Recent News

Although the OEIG’s offices are currently closed to the public due to the COVID-19 pandemic, staff is continuing its investigative work, and issuing investigative reports, revolving door determinations, and hiring and employment monitoring advisories. All staff are available by e-mail, videoconference, and telephone. The OEIG appreciates the work and cooperation of other State agencies during this time.

Employee Held Unapproved Secondary Employment, Abused Time and Resources

The Executive Ethics Commission recently released an OEIG founded report involving misconduct by former Illinois Department of Financial and Professional Regulation employee Charles Kean.

The OEIG received two anonymous complaints collectively alleging that Mr. Kean used State resources and State time for secondary employment at a community college; it was also alleged that Mr. Kean engaged in time abuse.

The OEIG discovered that in addition to his secondary employment with the community college, Mr. Kean also was an independent contractor with a local hospital. He failed to obtain the required agency approval for the secondary employment at the hospital.

The OEIG analyzed Mr. Kean’s use of various State resources. The analysis revealed that Mr. Kean sent over 100 e-mails unrelated to his IDFPR duties during a four-month period, and 93% of his State printer use during a ten-month period also did not appear to be related to his IDFPR duties. In addition, his internet usage history reflected that 65% of his usage was for streaming media, and two former co-workers said that they saw/heard him streaming movies in his office.

Mr. Kean resigned from IDFPR less than two months after his OEIG interview. The report, In re: Charles Kean (Case #18-00366), is available on the OEIG’s website.

Revolving Door Determination Affirmed

The Executive Ethics Commission recently affirmed a restricted revolving door determination by the OEIG.

In its determination, the OEIG found that an Illinois Department of Human Services employee had participated personally and substantially in the award of a change order worth more than $25,000 ($193,328) to a grantee. Therefore, the OEIG restricted the employee from accepting employment with the grantee for one year following the termination of his State employment. The employee appealed the OEIG’s determination.

In its decision on the appeal, the EEC agreed with the OEIG’s determination, and found that the employee’s participation “effected steps necessary to the execution of the change orders, represented an exercise of judgement, and were substantial.” The EEC also noted that “those adjustments and change order execution were being accomplished at roughly the same time he was seeking employment with” the grantee.

The EEC’s decision, In re: Daniel J. Wasmer (20-EEC-005), is available on the OEIG’s website.