she complied with his requests, because he was her boss and she was in her probationary period.

[Employee 1] described that initially she:

- reviewed and corrected his school papers and PowerPoint presentations;
- verified citations referenced in school papers;
- received schoolwork from him via her State e-mail account; and,
- used her or his State computer to make corrections.

[Employee 1] said she usually performed the above activities on State time, but there were a few occasions where she completed assignments for Mr. Redfield at home during evening hours. [Employee 1] said she knew that performing Mr. Redfield's schoolwork on State time violated IDES policies, but said she did not know how to refuse Mr. Redfield's requests, because she feared losing her job or being demoted if she did not comply. [Employee 1] said that Mr. Redfield subsequently asked her to:

- write papers and *create* bibliographies for him; and,

² [Two sentences concerning unfounded allegations redacted.]

- add graphics to or *create* PowerPoint presentations.

According to [Employee 1], there was “no way” Mr. Redfield’s requests for assistance were IDES work-related. [Employee 1] stated that between the fall of 2008 and October 2009, she worked on Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork about two or three times per week, and spent approximately one to three hours each time she worked on his schoolwork. She said she never “volunteered” to assist him with his schoolwork.

[Employee 1] also stated that when Mr. Redfield requested her assistance with his schoolwork during work hours, she felt a sense of urgency, because the material was typically due that evening and he expected her to stop performing her IDES work immediately to work on his schoolwork. She stated he often sent school assignments via email, then walked over to her office and explained what he wanted her to do with a particular project.

In May 2009, [Employee 1] was temporarily assigned to the Chicago Heights Unemployment Office. While there, Mr. Redfield traveled to her office and asked her to complete his schoolwork. Once, she conducted internet research with Mr. Redfield for an assignment.

B. Interviews of [IDES Employees 2, 3 and 4]

On March 8, 2011 and April 17, 2012, investigators interviewed IDES [Employee 2] and [Employees 3 and 4]. [Employee 2] [Employee 3], and [Employee 4] each stated that Mr. Redfield requested they work on his school assignments on State time. They also stated they knew that assisting Mr. Redfield with schoolwork on State time violated IDES policy, but felt they had to help him because he was their boss. They said they obtained permission from their direct supervisor, [Employee 5], before assisting Mr. Redfield with his schoolwork.

i) [Employee 2]

[Employee 2] also stated that Mr. Redfield asked him for help with math because [Employee 2] possessed teaching experience in math. [Employee 2] reported helping Mr. Redfield two or three times per week from January to May 2009 and stated he helped Mr. Redfield for about 40 to 60 minutes each time, sometimes during lunch breaks, and other times during work hours. [Employee 2] stated he also occasionally tutored Mr. Redfield while working overtime and estimated that about 30% of his tutoring occurred during a workday and about 20% occurred while on overtime.

ii) [Employee 3]

[Employee 3] stated that in October or November 2009, Mr. Redfield asked him for help with schoolwork. [Employee 3] only recalled working with Mr. Redfield twice during a one-week period for approximately one hour each time, using a State computer, printer, and State time to perform Mr. Redfield’s school assignments. According to [Employee 3], he showed Mr. Redfield how to do research on the internet, and helped him with a marketing project for a business administration class.

iii) [Employee 4]

[Employee 4] stated that he has an associate's degree in business management and a background in graphic design. [Employee 4] said that Mr. Redfield asked for his help with schoolwork in either February or March 2009. According to [Employee 4], he:

- assisted Mr. Redfield for six to eight weeks;
- primarily helped by *creating* or adding graphics to PowerPoint presentations;
- spent 45-60 minutes each time he assisted Mr. Redfield;
- received assignments from Mr. Redfield via office email;
- used his or Mr. Redfield's State computer;
- saved Mr. Redfield's work on State computers or a flash drive; and,
- printed Mr. Redfield's schoolwork on IDES color printers.

[Employee 4] also stated that he performed Mr. Redfield's schoolwork on State time, never during work breaks and completed some school assignments while being paid overtime.

C. Interviews of [IDES Employee 5]

On December 6, 2010 and May 17, 2012, investigators interviewed [IDES Employee 5], who supervised [Employee 2], [Employee 3], and [Employee 4], and whose immediate supervisor was Mr. Redfield. [Identifying sentence redacted.]

[Employee 5] told investigators that Mr. Redfield asked her for help with his schoolwork. She said she agreed to complete the work, because he was her immediate supervisor and wanted to be helpful. [Employee 5] said she never "volunteered" to do the work; rather, Mr. Redfield always requested her assistance. [Employee 5] said that she now knows it is a violation of IDES policy to perform non-State work on State time, but said at the time Mr. Redfield requested assistance, she did not know that she was committing a violation of IDES policy by working on Mr. Redfield's schoolwork on State time. [Employee 5] said she "didn't think it was that big of a deal" to read and edit Mr. Redfield's school papers and PowerPoint presentations. [Employee 5] also stated she:

- primarily proofread papers and edited PowerPoint presentations;
- received Mr. Redfield's papers and presentations through their State email accounts;
- printed his school assignments on the IDES color printer, at his request;
- performed most of Mr. Redfield's schoolwork during work hours; and,
- performed his schoolwork about two or three times per week.

[Employee 5] further stated that she spent a "sizable" amount of time on Mr. Redfield's schoolwork, maybe up to an hour each time she worked on his schoolwork. She said she was aware that her subordinates [Employee 2], [Employee 3], and [Employee 4] also worked on schoolwork for Mr. Redfield. In fact, [Employee 5] stated that she gave them "permission" to help Mr. Redfield with his schoolwork after Mr. Redfield asked to "borrow" them. [Employee 5] was unable to quantify how long Mr. Redfield utilized each of these employees for his schoolwork, or on how many occasions.

D. Interviews of Regional Manager Barbara Pinder

On April 21, 2011 and May 17, 2012, investigators interviewed Regional Manager Barbara Pinder, Mr. Redfield's supervisor. Ms. Pinder manages the Metro South Region, and her job duties include overseeing the operation of seven IDES regional offices.

Ms. Pinder initially told investigators that if she heard an employee was performing personal work on State time, using State resources, she would investigate the allegation and determine how to best resolve the situation.³

Ms. Pinder said that she was aware that between 2008 and 2010, Mr. Redfield pursued his college degree as a part-time student taking night classes, but she did not know if he completed schoolwork on State time or with assistance from IDES staff. She said that in 2011, after Mr. Redfield received his degree, she heard rumors that Mr. Redfield had asked others to review his schoolwork. Ms. Pinder said that Mr. Redfield denied the rumors.

Investigators then showed Ms. Pinder a copy of an April 29, 2009 email she, herself, received from Mr. Redfield through their State email account on State time. The email had attached to it a PowerPoint presentation regarding James Cleveland Owens.⁴ In the email, Mr. Redfield asked Ms. Pinder to edit the presentation. That same day, during State time, 9:50 a.m., Ms. Pinder responded to Mr. Redfield via email stating that she corrected some grammar, deleted a reference, and added an ending to the presentation.

After reviewing the email exchange and PowerPoint presentation relating to Mr. Owens, Ms. Pinder initially told investigators that she did not recall the emails or PowerPoint presentation, and said the presentation "could have" been a community outreach presentation. After reviewing the PowerPoint presentation again, however, Ms. Pinder did state that she did not see how the presentation could have been related to IDES business. Ms. Pinder concluded that the presentation must have been one of Mr. Redfield's school assignments. Ms. Pinder then confirmed that she received the email and presentation at her State email during State time, responded to Mr. Redfield during State time, and that it appeared she edited his presentation on State time. Ms. Pinder stated that she may have taken a break to edit his presentation. She added, however, she usually does not take breaks, and thus would have violated IDES policies relating to use of State email, time, and resources if she knew the presentation related to Mr. Redfield's schoolwork when she assisted him. Ms. Pinder said she could not recall if she reprimanded Mr. Redfield or took any action in response to this email. Ms. Pinder stated there were no other times she may have helped Mr. Redfield with his schoolwork.

Investigators then showed Ms. Pinder another email, dated July 23, 2009, which she received from Mr. Redfield while on State time at her State email. After reviewing the email and attached document (a case analysis), Ms. Pinder stated that she could not recall receiving this

³ Ms. Pinder received counseling in connection with OEIG Case No. 06-00964 for failing to enforce IDES work schedule policies regarding Mr. Redfield's prior misconduct.

⁴ More commonly known as Jesse Owens.

email or the attachment, but added that she could not “imagine it (the document) being work-related.” She said she could not recall if she responded to Mr. Redfield via email.⁵

Ms. Pinder also stated that she was responsible for speaking with employees who misuse State time and resources, but said she did not recall seeing Mr. Redfield work on school assignments with other IDES employees. Finally, despite the existence of the two emails addressed to her, Ms. Pinder denied having any direct knowledge that Mr. Redfield worked on school assignments on State time or used State resources.

E. Interviews of Assistant Regional Manager Clyde Redfield

On April 21, 2011 and March 19, 2012, investigators interviewed Assistant Regional Manager Clyde Redfield. Mr. Redfield confirmed that he received a degree in management from Benedictine University in August 2010, after taking part-time evening classes between August 2008 and August 2010.

Mr. Redfield said he was responsible for ensuring the IDES employees he supervises, including employees of the Harvey Office, comply with agency policies. He also said he was responsible for ensuring that those employees perform their State duties rather than spend State time doing personal work.

i) April 21, 2011 Interview

In his first interview, Mr. Redfield initially said that he had never used State time or equipment to complete schoolwork related to his degree. He also said that no members of the IDES office staff ever completed school assignments for him.

In response to further questioning, however, Mr. Redfield then stated that:

- [Employee 1] had assisted him with schoolwork;
- [Employee 1] had “volunteered” to help him;
- [Employee 1] had reviewed his school papers at the office while at lunch or after work;
- [Employee 4] helped him a few times in 2010 by printing presentations on an IDES color printer and saving them on a flash drive; and
- [Employee 2] may have helped him one time with a math problem during a lunch break.

Mr. Redfield said that [Employee 4] printed presentations on his behalf because he (Mr. Redfield) did not have access to a color printer. Mr. Redfield added that he did not think this behavior was inappropriate because the presentations were printed after 5:00 p.m., and, he only received assistance from these individuals after work or during lunch.

Mr. Redfield denied that either [Employee 5] or [Employee 3] ever assisted him with schoolwork. In addition, Mr. Redfield denied that:

- he received assistance from any employees while they were on overtime status;

⁵ The OEIG was unable to locate any email response from Ms. Pinder relating to this particular email.

- he ever asked anyone for help; rather, his co-workers “volunteered” to help him;
- he ever used his authority to threaten or intimidate anyone to help him; and,
- Ms. Pinder knew that IDES employees assisted him with schoolwork.

ii) *March 19, 2012 Interview*

On March 19, 2012, Mr. Redfield was interviewed a second time. Investigators asked if he wished to amend or clarify any of his prior statements. In response, Mr. Redfield stated that [Employee 4] never completed or printed schoolwork for him. Mr. Redfield stated that [Employee 4] only printed IDES job fair posters. Mr. Redfield also stated that [Employee 1] reviewed his schoolwork a total of four or five times, but not on State time.

Investigators then asked Mr. Redfield questions about specific IDES employees.

1) Mr. Redfield’s Statements Regarding [Employee 1]

Mr. Redfield stated again that [Employee 1] always “volunteered” to review his school papers. Mr. Redfield said he could not recall if he handed school assignments to [Employee 1] or whether he used the State email system to give her his school assignments. Mr. Redfield stated, however, that *if* he emailed assignments to [Employee 1], he would have only sent them from his personal email address to her personal email address after work. Mr. Redfield denied sending any school assignments through the State email system and denied performing any schoolwork at an IDES office.

Investigators then showed Mr. Redfield two emails (March 10, 2009 at 11:07 a.m. and March 18, 2009 at 3:53 p.m.), each sent from his personal account to [Employee 1]’s State email address (and his own State email address) during the workday. In each email, Mr. Redfield sent [Employee 1] PowerPoint presentations. After reviewing these documents, Mr. Redfield denied logging into his personal email account while at work and stated that his wife might have sent the presentations from his home. After further questioning, he then stated:

- he did access his personal email account at work on some occasions;
- he “may” have sent schoolwork to his State account from his personal account; and
- he had no idea if [Employee 1] worked on the presentations on State work time.

Mr. Redfield acknowledged that he would have violated IDES computer policies if he forwarded his schoolwork presentations to [Employee 1] during State time and that [Employee 1] would have violated IDES policies if she worked on his school assignments on State time. Mr. Redfield told investigators that he did not know of any other instances he may have used the State email system to forward schoolwork to [Employee 1].

Mr. Redfield said that at that time he sent the March 2009 emails, he did not know IDES policies prohibited his use of a State computer or email address to send, forward, or receive personal emails during lunch, on breaks, or after work hours. He also said he did not know that IDES policies prohibited him from working on personal business, such as his school presentations.

Investigators then showed Mr. Redfield yet another email he sent from his State email account to [Employee 1]'s State email account during work hours (March 19, 2009 at 9:47 a.m.). In this email, Mr. Redfield asked [Employee 1] to print a school presentation on the IDES color printer. After reviewing the email, Mr. Redfield confirmed that he:

- used his State computer to email [Employee 1] and classmates during work hours;
- asked [Employee 1] to print this presentation, as he did not have access to a color printer;
- was unaware of when [Employee 1] printed the presentation, but had an “oral agreement” with her that she would only assist him on her lunchtime, breaks, and after work; and
- was now aware of IDES policies relating to use of State equipment, but at that time, thought it acceptable to use State computers and printers for personal matters.

Investigators then presented Mr. Redfield with another email, this one a March 10, 2009 (9:29 a.m.) email from [Employee 1]'s State email account in which she states that she made corrections to a PowerPoint presentation Mr. Redfield had forwarded to her State email address the night before, asking her to review it. Mr. Redfield confirmed that this email represented another example of him asking [Employee 1] to assist with his school assignments during her State work hours. Mr. Redfield denied that he made these types of requests to [Employee 1] on a daily basis or that he knew it was wrong to ask a subordinate to assist him with non-work-related projects.

Mr. Redfield again said he could not recall that any other IDES employees assisted him with schoolwork and that he would disagree with other employees who claimed they performed work for him. He reiterated that [Employee 1] was the only IDES employee who assisted him with his schoolwork.

2) Mr. Redfield's Statements Regarding [Employee 4]

Investigators then informed Mr. Redfield that he had previously stated that [Employee 4] had printed school assignments for him. Mr. Redfield denied any recollection of making that statement. Upon further questioning, Mr. Redfield then said that [Employee 4]:

- might have saved some of his schoolwork on a personal flash drive on a lunch break; and
- was asked, on multiple occasions, to print his schoolwork on an IDES color printer.

Mr. Redfield stated that he knew it was wrong to use an IDES color printer to print his schoolwork, but thought it would be “acceptable” if [Employee 4] printed the documents outside of State time. He added, however, that he never actually knew whether [Employee 4] printed his materials on State time or during breaks. Mr. Redfield then said he wanted to amend a prior statement he made, and confirmed that [Employee 4] did in fact save documents on a flash drive and print other documents for him.

Investigators then showed Mr. Redfield PowerPoint presentations and other documents that appeared to be his schoolwork. After reviewing some of these documents, Mr. Redfield said that he was unsure who created the various documents even though his name appeared on them. Mr. Redfield initially told the investigators that he:

- might have asked [Employee 4] to create some of these presentations;
- created some of the other presentations and asked [Employee 4] to print them; and that
- would not doubt [Employee 4] if he ([Employee 4]) said he assisted him by printing some of these documents.

Mr. Redfield then denied that [Employee 4] ever created PowerPoint presentations for him and said that all [Employee 4] did was print documents.

3) Mr. Redfield's Statements Regarding [Employee 5]

Despite the fact that Mr. Redfield told investigators that [Employee 1] was the only IDES employee who assisted him with his schoolwork, he said he also emailed [Employee 5] some of his school documents, via their State email accounts, and asked her to print them or save them on his personal flash drive. He also said that [Employee 5] may have reviewed some of his school papers, and he asked her to assist him on multiple occasions. Mr. Redfield denied that [Employee 5] ever created any PowerPoint presentations for him or assisted him with schoolwork on State time.

4) Mr. Redfield's Statements Regarding [Employee 3] and [Employee 2]

Mr. Redfield denied asking for or receiving any assistance in completing his schoolwork from either [Employee 3] or [Employee 2]. Mr. Redfield said that [Employee 3] never assisted with internet research. Investigators then informed Mr. Redfield that he previously told investigators that [Employee 2] did assist him on one occasion with a math problem in the lunchroom. In response, Mr. Redfield confirmed that [Employee 2] did offer to help him once, but after reviewing the math problem, he ([Employee 2]) could not figure out how to do the problem. Mr. Redfield then stated, "I know he ([Employee 2]) never helped me."

Mr. Redfield also denied that [Employee 2] ever tutored him in math at the IDES office or while [Employee 2] was working overtime. Mr. Redfield said that [Employee 2] would be lying if he said he tutored him. Mr. Redfield explained that he had a math tutor, another IDES employee, who he worked with at night and on weekends. Mr. Redfield then acknowledged that he might have emailed the other employee via the State email system to schedule study sessions.

5) Mr. Redfield's Statements Regarding Use of Other IDES Property

Mr. Redfield denied ever using IDES computers to conduct any internet research related to his schoolwork with [Employee 3] or to transmit his schoolwork to Benedictine University. He also denied sending any emails, other than the ones he was shown, to any IDES employees about his schoolwork and denied that any other IDES employees (other than the ones he admitted to in his interview) assisted him with his schoolwork.

Mr. Redfield said that he sometimes printed PowerPoint presentations at the IDES office and worked on them during his lunchtime or after work, but could not recall ever working on a presentation during his State workday.

6) Mr. Redfield's Statements Regarding Knowledge of IDES Policies

Investigators showed Mr. Redfield copies of the IDES Code of Ethics, the IDES Internet Access policy, and several acknowledgment forms containing his signature. The acknowledgment forms state that the signer, Mr. Redfield, confirmed receiving, reading, and agreeing to abide by the IDES Code of Ethics. Mr. Redfield reviewed the documents and confirmed that he executed them and was aware that he was required to abide by the policies.

Mr. Redfield then confirmed that he did not abide by some of the policies, because he used his State office equipment for non-State business, and because he asked [Employee 1], [Employee 5], and [Employee 4] to assist with his homework or print school assignments. Mr. Redfield said his conduct was unreasonable and wrong. Mr. Redfield, however, also stated that he completed all of these school assignments, and that no one else did them for him. Mr. Redfield indicated that most of the activities that he was questioned about occurred during his first year of the college program (August 2008 to 2009), as that is when he needed the most assistance.

F. Review of Mr. Redfield's Email Account

A review of Mr. Redfield's email account archive from August 2008 to August 2010 revealed that he used his State email account to send or receive approximately 400 emails that clearly appeared to be related to his schoolwork. Mr. Redfield sent or received school related emails to or from:

- [Employee 1];
- [Employee 4];
- Barbara Pinder; and,
- Other IDES employees.⁶

Mr. Redfield often directed IDES employees to review and edit, or print his schoolwork. In some instances, Mr. Redfield sent emails from his personal email account to himself or to IDES employees. Most of the emails included attachments of multi-page reports and color PowerPoint presentations. In some instances, Mr. Redfield sent assignments to himself from his personal email account in the morning, and then forwarded the assignments, via his State computer and email account, to his Benedictine University instructors later in the day or the next day. The OEIG's analysis also revealed emails that reflected discussions between Mr. Redfield and his classmates or his family members about assignments, editing assignments, meetings, and other school activities.⁷

⁶ Given the extent of Mr. Redfield's misconduct, the OEIG will not detail the contents of all the other emails here. As examples, however, on March 25, 2010 at 4:36 p.m., Mr. Redfield sent an email to another IDES employee with a 20-page PowerPoint presentation attached for the employee to print in color. After work hours, on August 27, 2010, Mr. Redfield sent a school paper, via State email, to another IDES employee, who replied two hours later stating that she made corrections to the paper for him. Other examples abound.

⁷ In addition to his schoolwork, Mr. Redfield used his State computer and State email account to send and receive hundreds and hundreds of personal emails between August 2008 and August 2010. Some of the recipients of non-work related emails from Mr. Redfield were IDES employees, including Ms. Pinder.

IV. ANALYSIS

A. *Clyde Redfield, His Subordinates, and Barbara Pinder Violated IDES Policy by Performing Clyde Redfield's Schoolwork during State Time*

Section 1019.701 of the IDES Procedures Manual (the Code of Ethics), states in part, "IDES employees are to perform duties on behalf of the Department during working hours." There is no doubt that Mr. Redfield and his subordinates violated IDES policies by performing Mr. Redfield's schoolwork on State time.

Mr. Redfield repeatedly violated Section 1019.701 when he engaged in non-State work on State time and when he caused other IDES employees to spend their State time doing his Benedictine University schoolwork. [Employee 1], [Employee 2], [Employee 3], [Employee 4], and [Employee 5] each said that they worked on Mr. Redfield's schoolwork during State time and/or overtime, at his request, and some of them worked on the assignments during State time with Mr. Redfield. Mr. Redfield eventually admitted that during State time he sent emails regarding his schoolwork from his personal and State email accounts, and asked subordinates to print, save, and/or edit his schoolwork, but did not admit to the extent of his misconduct.

Specifically, the investigation revealed that Mr. Redfield sent numerous emails during work hours relating to his schoolwork to himself, other IDES employees, and to his instructors. Some of the emails directed subordinate employees, and even his supervisor, to perform tasks related to his schoolwork, but none of the emails directed subordinates or his supervisor to wait until after work to perform tasks. [Employee 1] said that she felt that she needed to defer her IDES work to complete Mr. Redfield's homework, because the assignments were due the same evening she was directed to work on them. Mr. Redfield's email archive also included emails containing discussions of assignments and edits Mr. Redfield and his classmates were making to schoolwork during his workday.⁸ Therefore, the allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by performing non-State work, specifically schoolwork, during State time is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 1] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 2] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 3] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 4] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

⁸ Even though Mr. Redfield denied that he worked on his school assignments during State time, his statements are incredible, given the amount and pattern of school-related emails in his archive and the fact that he repeatedly lied to OEIG investigators.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 5] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing Barbara Pinder to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

In addition, the allegation that [Employee 1] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 2] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 3] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 4] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 5] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

Barbara Pinder also assisted with or performed Mr. Redfield's schoolwork during work hours. Thus, the allegation that Barbara Pinder abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

B. Clyde Redfield, His Subordinates, and Barbara Pinder Misused State Property

The IDES Procedures Manual, Section 1019.554, states in pertinent part:

All Department property, equipment, and supplies are to be used for official Department business, only.... IDES computers are provided for the processing of official State of Illinois business, only.... Use of the State's Internet system is limited to official business.... An employee's limited personal use of internal e-mail within IDES will be considered reasonable if it does not adversely affect the performance of the employee's official duties or those of the employee's organization, and it is reasonable in duration and frequency.

Mr. Redfield repeatedly violated Section 1019.554 by using IDES computers, internet, and color printers to complete his school assignments.

Mr. Redfield also violated Section 1019.554 by misusing the State email system. Limited personal use of the IDES email system is only acceptable "if it does not adversely affect the performance of the employee's official duties or those of the employee's organization ..." and is used to send "internal e-mail[s] within IDES." Mr. Redfield's internal use of IDES email was not limited, but rather extensive and repeated. Moreover, Mr. Redfield's use and causing others

to use State equipment for his college schoolwork clearly affected his and his subordinates' performance of official duties, because the schoolwork-related tasks he did and directed others to do, via email, prevented them from performing their State duties. Thus, the allegation that Clyde Redfield misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 1] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is also **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 3] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 4] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 5] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing Barbara Pinder to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

In addition, the allegation that [Employee 1] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 3] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 4] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 5] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Barbara Pinder misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield's schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

C. Clyde Redfield and His Subordinates Acted Discourteously and Unprofessionally, Bringing IDES into Disrepute

The IDES Procedures Manual, Section 1019.551, states in pertinent part:

All IDES employees shall conduct themselves in a courteous and professional manner when dealing with the general public and co-workers thereby reinforcing the public's confidence in the Department ... and shall at all times conduct themselves so as not to bring IDES into disrepute.

Mr. Redfield held two supervisory positions during the time he directed other IDES employees to complete his schoolwork: Local Office Manager and Assistant Regional Manager. Mr. Redfield had supervisory authority over the employees who assisted him with schoolwork. [Employee 1], [Employee 2], [Employee 3], [Employee 4], and [Employee 5] all said they felt they had to agree to Mr. Redfield's requests, because he was their boss.

A supervisor's request for assistance with personal business of a subordinate inevitably carries the potential that the subordinate will fear unfavorable treatment for refusing to comply. In this case, Mr. Redfield repeatedly suggested that certain IDES employees who helped him "volunteered" to help and that he had an agreement with [Employee 1] that she would only perform his schoolwork while on her breaks or after work. The OEIG does not accept as true Mr. Redfield's protestations that IDES employees "volunteered" to help him. Although the investigation did not reveal that Mr. Redfield threatened or bribed his subordinates to gain their assistance with his schoolwork, his position as supervisor did influence their decisions to comply with his requests and take time away from their IDES work to help with his schoolwork. The State of Illinois expects people who are paid to be managers to manage in the State's interest, rather than their own self-interest. Mr. Redfield, as a supervisor, failed to follow IDES policies relating to use of State time and property and failed to direct employees to comply with policies. Mr. Redfield's discourteous and unprofessional conduct towards his subordinates clearly brings IDES into disrepute. Thus, the allegation that Clyde Redfield acted unprofessionally by engaging in non-State work (his schoolwork) using IDES equipment during work hours, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 1] to assist with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 2] to assist with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 3] to assist with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 4] to assist with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 5] to assist with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he asked his supervisor, Barbara Pinder, to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

In addition, the OEIG concludes that [Employee 5] not only personally engaged in non-State work using IDES equipment during work hours, she also condoned her subordinates' misuse of State time and equipment in the same manner when she allowed them to assist Mr. Redfield with his schoolwork. Thus, the allegation that [Employee 5] acted discourteously and unprofessionally when she abused her supervisory authority and allowed [Employee 2] to assist Mr. Redfield with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 5] acted discourteously and unprofessionally when she abused her supervisory authority and allowed [Employee 3] to assist Mr. Redfield with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

The allegation that [Employee 5] acted discourteously and unprofessionally when she abused her supervisory authority and allowed [Employee 4] to assist Mr. Redfield with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

D. Barbara Pinder Failed to Adequately Supervise Clyde Redfield

The investigation revealed that Barbara Pinder knew about Mr. Redfield's misuse of State time and property to perform schoolwork. Although Ms. Pinder denied knowing anything about Mr. Redfield's use of State resources or time to do schoolwork, evidence discovered in this case reveals otherwise. In this case, Ms. Pinder received at least two emails from Mr. Redfield, via their State email accounts on State time, containing documents that Ms. Pinder ultimately confirmed were not related to IDES business. Ms. Pinder responded, via State email on State time, to at least one of the emails, indicating that she, herself, edited Mr. Redfield's PowerPoint presentation. However, even after reviewing two emails addressed to her from Mr. Redfield during State time about his schoolwork, Ms. Pinder still denied having any direct knowledge that Mr. Redfield worked on school assignments on State time or using State resources.

Ms. Pinder also received other non-work related emails from Mr. Redfield. Rather than questioning why Mr. Redfield performed non-State work on State time, or telling him to cease engaging in this misconduct, it appears that Ms. Pinder aided Mr. Redfield in his misconduct. As Regional Manager, Ms. Pinder had a responsibility to address her subordinate's misuse of State time and resources, not to condone or facilitate misconduct. Thus, the allegation that Barbara Pinder conducted herself in an unethical and unprofessional manner, in a manner that would bring IDES into disrepute, in violation of IDES policy, is **FOUNDED**.

E. Clyde Redfield Failed to Cooperate During his Interviews with the OEIG

The State Officials and Employees Ethics Act (Ethics Act) requires all State employees under the OEIG's jurisdiction to cooperate with the OEIG. 5 ILCS 430/20-70. Non-cooperation includes, "intentional omissions and knowing false statements." *Id.* Moreover, "all employees are required to cooperate with any internal investigations, including investigations conducted by the OEIG." IDES Procedures Manual, Section 1019.752. IDES policies require that employees must be truthful in "matters of official interest," which include investigations of the OEIG. *Id.* at Section 1019.558. Specifically, IDES policies state, "employees must not submit any knowingly false statements or misleading information in any oral or written report." *Id.*

The investigation revealed that Mr. Redfield asked and received help on his college schoolwork from numerous State employees during a one to two-year period. Mr. Redfield did not deny that certain State employees helped him perform schoolwork on State time. However, despite admitting that certain employees helped him, he denied that others helped him, including [Employee 2] and [Employee 3]. The OEIG finds the statements of [Employee 2], [Employee 3], [Employee 1], and others, in light of the overall evidence uncovered in this case, more credible than Mr. Redfield's bald denials. Thus, the OEIG concludes that Mr. Redfield:

- Falsely stated that [Employee 2] never completed or assisted him with his schoolwork, even though the evidence reveals that [Employee 2] assisted him two or three times per week for five months (January to May 2009) for about 40 to 60 minutes each time. Thus, the allegation that Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG's investigation when he falsely stated that [Employee 2] never completed or assisted him with his schoolwork, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual, is **FOUNDED**.
- Falsely stated that he never transmitted school assignments to Benedictine University through his State computer or email account, even though the evidence, namely a review of his State email account, indicates that he transmitted multiple assignments to his Benedictine University professors. Therefore, the allegation that Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG's investigation when he falsely stated that he never transmitted school assignments to Benedictine University through his State computer or email account, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual, is **FOUNDED**.
- Falsely stated that he never sent any emails to any other IDES employees (besides those discussed in his interviews) related to his schoolwork, even though the evidence, namely a review of his State email account, indicates that he did send emails to other IDES employees. For example, on March 25, 2010 at 4:36 p.m., Mr. Redfield sent an email to another IDES employee with directions to print a 20-page PowerPoint presentation in color. Thus, the allegation that Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG's investigation when he falsely stated that he never sent any emails to other IDES employees related to his schoolwork, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual, is **FOUNDED**.
- Falsely stated that no other IDES employees (besides those discussed in his interviews) ever assisted with his schoolwork, even though the evidence, namely a review of his State

email account, indicates that he asked other IDES employees to perform tasks related to his schoolwork and some of those employees even replied via email. For example, on August 27, 2010, Mr. Redfield sent a school paper, via State email, to another IDES employee, who replied two hours later stating that she made corrections to the paper for him. Therefore, the allegation that Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG's investigation when he falsely stated that no other IDES employees ever assisted with his schoolwork, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual, is **FOUNDED**.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Following due investigation, the OEIG issues these findings:

A. *Findings Relating to Clyde Redfield:*

In regards to Section 1019.701, the OEIG makes the following findings:

- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by performing non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 1] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 2] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 3] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 4] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing [Employee 5] to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield abused State time by causing Barbara Pinder to perform non-State work (his schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.

In regards to Section 1019.554, the OEIG makes the following findings:

- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 1] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 3] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.

- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 4] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing [Employee 5] to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield misused State property by causing Barbara Pinder to use office equipment to complete non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.

In regards to Section 1019.551, the OEIG makes the following findings:

- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted unprofessionally by engaging in non-State work (his schoolwork) using IDES equipment during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 1] to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 2] to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 3] to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 4] to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he abused his supervisory authority and directed [Employee 5] to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield acted discourteously and unprofessionally when he asked his supervisor, Barbara Pinder, to assist him with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.

In regards to the Ethics Act and Section 1019.558, the OEIG makes this finding:

- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG’s investigation when he falsely stated that [Employee 2] never completed or assisted him with his schoolwork, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG’s investigation when he falsely stated that he never transmitted school assignments to Benedictine University through his State computer or email account, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual.

- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG’s investigation when he falsely stated that he never sent any emails to other IDES employees related to his schoolwork, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual.
- **FOUNDED** – Clyde Redfield failed to cooperate with the OEIG’s investigation when he falsely stated that no other IDES employees ever assisted with his schoolwork, in violation of the Ethics Act and the IDES Procedures Manual.

B. Finding Relating to Barbara Pinder

- **FOUNDED** – Barbara Pinder abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Barbara Pinder misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – Barbara Pinder conducted herself in an unethical and unprofessional manner, in a manner that would bring IDES into disrepute, in violation of IDES policy.

C. Findings Relating to Clyde Redfield’s Subordinates

In regards to Section 1019.701, the OEIG makes the following findings:

- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 1] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 2] abused State time by engaging in non-State (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork) work during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 3] abused State time by engaging in non-State (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork) work during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 4] abused State time by engaging in non-State (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork) work during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 5] abused State time by engaging in non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork) during work hours, in violation of IDES policy.

In regards to Section 1019.554, the OEIG makes the following findings:

- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 1] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 3] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 4] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 5] misused State property by using office equipment to complete non-State work (Mr. Redfield’s schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.

In regards to Section 1019.551, the OEIG makes the following findings relating to [Employee 5]:

- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 5] acted discourteously and unprofessionally when she abused her supervisory authority and allowed [Employee 2] to assist Mr. Redfield with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 5] acted discourteously and unprofessionally when she abused her supervisory authority and allowed [Employee 3] to assist Mr. Redfield with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.
- **FOUNDED** – [Employee 5] acted discourteously and unprofessionally when she abused her supervisory authority and allowed [Employee 4] to assist Mr. Redfield with non-State work (his schoolwork), in violation of IDES policy.

The OEIG previously issued a report in OEIG case number 06-00964 finding that Clyde Redfield conducted personal business on State time, falsified timekeeping records, failed to work his scheduled hours, and failed to cooperate with the OEIG. As a result of that report, Mr. Redfield only received counseling, which clearly did not deter him from engaging in future misconduct. Therefore, in light of his continuing and serial misconduct, the OEIG recommends that Clyde Redfield be discharged for time abuse, misuse of State property, abuse of authority, and for failing to cooperate with the OEIG.

Because the OEIG concludes that Mr. Redfield was untruthful and thus failed to fully cooperate with the OEIG's investigation, in violation of Section 20-70 of the Ethics Act, it will refer this matter to the Illinois Attorney General for a reasonable cause determination.

In OEIG case number 06-00964, the OEIG found that Ms. Pinder condoned Mr. Redfield's misconduct, in part, and failed to enforce IDES policies. As a result of that report, Ms. Pinder received counseling. The OEIG recommends that Barbara Pinder be disciplined for violating IDES policies, failing to supervise Mr. Redfield, and condoning misconduct.

[Employee 1], [Employee 2], [Employee 3], [Employee 4], and [Employee 5] violated IDES policy in regards to use of State time. In addition, [Employee 1], [Employee 3], [Employee 4], and [Employee 5] violated IDES policy on use of State equipment. Moreover, [Employee 5] violated the IDES policy on professional conduct. Nonetheless, each of the aforementioned individuals violated these policies at the direction of their supervisor, Mr. Redfield. Thus, the OEIG recommends that they be counseled.

No further action is required and this matter is closed.

Date: **June 29, 2012**

Office of Executive Inspector General
for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor
32 W. Randolph Street, Ste. 1900
Chicago, IL 60601

Fallon Opperman
Assistant Inspector General

Donald Rehmer
Investigator #139



Pat Quinn
Governor

Jay Rowell
Director

September 12, 2012

Ms. Erin Bonales
Deputy Inspector General
Office of the Executive Inspector General
For the Agencies of the Illinois Governor
Complaints & Compliance
32 West Randolph Street, Suite 1900
Chicago, Illinois 60601

RE: Your OEIG Complaint Number 10-00649

Dear Ms. Bonales:

This is the final update regarding IDES's response to the report in OEIG Case No. 10-00649.

I am advised that all of the discipline and counseling described in my letter of August 22, 2012, were issued as of August 31.

As for Mr. Redfield, IDES has now confirmed with CMS that his resignation can be recoded to indicate he is not to be rehired. IDES's Labor Relations Unit is in the process of finalizing the memorandum to support the recoding and expects to complete that task no later than September 14.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss any of this further. Otherwise, IDES will consider the matter closed upon furnishing the aforementioned memorandum to CMS, along with the accompanying transaction form.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Mueller
Legal Counsel

cc: Kristy Shores, OEIG



Pat Quinn
Governor

Jay Rowell
Director

August 22, 2012

Ms. Erin Bonales
Deputy Inspector General
Office of the Executive Inspector General
For the Agencies of the Illinois Governor
Complaints & Compliance
32 West Randolph Street, Suite 1900
Chicago, Illinois 60601

RE: Your OEIG Complaint Number 10-00649

Dear Ms. Bonales:

The purpose of this letter is to update you regarding IDES's response to the report in OEIG Case No. 10-00649.

The Department will suspend Ms. Pinder for 14 calendar days effective September 3, 2012. Formal written notice of the suspension was mailed to her on August 21.

The agency is preparing counseling memoranda for all the subordinates of Mr. Redfield's who were named in the report, except

 will receive an oral reprimand given that she directed the other subordinates to assist with Mr. Redfield's schoolwork and should have known better.

As previously noted, although Mr. Redfield had resigned by the time the Department received the report for this case, the agency plans to note this matter in his personnel file.

The Department expects to complete all responsive action concerning this matter by August 31. I will confirm in writing when those actions have been completed.

Sincerely,

Joseph P. Mueller
Legal Counsel

cc: Kristy Shores, OEIG



Office of Executive Inspector General
for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor
www.inspectorgeneral.illinois.gov

OEIG RESPONSE FORM

Case Number: 10-00649

Due Within 20 Days of Receipt of Report

Please check the box that applies.

- We have implemented all of the OEIG recommendations.
(Provide details regarding action taken.)

- We will implement all of the OEIG recommendations but will require additional time.
We will report to OEIG within 30 days from the original return date.
(Provide details regarding action planned / taken.)

SEE ATTACHMENT A

(over)

- We are implementing one or more of the OEIG recommendations, however, we plan to depart from other OEIG recommendations.

(Provide details regarding action planned / taken and any alternate plan(s).)

- We do not wish to implement any of the OEIG recommendations.

(Explain in detail why and provide details of any alternate plan(s).)

Signature

JOSEPH P. MUELLER

Print Name

IL DEPT OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY
LEGAL COUNSEL / ETHICS OFFICER

Print Agency and Job Title

JULY 23, 2012

Date

ATTACHMENT A

IDES is unable to discharge Mr. Redfield, as he resigned effective June 30, 2012, prior to the Department's receipt of the report in Case No. 10-649. The Department is, however, considering noting this matter in Mr. Redfield's permanent record. The Department is considering the appropriate level of discipline regarding Ms. Pinder. At a minimum, the Department will counsel the other employees named in the report; it may pursue stronger action against any who have prior conduct issues.