



OEIG Investigation No.: 19-00042
Subject(s) Name(s): Stacey Kidd and [IDOC Employee 1]

Investigative Summary Report Publication

The Executive Ethics Commission ("Commission") is responsible for publishing the attached redacted Executive Inspector General for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor investigative summary report pursuant to the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. 5 ILCS 430/20-52. An Executive Inspector General issues an investigative summary report at the conclusion of an investigation if they determine that reasonable cause exists to believe a violation has occurred. 5 ILCS 430/20-50. The Commission did not write the report, conduct the investigation leading to the report, or impose any discipline upon the subject of the report.

The Commission and Investigative Summary Reports

The Ethics Act requires the Commission to publish an investigative summary report and ultimate jurisdictional authority's response if the report's subject was terminated or suspended for three days or more. 5 ILCS 430/20-52(a). Otherwise, the Commission may, but does not have to, publish the report and response. The ultimate jurisdictional authority varies from report to report and is typically the constitutional officer overseeing the subject's work location.

Investigative Summary Report Redactions

The Ethics Act also requires the Commission to redact, or remove, some information from investigative summary reports before publishing them. 5 ILCS 430/20-52(b). The Commission must redact information that may reveal the identity of witnesses, complainants, or informants or where the Commission determines that redaction is appropriate to protect the identity of a person. The Ethics Act permits the Commission, in its discretion, to redact other information it does not believe should be made public.

Before the Commission publishes a redacted report, it sends the report with the proposed redactions to the subject(s), the Executive Inspector General, and the Office of the Attorney General to review the proposed redactions, offer suggested redactions, and/or provide a response to be published with the report. 5 ILCS 430/20-52(b). The subject has an opportunity to provide a response to the report. If the report is published, the subject's response may be published as well. If the Executive Inspector General finds reasonable cause to believe that the subject(s) violated the Ethics Act's prohibition against sexual harassment, the Commission also sends the report with proposed redactions to the complainant for review and an opportunity to provide a response. 5 ILCS 430/20-63(b)(7).

Investigative Summary Report Publication Considerations

The Commission exercises its investigative summary report publication responsibilities only after thoughtful consideration. While the Ethics Act allows a subject to submit a response to be published with the report, it does not allow a subject to request a hearing before the Commission regarding the contents of a report. By publishing the following redacted report, the Commission neither makes nor adopts any arguments, allegations, determinations of fact, or conclusions of law relating to the subject or any other individual or entity referenced therein.

If you have questions about the content of the report, please contact the Executive Inspector General for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor. For enquiries about the Commission's publication process, please email eec@Illinois.gov or visit eec.illinois.gov for additional information.

Office of Executive Inspector General for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor

Investigation Case No. 19-00042



I. ALLEGATIONS AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On December 17, 2018, the OEIG received an anonymous complaint regarding two employees of the Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC), Stacey Kidd and [IDOC Employee 1].¹ According to the complaint, in February 2018, Ms. Kidd complained to Human Resources employee [IDOC Employee 1] that her starting salary in 2014 was lower than what she was entitled. The complaint alleged that [IDOC Employee 1] improperly approved a salary adjustment for Ms. Kidd without the necessary supporting documents, which gave Ms. Kidd a higher salary and back wages.

Based on its investigation, the OEIG found that Ms. Kidd defrauded IDOC by falsifying employment and income information in order to obtain an improper salary adjustment and approximately \$40,038 in back wages.² The OEIG also found that [IDOC Employee 1] mismanaged Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment by failing to take reasonable steps to ensure that Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment was appropriate and properly supported.

II. BACKGROUND

A. Stacey Kidd And [IDOC Employee 1]

Stacey Kidd was hired by IDOC as an Office Associate at the Graham Correctional Center on July 16, 2014. After several promotions within IDOC, on February 1, 2017, Ms. Kidd was promoted to her current position as a Human Resources (HR) Representative at IDOC's Central Office.

[IDOC Employee 1] was hired into State service on November 2, 1987, and served in HR-related positions in the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS) until 2011, when she became the Transactions Manager at the Public Safety Shared Services (PSSS) Center.³ From 2014 to 2017, [IDOC Employee 1] returned to work in HR at DHS before she was appointed, on July 16, 2017, Deputy Director of HR for the PSSS Center located at IDOC's Central Office. On September 1, 2018, [IDOC Employee 1] sought and accepted a position as the Transaction Manager for PSSS, a step down from her previous Deputy Director role.

B. Rules Governing Entrance Base Salary And Salary Adjustments

The Illinois Department of Central Management Services (CMS) provides a broad range of programs and services to State agencies.⁴ The CMS Bureau of Personnel is responsible for

¹ Although the complaint listed the name variously as [IDOC Employee 1], the OEIG was able to confirm that the employee listed in the complaint was IDOC employee [IDOC Employee 1], who often goes by "[IDOC Employee 1]."

² Because of the potential criminal nature of this misconduct, the OEIG referred this investigation to the Illinois Attorney General's Office for consideration. In order to not interfere with that criminal referral, Ms. Kidd was not interviewed in this investigation.

³ Executive Order 2006-06 created two Shared Services Centers in March 2006. The Public Safety Shared Services Center combined administrative functions, including many HR-related functions, for five public safety agencies, including IDOC. While [IDOC Employee 1] works in the PSSS, she is an IDOC employee.

⁴ See <https://www2.illinois.gov/cms/About/Pages/default.aspx> (last visited July 19, 2019).

developing and administering the State's pay plan and establishing and implementing position classification and compensation standards, employee and agency transactions, and payroll certifications.⁵

CMS promulgated the CMS Pay Plan, which contains policy and procedures that are controlling in matters of State employee pay administration.⁶ According to the Pay Plan, each State employee is subject to the pay schedules delineated in the plan and is paid at a rate of pay or step in the appropriate pay grade listed in the plan for the class of position in which the employee is employed.⁷

The initial base salary assigned to an employee upon entering State service is their "entrance base salary."⁸ When calculating an entrance base salary, the "salary used for equivalency calculation is the most current or last employment recorded on the candidate's CMS-100 Employment Application (CMS-100).⁹ When a candidate for employment lists on their CMS-100 part-time employment as their most current or last employment, State agencies use the CMS Salary Equivalency Calculation Guide to calculate what their equivalent full-time salary would be. Agencies are responsible for verifying the completeness and accuracy of the CMS-100.¹⁰

The CMS Pay Plan states that after entering State service, an employee may receive an upward adjustment in their entrance base salary for the purpose of correcting a previous error or oversight, or when the best interest of the agency and the State of Illinois will be served. Salary adjustments require the prior approval of the Director of CMS.¹¹ IDOC Administrative Directive 03.02.104 requires salary adjustments to be approved by the appropriate Deputy Director or the Director before it can be processed.¹²

III. INVESTIGATION

A. Ms. Kidd's Entrance Base Salary And IDOC Hire

To better understand Ms. Kidd's starting salary and her subsequent adjustment, the OEIG interviewed CMS and IDOC employees to determine how a starting employee's entrance base salary is determined.

⁵ See <https://www2.illinois.gov/cms/About/Bureaus/Pages/default.aspx> (last visited July 9, 2019).

⁶ See CMS Pay Plan 2019, Section 310.20 Policy and Responsibilities. While the CMS Pay Plan has been amended numerous times since 2014 and 2017, when some of the personnel transactions occurred in this case, all of the rules cited in this report remain unchanged from the June 11, 2014 version of the CMS Pay Plan. Accordingly, this report cites to the 2019 CMS Pay Plan.

⁷ See CMS Pay Plan 2019, Section 310.40 Pay Schedules.

⁸ See CMS Pay Plan 2019, Section 310.50 Definitions.

⁹ See CMS Salary Equivalency Calculation Guide, January 21, 2011. The OEIG notes that the Equal Pay Act of 2003 was recently amended and now prohibits employers in many circumstances from inquiring about job applicant's salary or wage history. See Equal Pay Act of 2003, 2019 Ill. Legis. Serv. P.A. 101-177 (H.B. 834) (West). However, the amendment does not apply to this case as it was not in effect at times relevant to this case.

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ See CMS Pay Plan 2019, Section 310.80(e) Increases in Pay.

¹² See IDOC Administrative Directive 03.02.104(D)(1).

1. Interviews of CMS Employees

On March 5, 2019 and March 19, 2019, OEIG investigators interviewed the Interim Manager of the Division of Technical Services within CMS's Bureau of Personnel, [CMS Employee 1], and CMS Acting Division Manager [CMS Employee 2], respectively. [CMS Employee 1] stated that his duties include supervising CMS' Division of Compensation. [CMS Employee 2] reported that she was Assistant Division Manager from 2014 to 2016, and became the Acting Division Manager in October 2016. [CMS Employee 2] said her duties and responsibilities include ensuring agencies comply with the Personnel Code, other policies, and coded transactions.

[CMS Employee 2] reported that new State hires receive an entrance base salary at the minimum pay step of 1C if they have no related experience when they start. [CMS Employee 2] and [CMS Employee 1] both stated that new hires may get above the minimum 1C salary based on relevant experience, but that decision is up to the employing agency. [CMS Employee 1] emphasized that the CMS Pay Plan explicitly states that agencies "may" offer candidates a higher entrance base salary so offering a prospective employee a salary above the minimum is not mandatory. [CMS Employee 2] stated that if a new hire is starting above the minimum salary, the employing agency obtains paystubs from the candidate to verify their recent salary and CMS reviews the candidate's CMS-100 to verify that the higher salary is justified. [CMS Employee 2] reported that if the agency cannot show supporting documents they are questioned by CMS.

2. Interview of IDOC Transaction Manager [IDOC Employee 1]

On July 9, 2019, OEIG investigators interviewed IDOC Transaction Manager [IDOC Employee 1]. [IDOC Employee 1] explained that the CMS Pay Plan and the new hire's CMS-100 that shows a current or previous salary are used to determine the prospective employee's starting salary. [IDOC Employee 1] reported that IDOC generally gives new employees their recent or current salary plus 5%.¹³

[IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that CMS requires State agencies to verify the accuracy of each applicant's CMS-100, which [IDOC Employee 1] reported the IDOC hiring unit accomplishes by obtaining and reviewing recent paystubs, which she said are then maintained in the employee's hiring file. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that she does not know if requiring paystubs from applicants is a written policy, but reported that checking paystubs has been an IDOC practice for as long as she could remember, and certainly had been an IDOC practice since 2014. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that if the prospective employee is unable to submit paystubs to verify the information in their CMS-100, IDOC would accept things like a Form W-2. [IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that if a prospective employee fails to provide paystubs, or other acceptable verification of their current or last salary, they receive an entrance base salary at the minimum pay step of 1C.

¹³ According to the CMS Pay Plan 2019 Section 310.100(b)(2), if a candidate possesses directly related education and experience in excess of the minimum requirements of the class specification, the employing agency may offer the candidate an entrance base salary that is not more than 5% above the candidate's current base salary.

3. Interview of IDOC Human Resources Representative [IDOC Employee 2]

On March 19, 2019, OEIG investigators interviewed IDOC HR Representative [IDOC Employee 2]. [IDOC Employee 2] stated that he has been employed by IDOC since January of 2012, and has been in his current position for five years. [IDOC Employee 2] said his duties consist of contractual hiring, which includes determining new employee salaries.

[IDOC Employee 2] explained that the CMS Pay Plan and the new hire's CMS-100 that shows a current or previous salary are used to determine the prospective employee's starting salary. [IDOC Employee 2] said that generally, if a new hire's previous salary is lower than the minimum entrance salary for the position, they automatically get the minimum entrance base salary. [IDOC Employee 2] said if a new employee had a higher previous salary, paystubs are checked to determine the salary offer. [IDOC Employee 2] reported that he is sent each candidate's paystubs from whatever IDOC facility is hiring the new employee and he keeps a copy of whatever paystubs he receives in the hiring file. [IDOC Employee 2] reported that if a candidate fails to provide previous paystubs, they are either not hired or they receive the minimum entrance base salary for the position.

[IDOC Employee 2] reported that he does not recall hiring anyone claiming to make more than the 1C paygrade without checking their previous paystubs. [IDOC Employee 2] stated that new hires are generally offered their current or previous salary, plus 5%. [IDOC Employee 2] said that there are situations where more than a 5% salary increase is offered, but those situations necessitate submitting a special form to CMS. [IDOC Employee 2] said this process has been the same for the entirety of the time he has worked as an HR Representative.¹⁴

4. Interview of IDOC Administrative Assistant II [IDOC Employee 3]

On April 23, 2019, OEIG investigators interviewed IDOC Administrative Assistant II [IDOC Employee 3]. [IDOC Employee 3] stated that she was a HR Representative at Graham Correctional Center from April 2012 until August 2016, was promoted in August 2016 to Administrative Assistant II, and retired in December 2018. [IDOC Employee 3] reported her duties and responsibilities as both an HR Representative and Administrative Assistant included completing personnel transactions related to hiring.

According to [IDOC Employee 3], once IDOC picks a top candidate for an open position, the hiring unit determines the candidate's proposed starting salary based on the candidate's CMS-100 and paystubs from the candidate's current employer. [IDOC Employee 3] reported that if the candidate does not provide paystubs to verify the accuracy of their CMS-100, then it is up to the hiring unit to determine the starting salary.

¹⁴ An email dated January 18, 2018, sent from Ms. Kidd's State email account, appears to show Ms. Kidd was aware of this process. Regarding another candidate, the email from Ms. Kidd's State email account stated, "If she cannot provide us with any pay stubs that are recent or at within [sic] the last 6 months, then we have to be fair across the board with all new hires. She will have to start at 1C. Sorry that is just how everything works with the state. You will just have to explain to her the steps and give her the union book so she understands the range better."

5. Ms. Kidd's Initial IDOC Application and Selection

The OEIG obtained and reviewed Ms. Kidd's Graham Correctional Center personnel file that had been closed following her transfer to IDOC Central Office (Graham personnel file). This file contained hiring and personnel documents related to Ms. Kidd's employment at Graham Correctional Center including her initial CMS-100 application form (Graham CMS-100), dated June 5, 2014, submitted for an Office Associate position at Graham Correctional Center, bearing a signature in the name of Stacey Kidd.¹⁵ The Graham CMS-100 listed Ms. Kidd's current or last employer as Temporary Hygiene Agency, and that she worked there from August 2012 to April 2014 as a Dental Hygienist. While the Graham CMS-100 listed an average of 16 hours per week for this position, it did not list any salary information for this position.

Emails between members of IDOC HR discuss the fact that Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 did not list a salary for her then-current position at Temporary Hygiene in 2014:

- On June 11, 2014, an email from the State email account of IDOC employee [IDOC Employee 2] to IDOC employee [IDOC Employee 3], stated that "Stacey Kidd is our #1 Candidate [for the Office Associate position], but on her CMS100 she did not indicate a salary for her current position. Please find out what the salary is. Also, she stated that it's a temp position, so she might have a different job by now. If this is the case, please request two of her latest paystubs so I can compute her new salary."
- An email originating from the State account of [IDOC Employee 3] responded that same day stating, "Just spoke with Ms. Kidd and she states that she is still with the Temporary Agency and only works 8-16 hours per week, and gets paid \$26-\$28 per hour. . . . She does not have a different job. . . . I didn't request paystubs, since she was still with the temp agency, but if I need to, let me know."
- On June 18, 2014, an email from the account of [IDOC Employee 2] to [IDOC Employee 3], directed [IDOC Employee 3] to "make a conditional offer of employment for [the Office Associate] position to Stacey Kidd. . . and her salary will be 2991, step 1c."¹⁶

OEIG investigators also reviewed three additional emails dated June 26, 2014 and June 30, 2014, from [IDOC Employee 3] State email account. Each email discussed processing paperwork for Ms. Kidd's hire into the Office Associate position at Graham Correctional Center and attached a CMS-100 dated June 5, 2014 for Ms. Kidd. Upon review by OEIG investigators, the CMS-100 attached to each of the three emails matched exactly the document that has been identified in this report as Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100.

¹⁵ The Graham CMS-100 indicated that Ms. Kidd had completed high school and had worked as an office coordinator or similar position for at least six years. The CMS Class Specification for Office Associate indicated that the position required the completion of high school, two years of office experience, and extensive knowledge of things including office practices, grammar, spelling, basic mathematics, and agency programs and regulations.

¹⁶ In June 2014, when this email was sent, the step 1C salary for the Office Associate position was \$2,991 per month; however, on July 1, 2014, before Ms. Kidd started, the 1C salary for the Office Associate position was increased to \$3,051 per month.

6. Additional 2014 CMS-100 for Ms. Kidd

During this investigation, the OEIG also obtained and reviewed: (1) Ms. Kidd's IDOC personnel file that was maintained at the IDOC Central Office (IDOC personnel file), (2) her hiring and promotional file kept at IDOC Central Office (IDOC hiring file), and (3) her CMS file containing hiring and promotional documents related to every position Ms. Kidd has held with the State (CMS file). Investigators discovered that these files, except for the IDOC hiring file,¹⁷ contained a version of Ms. Kidd's CMS-100 dated June 5, 2014 that was different from the Graham CMS-100. The table below highlights the relevant discrepancies between the Graham CMS-100 and the other version of her CMS-100 dated June 5, 2014 (IDOC 2014 CMS-100):¹⁸

| Location of the CMS-100 | Date of CMS-100 | Current or Last Employer | Dates | Average Hours Worked | Current or Last Salary | Salary Period |
|---|-----------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| Graham Correctional Center Personnel File | June 5, 2014 | Temporary Hygiene Agency | August 2012 to April 2014 | 16 | blank | blank |
| IDOC Personnel File | June 5, 2014 | Temporary Hygiene Agency | August 2012 to April 2014 | 32 | \$1,024 | weekly |
| CMS File | June 5, 2014 | Temporary Hygiene Agency | August 2012 to April 2014 | 32 | \$1,024 | weekly |

IDOC Directive 03.02.107 indicates that agency and division personnel files shall contain only the official work history of employees and states that “[a]ny changes made to correct any erroneous information in a file must be documented with a notation which briefly explains the reason for the changes. The notation must be dated and signed by an authorized Agency or division personnel staff.” On the top right corner of the fourth and fifth pages of both Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100, the initials “SK” dated June 20, 2014 appear. In her interview with investigators, [IDOC Employee 3] explained that these notations indicate that someone likely filled in gaps in Ms. Kidd's employment history from 2000 to 2006. However, on neither Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 or IDOC 2014 CMS-100 did the pages listing her employment history with Temporary Hygiene Agency contain a notation, date, or signature indicating that a change was made to correct erroneous information.

¹⁷ The IDOC hiring file did not contain any documents related to Ms. Kidd's initial hiring at Graham Correctional Center.

¹⁸ OEIG investigators also identified other discrepancies between information provided on Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 and information provided on the CMS-100s she submitted for subsequent promotions. For example, the Graham CMS-100 stated that Ms. Kidd worked for Temporary Hygiene Agency from August 2012 to April 2014 with the salary information blank; however, Ms. Kidd's November 2015 CMS-100 stated that she worked for Temporary Hygiene Agency from September 2012 to July 2014 making \$480 per week. The Graham CMS-100 stated that she received \$1,120 weekly from her former employer [Company 1]; however, Ms. Kidd's November 2015 CMS-100 stated she received \$1,015 weekly from [Company 1].

7. IDOC Reference Check

In her interview, [IDOC Employee 3] stated that once the salary and employment offer are finalized, she contacts the candidate to make a conditional offer of employment that includes a starting salary and step, pending a background check and other agency background procedures. [IDOC Employee 3] indicated that once the conditional offer is accepted by the candidate, candidates are asked to complete a form, called an Employment Reference Check DOC 0037, that IDOC sends to the candidate's former employers to complete and return to IDOC. [IDOC Employee 3] stated that there is no salary information on the form.

Ms. Kidd's Graham personnel file and subsequent emails from [IDOC Employee 3]' State account indicate that IDOC received verification of employment forms from several of the previous employers listed on Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100. However, an employee reference check form addressed to "Temp Agency" at the address Ms. Kidd provided for Temporary Hygiene Agency was not signed by Ms. Kidd.¹⁹ Thus, neither the Graham personnel file, nor emails, contained an employment reference check for Temporary Hygiene Agency. Additionally, no paystubs for Ms. Kidd were found in the emails or in her Graham personnel file, IDOC personnel file, IDOC hiring file, or CMS file.

On July 2, 2014, an email originating from the State account of [IDOC Employee 3] states that Ms. Kidd's background check was completed and approved. Ms. Kidd's Graham personnel file shows that on July 7, 2014, [IDOC Employee 3] sent a letter to Ms. Kidd informing her that she had been approved for employment as an Office Associate with the Graham Correctional Center. A CMS Personnel/Position Action Form (CMS-2) shows that Ms. Kidd started work as an Office Associate on July 16, 2014, with a monthly salary of \$3,051, at step 1C.

8. IDOC Employee Interviews Regarding Ms. Kidd's Hire

During their separate interviews with investigators, [IDOC Employee 2] and [IDOC Employee 3] both stated that in 2014, they were involved in the hiring of Ms. Kidd. [IDOC Employee 3] said that she followed IDOC procedures for Ms. Kidd's hiring process and salary determination. [IDOC Employee 3] stated she did not remember whether IDOC received a completed DOC 0037 from Temporary Hygiene Agency, Ms. Kidd's then-current employer based on her CMS-100.

[IDOC Employee 2] stated that back when Ms. Kidd was hired, he would have received Ms. Kidd's previous paystubs from someone at Graham Correctional Center, where she was being hired, and his contact would have been [IDOC Employee 3]. [IDOC Employee 2] reported that all of the information he and [IDOC Employee 3] had on Ms. Kidd would be found in the hiring file. Neither [IDOC Employee 3] or [IDOC Employee 2] recalled what, if any, paystubs were received for Ms. Kidd.

¹⁹ Ms. Kidd's Graham personnel file did contain a completed employee reference check signed by Ms. Kidd and hand addressed to "Temp Agency." However, the form appears to have been sent to an address different than the address listed on Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 for Temporary Hygiene Agency, the person's name who filled out the form was different than the name of the owner for the Temporary Hygiene Agency provided by Ms. Kidd, and the time period the person indicated that Ms. Kidd worked for the office did not match the time period Ms. Kidd listed on her Graham CMS-100 as working for Temporary Hygiene Agency.

9. Ms. Kidd's IDOC Promotional History and Resulting Salary Increases

CMS-2s show that Ms. Kidd has received the following promotions and resulting salary changes since entering IDOC in 2014:²⁰

| Date | New Position | Location | Salary |
|------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| July 16, 2014 | Office Associate | Graham Correctional Center | \$3,051, step 1C |
| July 1, 2015 | Account Technician I | Graham Correctional Center | \$3,250, step 1C |
| May 1, 2016 | Accountant | IDOC Central Office in Springfield | \$3,647, step 1C |
| February 1, 2017 | Human Resources Representative | IDOC Central Office in Springfield | \$4,159, step 1C |

B. Ms. Kidd's Salary Adjustment And Back Wage Claim

During her interview with investigators, CMS Acting Division Manager [CMS Employee 2] stated that if there was an error in a candidate's starting salary, she would instruct the employing agency to submit a correction to the original CMS-2. [CMS Employee 2] reported that for a correction to a salary, CMS receives an original CMS-2 from the agency with "correction" written at the top, a statement explaining the correction written in the remarks section, and documents supporting the correction. [CMS Employee 2] stated that the agency Director and CMS would have to sign off on the correction and that the corrected CMS-2 would be processed by [CMS Employee 2] or her staff.²¹

1. Ms. Kidd's Request for a Salary Adjustment

During her interview with investigators, [IDOC Employee 1] stated that Ms. Kidd came to her around the holidays in December 2017, regarding the need for a salary adjustment. According to [IDOC Employee 1], Ms. Kidd believed, based on her recently acquired knowledge from working in the hiring unit in HR, that her entrance base salary had been miscalculated. Ms. Kidd told [IDOC Employee 1] that she believed at the time of her initial hire that the hiring unit mistakenly used her prior salary (from Temporary Hygiene Agency), listed on the CMS-100, as her monthly salary rather than her weekly salary. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that Ms. Kidd did not show her any documents during the discussion.

[IDOC Employee 1] reported that she generally processes salary adjustments a handful of times each year to correct an error in a candidate's starting salary. [IDOC Employee 1] explained that the IDOC Personnel Manager must approve any salary adjustment for IDOC employees and CMS must also sign off on the correction. [IDOC Employee 1] explained that to make a salary adjustment to correct an error, CMS requires agencies to submit an explanation of the error along with supporting documentation. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that to correct a salary error, she

²⁰ All the mentioned personnel files contained the same CMS-2s for Ms. Kidd's subsequent promotions.

²¹ [CMS Employee 2] also explained that while an agency's HR or Payroll departments would make payments for salary corrections that occur in the current fiscal year, back wage payments are payments from a prior fiscal year and are processed through CMS.

typically writes “correction” at the top of the original CMS-2 and explains the correction in the remarks section before sending the document, along with supporting documentation, to CMS for review and approval.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated that based on her conversation with Ms. Kidd, she pulled Ms. Kidd’s IDOC personnel file, located at IDOC Central office, and referenced the CMS-100 contained in that file. [IDOC Employee 1] was shown and recognized Ms. Kidd’s IDOC 2014 CMS-100 as the version of Ms. Kidd’s CMS-100 that she referenced. According to [IDOC Employee 1], if the listed salary of \$1,024 had been appropriately used as a weekly salary rather than a monthly salary, then Ms. Kidd would have been entitled to a higher starting salary, as suggested by Ms. Kidd. Thus, based on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100, [IDOC Employee 1] assumed that Ms. Kidd’s original salary had been miscalculated.

In making that assumption, [IDOC Employee 1] stated she did not discuss Ms. Kidd’s previous employment with her, or speak with either [IDOC Employee 2] or [IDOC Employee 3] about the alleged error. [IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged she also did not pull Ms. Kidd’s IDOC hiring file or check elsewhere for an employee reference check for Temporary Hygiene Agency or paystubs that could verify the prior income information she relied on. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that she assumed that at the time of Ms. Kidd’s hire, [IDOC Employee 2] and [IDOC Employee 3] referenced the same CMS-100 she saw and made an error in calculating Ms. Kidd’s entrance base salary.

Accordingly, [IDOC Employee 1] said that she calculated what entrance base salary Ms. Kidd should have received based on the \$1,024 weekly salary, which would put Ms. Kidd at step 8 making \$4,234 per month. [IDOC Employee 1] reported that because Ms. Kidd is an IDOC employee, she called then-IDOC Personnel Manager [IDOC Employee 4] to explain the error and received verbal approval to go through with Ms. Kidd’s salary adjustment to correct the error. [IDOC Employee 1] stated she also may have discussed the error with the hiring manager, Ms. Kidd’s supervisor, before processing the salary adjustment right after the holidays in early 2018.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated that when she changed the original 2014 CMS-2, Ms. Kidd’s salary for her subsequently held positions in IDOC also needed to change, so [IDOC Employee 1] stated that she made corrections to Ms. Kidd’s 2015, 2016 and 2017 CMS-2s as well. [IDOC Employee 1] identified her signature on Ms. Kidd’s corrected CMS-2s, stated she wrote “correction” at the top of each corrected CMS-2, and wrote the explanation of “correction to salary . . .” in the remarks sections. [IDOC Employee 1] said that she had signature authority to sign then-Acting Director [IDOC Employee 5]’s name on personnel documents and did so often. Thus, [IDOC Employee 1] stated that she also signed [IDOC Employee 5]’s name to the CMS-2s, initialed “[IDOC Employee 1]” at the bottom of the CMS-2s, and changed the step and salary amount on each CMS-2. [IDOC Employee 1] indicated that she both recognized her writing on the CMS-2s and recalled making the corrections.

2. Ms. Kidd’s Salary Adjustment and Back Wage Claim Paperwork

The CMS-2s found in Ms. Kidd’s Graham personnel file, IDOC personnel file, and CMS file detail Ms. Kidd’s upward salary adjustment to the entrance base salary she received as an

Office Associate in 2014, and the resulting upward adjustments [IDOC Employee 1] made to the salary Ms. Kidd earned in each subsequent position she held at IDOC. The following table shows the salary adjustments received by Ms. Kidd, with the crossed out pay step and salary reflecting the original salary Ms. Kidd received for each position and the new salary above showing the pay step and salary she earned following the upward adjustment submitted by [IDOC Employee 1]:

| Form | Position | Signature(s) | Handwritten Salary Change(s) | Remarks |
|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--|
| CMS-2 *Correction* | Office Associate | [CMS Employee 2], 2-8-18 [IDOC Employee 5], 1-5-18 (with [IDOC Employee 1] initials) ²² | 8 \$4,234 4C \$3,051 | “Correction to salary. Salary was calculated in error as CMS100 shows a weekly salary not a monthly salary. Salary should be step 8. [IDOC Employee 1].” |
| CMS-2 *Correction* | Account Technician I | [CMS Employee 2], 2-8-18 [IDOC Employee 5], 1-5-18 (with [IDOC Employee 1] initials) | 7 \$4,418 4C \$3,250 | “Correction to salary due to correction of 7-16-14 salary.” |
| CMS-2 *Correction* | Accountant | [CMS Employee 2], 2-8-18 [IDOC Employee 5], 1-5-18 (with [IDOC Employee 1] initials) | 5 \$4,675 4C \$3,647 | “Correction to salary due to correction of 7-16-14 salary. [IDOC Employee 1].” |
| CMS-2 *Correction* | Human Resource Representative | [CMS Employee 2], 2-8-18 [IDOC Employee 5], 1-5-18 (with [IDOC Employee 1] initials) | 3 \$4,999 4C \$4,159 | “Correction to salary due to correction of 7-16-14 salary.” |

Ms. Kidd’s CMS Back Wage File contained a Claim for Back Wages (CMS-390) dated February 16, 2018, with a signature in the name of Ms. Kidd²³ that was received by CMS on March 9, 2018. Although the “amount claimed” section on the form was left blank, the “reason for the claim” is listed on the form as “Put on wrong step when hired.” A Certification and Disputation of Back Wage Claim (CMS-391) completed by IDOC indicates that the basis for Ms. Kidd’s back wage claim was that she “was put on wrong step when hired 7/16/2014.” IDOC checked a box on the CMS-391 indicating that Ms. Kidd’s claim in the amount of \$40,038.27 constituted a valid back wage claim. The CMS-391 is signed by others in the name of [IDOC Employee 5] and then CMS Acting Director [CMS Employee 3].

²² At the time of the correction, [IDOC Employee 5] was IDOC’s Acting Director. The signature bearing the name [IDOC Employee 5] is cut off on copies of the CMS-2s in Ms. Kidd’s IDOC master personnel file; however, the signature, date, and initials are visible on copies of the CMS-2s in Ms. Kidd’s CMS file. During her interview with investigators, [IDOC Employee 1] stated she signed the corrected CMS-2s on behalf of [IDOC Employee 5], which is something she did regularly as part of her job duties. [IDOC Employee 1] also confirmed that she signed on her own behalf and filled out remarks section.

²³ During her interview with investigators, [IDOC Employee 1] identified the signature on the CMS-390 as Ms. Kidd’s.

Documents show that in April 2018, Ms. Kidd received an upward salary adjustment to the entrance base salary she received as an Office Associate in 2014 and to each position she held in IDOC after that, which resulted in a gross back wage claim of \$40,038.27. In addition to receiving back wages and earning a higher monthly salary moving forward, documents show that Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment also provided her with \$24,688.81 in additional contribution by the State to her retirement, Medicare, and Social Security.

The Illinois Comptroller's Salary Database confirms that Ms. Kidd's 2017 monthly salary as an HR Representative was \$4,200 and her IDOC 2018 monthly salary in the same position is listed as \$5,000, indicating a \$9,600 yearly increase due to the salary adjustment.

3. Email Discussion of Ms. Kidd's Salary Adjustment and Back Wage Claim

Emails sent and received by Ms. Kidd in early 2018 discuss her upward salary adjustment and resulting back wage claim:

- On January 2, 2018, an email from Ms. Kidd's State account to IDOC employee [IDOC Employee 6] states, "I really am concerned with money the most but if [IDOC Employee 1] is getting me lined out like she said Friday . . . Hopefully I will be adjusted to a Step 3 HR Rep. soon. She said that she doesn't even have to do the CMS-163. Said that [CMS Employee 2] at CMS said that she thinks it looks like from the original application that they went off of 1,000 monthly instead of weekly. Keep your fingers crossed and please do not tell anyone about this either because you know how all these B's are. . . . one of them will probably try to make it so it doesn't happen."
- On February 26, 2018, an email from Ms. Kidd's State email account to former IDOC employee [IDOC Employee 7] states, "They got me adjust [sic] all the way back to the beginning and it has been approved. I should have the back-pay until July of 2017 on my next paycheck, they have me adjusted to a step 3 HR Rep. and then my back wage claim is right at \$41,000 YAY!!!! [IDOC Employee 8] said it should come within the next 3 months. She also said that you cannot designate any of your money so I will have to be taxed on it all and that the percentage is ungodly. It is around 40% - I may have like \$18,000 going to taxes. BUT....whatever has to happen. It is a good thing!!!! I feel like I have hit the LOTTO!!!"
- On March 9, 2018, an email from Ms. Kidd's State email account to Federal Bureau of Prisons employee [Federal Bureau of Prisons Employee 1] states, "Oh, and I forgot to tell you that I found a mistake when I was brought in 4 years ago. I have a back wage claim of 48,000 coming in the next couple months (If taxes don't take it all) YAY!! They already gave me 6,500. They then adjusted my wage 5 steps higher another 1,000/month. I felt like I had hit the Lotto."

4. False Information Provided on Ms. Kidd's CMS-100s

a) Non-Existence of Temporary Hygiene Agency

OEIG investigators attempted to locate the Temporary Hygiene Agency Ms. Kidd listed as her current or last employer on her Graham CMS-100 and her IDOC 2014 CMS-100, but were unsuccessful. The following searches were done:

- A corporation and LLC search for ‘Temporary Hygiene Agency’ on the Office of Illinois Secretary of State website did not match any records in the database;
- An internet search for ‘Temporary Hygiene Agency’ located at the address provided on both versions of Ms. Kidd’s 2014 CMS-100 ([Street 1] in [City 1], Illinois) did not yield any relevant results;
- An internet search for ‘Temporary Hygiene Agency’ located at the address provided on Ms. Kidd’s February 2016 CMS-100 (P.O. Box 599; [Street 1], [City 1], Illinois) did not yield any relevant results;²⁴
- Documents in Ms. Kidd’s Graham personnel file list a telephone number for Temporary Hygiene Agency. A LexisNexis Accurint search for the telephone number showed it is a wireless telephone number, but does not show an owner;
- A LexisNexis Accurint search for dental companies on [Street 1] in [City 1], Illinois yielded four results. However, none of the companies in the results were named Temporary Hygiene Agency;²⁵
- Documents in Ms. Kidd’s Graham personnel file list “[Individual 1]” as the owner of Temporary Hygiene Agency. A LexisNexis Accurint search for dental companies owned by ‘[Individual 1]’ showed a [Individual 1] as president of [Company 2];
- A LexisNexis Accurint search for [Individual 1] indicated this person lived on [Street 1] in [City 1], Illinois from March 2006 to October 2007; and
- A corporation and LLC search for ‘[Company 2],’ the company owned or operated by [Individual 1], on the Office of Illinois Secretary of State website listed [City 1] Illinois as the agent city. However, the results showed that the company was dissolved in 2009.

Thus, OEIG investigators were unable to locate a company called ‘Temporary Hygiene Agency’ in [City 1], Illinois that existed during the time period Ms. Kidd indicated on her CMS-100s as a former employer.

b) No Prior Income Found from Temporary Hygiene Agency

OEIG investigators obtained Ms. Kidd’s [redacted] file. The information contained in the [redacted] file contradicted the employment and income information provided on both Ms. Kidd’s Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100, and subsequent CMS-100s submitted to IDOC for Ms. Kidd’s promotions.

Both Ms. Kidd’s Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100, bearing her signature, indicated that she worked for Temporary Hygiene Agency from August 2012 to April 2014. [Redacted].

²⁴ In fact, an internet search for post offices where a P.O. Box might be located on [Street 1] in [City 1], Illinois did not produce any results.

²⁵ The closest business name the search produced was [Company 3]; however, the telephone number associated with that business is different than the telephone number Ms. Kidd provided for Temporary Hygiene Agency.

c) Additional False Statements

Both Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100, which bear her signature, stated that she worked for [Company 1] from February 2006 to August 2012, and that she left the position to temporarily move to Arizona. Additionally, both Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100 contained question 10A asking, "Have you ever been fired from a job?" On both applications, "No" was checked in response to question 10A. Both CMS-100s contained the following affirmation: "I certify that all the information on this application is true and accurate and understand that misrepresentation of any material fact may be grounds for ineligibility or termination of employment."

Additionally, an IDOC Applicant Information Sheet bearing Ms. Kidd's signature dated June 20, 2014, contained a question asking, "have you EVER been fired or terminated for cause from any employment?" "NO" was checked in response to the question. On the same Applicant sheet it stated that Ms. Kidd resigned from [Company 1] to go with her family to Arizona. [Redacted].

5. Interview of IDOC Human Resources Representative [IDOC Employee 2] Regarding Ms. Kidd's Entrance Base Salary Decision in 2014

During his interview with investigators, [IDOC Employee 2] reviewed the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 shown to him by investigators stating that Ms. Kidd worked 32 hours per week for Temporary Hygiene Agency and made \$1,024 per week. [IDOC Employee 2] stated that if Ms. Kidd had submitted paystubs verifying a \$4,000 per month income at the time of her hire, he would not have hired her at the lowest salary step of 1C. [IDOC Employee 2] stated that Ms. Kidd's reported \$1,000 weekly income would have, according to the CMS Alphabetical Index of Position Titles, made Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary a level 7 or 8 on the CMS Pay Plan. [IDOC Employee 2] reiterated that if he saw Ms. Kidd's paystubs evidencing the reported \$1,000 weekly income, he should have hired her with a higher starting salary, but stated that based on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 and Ms. Kidd's CMS-2 he is unsure whether he ever received her paystubs.

[IDOC Employee 2] said if he made a mistake in 2014 calculating Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary, it still would have gone through [IDOC Employee 3] and she "probably would have caught it" because she had been at Graham Correctional Center for a while. Further, [IDOC Employee 2] said Ms. Kidd's salary inquiry is the first time his work has been challenged. [IDOC Employee 2] said he would assume whoever corrected Ms. Kidd's starting salary would have obtained her paystubs or some proof of her previous higher salary.

6. Interview of IDOC Transaction Manager [IDOC Employee 1] Regarding her Decision to Adjust Ms. Kidd's Salary

In her interview, [IDOC Employee 1] reported that she knows Ms. Kidd because Ms. Kidd works in the hiring unit and reports to the hiring manager, whom [IDOC Employee 1] previously supervised. [IDOC Employee 1] said that she and Ms. Kidd also have shared acquaintances, so may occasionally be at the same social setting outside of work.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated that in her previous role as Deputy Director of HR, she supervised the IDOC hiring manager and reviewed staff's work to make sure it was done appropriately, which included reviewing entrance base salary calculations completed by lower-level HR employees. During her interview with investigators, [IDOC Employee 1] opined that an error in the calculation of an entrance base salary from 2014 was not unusual. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that if an error is brought to her attention she is going to fix it if they had the documentation, even if the error was made 20 years ago. [IDOC Employee 1] said that Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment required CMS approval, but that the larger amount of the adjustment would not require more scrutiny.

[IDOC Employee 1] reported that when Ms. Kidd brought the alleged error to her attention, they did not discuss Ms. Kidd's previous employer. Rather, [IDOC Employee 1] said she simply pulled Ms. Kidd's IDOC personnel file to obtain her CMS-100. [IDOC Employee 1] initially said that before processing Ms. Kidd's upward salary adjustment, she may have also pulled Ms. Kidd's IDOC hiring file to see if there were notes in that file that may explain the error in the calculation of her entrance base salary. However, [IDOC Employee 1] later stated she must not have pulled Ms. Kidd's IDOC hiring file. [IDOC Employee 1] said that she did not see any paystubs that verified the information she relied on in Ms. Kidd's IDOC 2014 CMS-100.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated that she based Ms. Kidd's salary correction solely on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 she referenced from Ms. Kidd's IDOC personnel file. [IDOC Employee 1] said that the CMS Pay Plan states that a salary adjustment requires supporting documentation, but, in her opinion, the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 was that supporting document. [IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that agencies are required by CMS to verify the information contained in CMS-100s, but stated she did not have any reason to believe the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 she referenced was not verified at the time of Ms. Kidd's hiring, even though Ms. Kidd was claiming an error.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated that she did not know that at the time of her initial hire, Ms. Kidd did not authorize a reference check for Temporary Hygiene Agency or submit paystubs from her current or last employer. Similarly, [IDOC Employee 1] stated she had never seen the Graham CMS-100 version of Ms. Kidd's CMS-100 that stated Ms. Kidd worked at Temporary Hygiene Agency 16 hours per week, but did not list any salary information.

After reviewing emails between [IDOC Employee 2] and [IDOC Employee 3] from the time Ms. Kidd was initially hired in 2014, [IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that in calculating Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary, it appeared they used the Graham CMS-100 that showed Ms. Kidd worked at Temporary Hygiene Agency 16 hours per week, but did not list any salary information. [IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that version of Ms. Kidd's June 5, 2014 CMS-100 was hugely different from the version she referenced in making Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment, but stated she could not explain the changes to the document. [IDOC Employee 1] noted that other changes on Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100 were initialed and dated, but conceded that the changes to the salary and hour information for Temporary Hygiene Agency were not initialed or dated. Thus, [IDOC Employee 1] stated she could not say who made the changes or when the changes were made, which she said was problematic. [IDOC Employee 1] explained that the IDOC personnel files are kept in paper form and there is no way to know who puts in or

removes documents from the files. However, [IDOC Employee 1] said that if there is an error on a CMS-100, typically both the incorrect and corrected versions would go in the file.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated that she assumed that [IDOC Employee 2] and [IDOC Employee 3] referenced the same CMS-100 she saw and simply made an error in calculating Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary. However, [IDOC Employee 1] admitted that she did not speak with [IDOC Employee 2] or [IDOC Employee 3] before processing Ms. Kidd's upward salary adjustment based on their alleged error.

[IDOC Employee 1] explained that while IDOC institutions maintain personnel files for each employee, both an employee's IDOC personnel file and IDOC hiring file are kept in the administrative building at the office in Springfield where she and Ms. Kidd work.²⁶ [IDOC Employee 1] reported that, although the administrative building is kept locked, hiring, transactions, and occasionally benefits or payroll staff – including Ms. Kidd - have access to the files.

IV. ANALYSIS

A. Ms. Kidd Defrauded IDOC To Obtain An Improper Salary Adjustment And Back Wages

This investigation revealed that Ms. Kidd defrauded IDOC by intentionally lying about her employment and income information to obtain an upward salary adjustment and back wages, which she was not entitled to. Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 dated June 5, 2014, showed that she worked at Temporary Hygiene Agency 16 hours per week before entering State service, but did not list any salary information. The Graham CMS-100 matched exactly the CMS-100 attached to emails between HR Representatives at IDOC in June 2014 regarding Ms. Kidd's hire into the Office Associate position and thus, appears to be the original unaltered CMS-100 that Ms. Kidd submitted to IDOC in 2014.

In December 2017, after working in an HR position for eleven months, Ms. Kidd requested an upward salary adjustment from [IDOC Employee 1]. According to [IDOC Employee 1], Ms. Kidd claimed she was entitled to an upward salary adjustment because her CMS-100 listed an approximately \$1,000 weekly salary that had been mistakenly calculated by the hiring unit as a monthly salary. Ms. Kidd made this request even though her initial Graham CMS-100 did not contain any salary information, and her personnel files did not contain *any* verification of her prior employment or salary at the Temporary Hygiene Agency. Ms. Kidd also did not provide [IDOC Employee 1] with any documents supporting her salary adjustment request. Interestingly, when [IDOC Employee 1] pulled Ms. Kidd's IDOC personnel file housed at the IDOC Central Office, the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 in the file matched the Graham CMS-100 except for the number of hours

²⁶ As discussed above, OEIG investigators obtained and reviewed Ms. Kidd's institution-specific personnel file – the Graham personnel file – and Ms. Kidd's IDOC personnel and IDOC hiring files from IDOC's Central Office in Springfield. However, while [IDOC Employee 2], [IDOC Employee 3], and [IDOC Employee 1] agreed that paystubs and initial hiring documents are generally kept in the IDOC hiring file located in IDOC's Central Office administrative building where Ms. Kidd works, that file contained no documents related to Ms. Kidd's initial hire in 2014 into the Office Associate position in IDOC. Instead, only the file that Ms. Kidd did not have access to as an HR Representative at IDOC's Central Office – her Graham personnel file – contained the original documents related to Ms. Kidd's initial hire in 2014 into the Office Associate position in IDOC.

and amount of pay Ms. Kidd allegedly received from Temporary Hygiene Agency. Due to Ms. Kidd's position, she had access to these personnel files, and the changes on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 just happened to line up with the story Ms. Kidd told [IDOC Employee 1]. With the change of salary on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 to \$1,024/weekly, Ms. Kidd's assertion that there had been a previous error by calculating her entrance base salary based on \$1,024 per month seemed plausible.

Ms. Kidd needed [IDOC Employee 1] to believe her story about the \$1,024 weekly/monthly mistake because she knew that the original Graham CMS-100, if reviewed, would cause questions since the salary was left blank and the number of hours per week was different. Any further inquiry would have shown that the income and employment information provided in both Ms. Kidd's Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100 was false, as Ms. Kidd was actually [redacted]. The OEIG made an exhaustive search and found no Temporary Hygiene Agency at the address listed on the CMS-100s. In addition, Ms. Kidd provided no signed employment verification form to IDOC. [Redacted]. It is no wonder that in her emails from early 2018, when discussing the pending salary adjustment with another IDOC employee, Ms. Kidd asked the other employee to "*not tell anyone*" about the salary adjustment request. And then, when she learned that the request was approved, Ms. Kidd stated to at least two separate individuals that she felt like she had "hit the LOTTO!!!"

This investigation revealed that Ms. Kidd's prior employment and income information was misrepresented on forms bearing her signature and repeated to [IDOC Employee 1]. The OEIG finds that Ms. Kidd made these misrepresentations to [IDOC Employee 1] with the intent of obtaining an upward salary adjustment and resulting back wages for which she was not entitled. IDOC and CMS relied on those misrepresentations when approving Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment and back wage claim. The State has suffered a loss to date of more than \$75,927²⁷ as a result of Ms. Kidd's misrepresentations, and this loss continues to grow as Ms. Kidd is still employed at an improperly higher salary at IDOC. Thus, the allegation that Ms. Kidd defrauded IDOC in order to obtain an improper salary adjustment and back wages is [REDACTED].²⁸

B. Ms. Kidd Submitted False Employment Information To IDOC

Ms. Kidd's numerous misrepresentations also violated IDOC policy. IDOC Administrative Directive 03.02.108(II)(G)(8) states that "[a]ny employee who knowingly provides false information, including, but not limited to, false information provided in statements, incident reports, correspondence or an interview shall be subject to disciplinary action, including discharge." Further, each CMS-100 contains the following affirmation: "I certify that all the information on this application is true and accurate and understand that misrepresentation of any material fact may be grounds for ineligibility or termination of employment."

²⁷ This figure was arrived at by adding Ms. Kidd's \$40,038.27 gross back wage claim, the \$24,688.81 in additional contribution made by the State to her retirement, Medicare, and Social Security, and the additional \$11,200 in salary that Ms. Kidd has received at the time this report was issued since her adjustment occurred in April 2018. This figure does not account for the additional \$800 per month in salary that Ms. Kidd continues to collect moving forward as a result of her salary adjustment.

²⁸ The OEIG concludes that an allegation is "[redacted]" when it has determined that there is reasonable cause to believe that a violation of law or policy has occurred, or that there has been fraud, waste, mismanagement, misconduct, nonfeasance, misfeasance, or malfeasance.

As discussed above, this investigation revealed that two CMS-100s dated June 5, 2014 were submitted to IDOC bearing Ms. Kidd's signature – the Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100. Both versions of the CMS-100 stated that Ms. Kidd was employed by Temporary Hygiene Agency from August 2012 to April 2014. The evidence shows that none of that employment information was true. OEIG investigators discovered that Temporary Hygiene Agency does not exist. Searches on various resources produced no relevant results for a company with that name. Similarly, searches for the address or telephone number associated with a business by that name produced no results. In fact, the only business investigators discovered with information similar to that provided by Ms. Kidd for Temporary Hygiene Agency, was dissolved in 2009, three years before Ms. Kidd supposedly worked there.

Ms. Kidd also misrepresented her income information on the Graham CMS-100 and IDOC 2014 CMS-100. The Graham CMS-100 and emails from 2014 show that Ms. Kidd represented that she worked for Temporary Hygiene Agency 8-16 hours per week earning \$26-28 per hour and the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 shows that Ms. Kidd worked 32 hours per week at Temporary Hygiene Agency earning \$1,024 weekly. Again, the evidence shows that none of that income information provided by Ms. Kidd was true. Instead, Ms. Kidd [redacted]. Ms. Kidd herself reported [redacted]. [Redacted]. Additionally, on both versions of Ms. Kidd's 2014 CMS-100, she checked "No" in response to the question asking whether she had ever been fired from a job and indicated that she left her employment at [Company 1] in August 2012 to temporarily move to Arizona. Both versions of Ms. Kidd's 2014 CMS-100 contain a signature in her name, which [IDOC Employee 1] identified as Ms. Kidd's signature during her interview with investigators. By signing the CMS-100s, Ms. Kidd certified that the information she provided on the applications was true, and acknowledged that misrepresentation of any material fact could be grounds for termination of employment.

In addition to the false statements on the CMS-100s submitted by Ms. Kidd, she also falsified the IDOC Applicant Information Sheet. This form bore Ms. Kidd's signature dated June 20, 2014, and also contains a question asking, "have you EVER been fired or terminated for cause from any employment?" "NO" was checked in response to the question. On the same Applicant form it stated that Ms. Kidd resigned from [Company 1] to go with her family to Arizona. However, the evidence shows that her response to the termination questions were false. [Redacted].

Thus, the OEIG concludes that Ms. Kidd provided false income and employment information on her CMS-100s and provided false information on employment forms regarding previous [redacted]. Therefore, the allegation that Ms. Kidd violated IDOC Administrative Directive 03.02.108, is [REDACTED].

C. [IDOC Employee 1] Mismanaged Stacey Kidd's Salary Adjustment

This investigation also revealed that [IDOC Employee 1] mismanaged Ms. Kidd's upward salary adjustment based on her failure to take reasonable steps to verify Ms. Kidd's assertions of an error in the calculation of her entrance base salary. At the time Ms. Kidd requested the salary adjustment going back four years, [IDOC Employee 1] was a high-level HR employee who had

served in an HR-related position with the State for at least 30 years. [IDOC Employee 1] stated she was aware of the proper CMS and IDOC process for determining whether such an adjustment was warranted. Furthermore, [IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that she makes these salary adjustments on her own accord. She stated that she may seek informal verbal approval from the IDOC Personnel Manager, but that she had signature authority of the then-Acting IDOC Director for these type of transaction. Thus, before determining that an error in the calculation of Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary occurred, especially considering that this request involved four years of back pay, [IDOC Employee 1] should have made some effort to ensure the information upon which she relied was accurate.

In determining that an error in the calculation of Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary occurred, [IDOC Employee 1] stated she did not discuss Ms. Kidd's previous employment with her, nor did she discuss the possibility of an error with the original IDOC employees who calculated Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary, one of which works in [IDOC Employee 1]'s office. [IDOC Employee 1] instead relied solely on Ms. Kidd's supposed CMS-100, the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 version, an application submitted by Ms. Kidd, located in Ms. Kidd's IDOC personnel file. Because the information on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 was consistent with Ms. Kidd's assertion of error, [IDOC Employee 1] made the changes to Ms. Kidd's salary. However, had [IDOC Employee 1] taken any reasonable step to determine whether an error actually occurred, Ms. Kidd's misrepresentations were easily discoverable.

[IDOC Employee 1] acknowledged that CMS requires agencies to verify the information provided by applicants on their CMS-100s and that IDOC does so by checking recent paystubs. Even knowing this, and knowing that employee hiring files are maintained in her building as she said in her interview, [IDOC Employee 1] admitted she did not pull Ms. Kidd's IDOC hiring file or look elsewhere to verify the information she relied on in Ms. Kidd's IDOC 2014 CMS-100. [IDOC Employee 1] stated that she assumed that at the time of Ms. Kidd's hire, [IDOC Employee 2] and [IDOC Employee 3] referenced the same IDOC 2014 CMS-100 she saw and simply made an error in calculating Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary. Although she supervised the hiring unit at the time she processed Ms. Kidd's salary adjustment and worked in the same building as [IDOC Employee 2], [IDOC Employee 1] also admitted that she did not speak with either [IDOC Employee 2] or [IDOC Employee 3] before processing Ms. Kidd's upward salary adjustment based on their alleged error. Had [IDOC Employee 1] completed any of these steps, she likely would have discovered that there had been no error in the calculation of Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary.

[IDOC Employee 1] stated she did not have any reason to believe the information on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 she referenced was not verified at the time of Ms. Kidd's hiring. This is a problematic statement for two reasons. First, [IDOC Employee 1] admitted that she assumed [IDOC Employee 2] or [IDOC Employee 3] made a calculation error by believing the listed salary was a monthly wage instead of a weekly. If she believed they incorrectly read the CMS-100, this would likely cause someone to consider whether the hire was handled correctly including verifying the prior employment information. Second, if paystubs were obtained as they should have been, [IDOC Employee 1] would have to believe that [IDOC Employee 2] and [IDOC Employee 3] both misinterpreted those paystubs, as well as, the CMS-100 when determining Ms. Kidd's entrance base salary. Either of these reasons should have given [IDOC Employee 1] a basis to question whether a proper salary verification had been conducted at the time of Ms. Kidd's hire.

Furthermore and, most importantly, [IDOC Employee 1] had every reason to believe that the salary information listed on the IDOC 2014 CMS-100 had not been verified. [IDOC Employee 1] in her position is aware that when a wage verification does not support a salary listed in the CMS-100, an applicant is started at the lowest entrance base salary, which is exactly what happened to Ms. Kidd. Instead, [IDOC Employee 1] assumed, for some reason, that a wage verification was done that supported the higher salary, and two IDOC employees made a mistake. This additional assumption is perplexing given [IDOC Employee 1]’s experience. It completely overlooked the other obvious reason for the lower salary Ms. Kidd received at the time of her hire – that the wage verification did not show support for a higher salary. Because [IDOC Employee 1] is aware of this process and the reason for wage verifications, she should have, at least, inquired of the other employees involved or checked for the wage verification documentation that should be maintained in the personnel files, especially considering that [IDOC Employee 1] has signatory authority to make salary adjustments with only minimal review or oversight.

Given [IDOC Employee 1]’s authority to make these determinations, her experience and knowledge of this process, the four-year period of this particular salary adjustment which compounded the amount, and the availability of information [IDOC Employee 1] could have reviewed or inquired about, it is reasonable to expect some additional action to be taken before approving such a significant adjustment. Therefore, the allegation that [IDOC Employee 1] mismanaged Ms. Kidd’s salary adjustment by failing to take reasonable steps to ensure that the information she relied upon in processing Ms. Kidd’s salary adjustment was accurate and supported a salary adjustment, is [REDACTED].

V. [REDACTED] AND RECOMMENDATIONS

As a result of its investigation, the OEIG concludes that there is **REASONABLE CAUSE TO ISSUE THE FOLLOWING [REDACTED]:**

- [REDACTED] – IDOC Human Resources Representative Stacey Kidd defrauded IDOC in order to obtain an improper salary adjustment and back wages.
- [REDACTED] – IDOC Human Resources Representative Stacey Kidd falsified her IDOC employment applications by providing false income and employment information.
- [REDACTED] – IDOC Human Resources Representative Stacey Kidd falsified her IDOC employment applications by providing false information regarding a prior employment [redacted].
- [REDACTED] – Public Safety Shared Services Center Transaction Manager [IDOC Employee 1] mismanaged Ms. Kidd’s salary adjustment by failing to take reasonable steps to ensure that the information she relied upon was accurate and supported a salary adjustment.

Based on these [redacted], the OEIG recommends that IDOC terminate Ms. Kidd and that she not be rehired into State employment. The OEIG also recommends that IDOC take whatever action it deems appropriate with regard to [IDOC Employee 1], and consider:

- reviewing these hiring procedures with HR employees to ensure that they are properly trained on the CMS Pay Plan and related rules; and
- implementing a process for these types of salary adjustments or a threshold amount that would require additional review.

No further action is necessary and this matter is considered closed.

Date: **August 13, 2019**

Office of Executive Inspector General
for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor
69 West Washington Street, Ste. 3400
Chicago, IL 60602

By: **Kelly Fasbinder, # 146**
Assistant Inspector General

Catherine Wasylenko, # 113
Investigator



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

**AGENCY OR ULTIMATE JURISDICTIONAL AUTHORITY
RESPONSE FORM**

Case Number: 19-00042

Return 20 Days After Receipt

Please check the box that applies. (Please attach additional materials, as necessary.)

☐ We have implemented all of the OEIG recommendations. Please provide details as to actions taken:

☒ We will implement some or all of the OEIG recommendations but will require additional time to do so.
We will report to OEIG within 90 days from the original return date.

☐ We do not wish to implement some or all of the OEIG recommendations. Please provide details as to what actions were taken, if any, in response to OEIG recommendations:

Signature

Amanda Page
Print Name

Print Agency and Job Title

IDOC, Deputy Director HR

Date

9/3/19



The Illinois Department of Corrections

1301 Concordia Court • P.O. Box 19277 • Springfield, IL 62794-9277 • (217) 558-2200 TDD: (800) 526-0844

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 9, 2019

TO: Office of Executive Inspector General

FROM: Mandy Page
Acting Deputy Director, HR

SUBJECT: OEIG Case No. 19-00042

The Department of Corrections has implemented discipline on two employees for Case Number 19-00042.

IDOC Employee 1 was given an oral reprimand for not checking the application in question.

Stacey Kidd was placed on Administrative Leave of Absence effective October 4, 2019. She subsequently had an Employee Review Board Hearing on November 7, 2019. Hearing Officer Crow recommended Discharge and she will be placed on Suspension Pending Discharge effective December 16, 2019.



The Illinois Department of Corrections

1301 Concordia Court • P.O. Box 19277 • Springfield, IL 62794-9277 • (217) 558-2200 TDD: (800) 526-0844

MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 9, 2020
TO: Office of Executive Inspector General
FROM: Mandy Page
Acting Deputy Director, HR
SUBJECT: UPDATED: OEIG Case No. 19-00042

The Department of Corrections has implemented discipline on two employees for Case Number 19-00042.

[IDOC Employee 1] was given an oral reprimand for not checking the application in question.

Stacey Kidd was placed on Administrative Leave of Absence effective October 4, 2019. She subsequently had an Employee Review Board Hearing on November 7, 2019. Hearing Officer Crow recommended Discharge and she will be placed on Suspension Pending Discharge effective December 16, 2019.

Update:

Stacey Kidd was approved by CMS to discharge effective 1/2/20.

PRINTED

01

ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CENTRAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES
PERSONNEL/POSITION ACTION FORM

SS#: [REDACTED]

EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

| 03 | | | 04 | | 05 | 06 | 07 | 7A | 08 | | |
|-----------|--|--|------------|--|------|-----|------|-----|------|----------|---------------|
| LAST NAME | | | FIRST NAME | | INIT | SEX | RACE | VET | EDUC | TIER 1/2 | DATE OF BIRTH |
| KIDD | | | STACEY | | L | F | | | | | |
| KIDD | | | STACEY | | L | F | | | | | |

| 09 | | | | 10 | | 11 | 12 | 13 | 13A | |
|----------------|--|--|--|------------|--|--------|-------|----------|-----------|--|
| STREET ADDRESS | | | | CITY | | COUNTY | STATE | ZIP CODE | NATL ORIG | |
| [REDACTED] | | | | [REDACTED] | | | IL | | | |
| [REDACTED] | | | | [REDACTED] | | | IL | | | |

| 14 | 15 | 16 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 20 | 21 | 22 | | 22A | 22B |
|----------|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------------|----------------------|------------|
| PAY PLAN | PAY GRADE | PAY STEP | SALARY | PAY RATE | FULL/TIME | FUNDING BRD. COM | PAYROLL DEPT | CODE APPROP. | CORRECTED SOCIAL SECURITY NO. | BARGAINING UNIT CODE | PERF. CODE |
| | | | | 00 | F | | | | | | |
| | | | | 00 | F | | | | | | |

| 23 | | 24 | | 25 | | 26 | | 27 | | 28 | | 29 | | 29A |
|-------------------------|--|----------------|--|-------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|--------|--|----------------------------|--|----------------|--|------------|
| CONTINUOUS SERVICE DATE | | SENIORITY DATE | | CREDITABLE SERVICE DATE | | APPT. EXPIRATION DATE | | STATUS | | SUSPENSION/LOA RETURN DATE | | APPT. REQ. NO. | | DISABILITY |
| 07/16/14 | | 07/16/14 | | 02/01/09 | | | | A | | | | | | |
| 07/16/14 | | 07/16/14 | | 02/01/09 | | | | A | | | | | | |

POSITION INFORMATION

| 30 | | 31 | | 32 | 33 | 34 | 35 | 36 |
|----------------------------------|--|-----------------------|--|-----------|-------------|----------|-------|--------------|
| POSITION TITLE (NAME) and OPTION | | POSITION NUMBER | | EXMT CODE | WORK COUNTY | A/I AUTH | AUDIT | POS DES COMP |
| HUMAN RESOURCES REPRESENTATIVE | | 19692-29-40-222-11-01 | | 0 | 084 | | | |
| HUMAN RESOURCES REPRESENTATIVE | | 19692-29-40-222-11-01 | | | 084 | | | |

TRANSACTION INFORMATION

| 37 | | 38 | 39 | 40 |
|-----------------------|--|------------|----------------|------------|
| TRANSACTION NAME | | TRANS CODE | EFFECTIVE DATE | PRIOR -ITY |
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |
| 1 DISCHARGE FOR CAUSE | | BA122 | 1/2/20 | |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | | | | |

| CODES | |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| STATUS | EXEMPT |
| A-CERTIFIED | 0-NOT EXEMPT |
| B-PROBATIONARY 4 MOS | 1-PRIVATE SEC & CONF ASSTNT |
| C-PROBATIONARY 6 MOS | 2-ADMINISTRATIVE HEAD |
| D-PROVISIONAL | 3-POLICY MAKER |
| E-3 MONTHS CERTIFICATION | 4-PREVAILING RATE/TRADE |
| F-EXEMPT | 5-LICENSED PROFESSIONAL |
| G-TEMPORARY | 6-OUT OF STATE |
| H-EMERGENCY | 7-TECH ADVSR WC COMM |
| I-8 MONTHS CERTIFICATION | 8-PARTIAL EXTENSION |
| J-TRAINEE (OC LIST) | 9-PARTIAL EXMPT BY STATUTE |
| K-TRAINEE (TRAINEE PERMIT) | |
| L-TRAINEE (AGENCY SELECTED) | |
| M-9 MONTHS CERTIFICATION | |
| N-12 MONTHS CERTIFICATION | |
| O-137 DAYS | |
| P-18 MONTHS (UMP) | |
| Q-INTERIM ASSIGNMENT | |

TRANSACTIONS

REMARKS

See attached statement of charges (TAS)
-EHR: 11/7/19

DEC 19 2019

RECEIVED

DEC 19 2019

EMPLOYEE SIGNATURE (REQUIRED ON VOLUNTARY ACTION)

DATE

AGENCY APPROVAL (OPTIONAL)

DATE

SIGNATURE OF PERSON SERVING SUS/DISC

DATE

AGENCY BUDGETARY (OPTIONAL)

DATE

BY MAIL ☐ IN PERSON ☐

DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL MANAGEMENT SERVICES

DATE

AGENCY HEAD APPROVAL

DATE

12/30/19

12/6/19

Employee : Stacey Kidd
XXX-XX [REDACTED]
Transaction : Discharge for Cause
Effective Date : January 2, 2020

In accordance with Personnel Rule 302.700, Discharge for Cause, Stacey Kidd, employed by the Illinois Department of Corrections at Concordia Court, in the position of Human Resources Representative, is being discharged effective January 2, 2020. The discharge is being imposed for the following:

1. On or about December 17, 2018 an OEIG case was opened and investigated in regard to Stacey Kidd defrauding IDOC in order to obtain an improper salary adjustment and back wages for herself. As a result of this investigation, it was [REDACTED] and substantiated that HR Rep Stacey Kidd defrauded IDOC in order to obtain an improper salary adjustment and back wages, falsified her IDOC employment applications by providing false income and employment information, and falsified her IDOC applications by providing false information regarding a prior employment termination.

As outlined in the Employee Review Hearing conducted November 7, 2019, this is in violation of:

D. R. 120 Rules of Conduct
A. D. 03.02.108 Standards of Conduct

A review of Stacey Kidd's personnel file reveals the following discipline history:

| Date | Disposition | Violation |
|------|-------------|-----------|
| NONE | | |

Stacey Kidd was placed on Suspension Pending Discharge effective December 16, 2019.

Due to the severity of the actions of Stacey Kidd, she has compromised her position of trust and her actions are considered unprofessional and unbecoming. Ms. Kidd's blatant violation of this Agency's Standards of Conduct, including the seriousness and nature of the infraction warrant harsher penalties. For these reasons, Stacey Kidd is recommended for immediate discharge from the Illinois Department of Corrections.

[REDACTED] [REDACTED] 12/30/19

From: [Myers, Barbara](#)
To: [Stratton, Haley D.](#); [Long, Kayley](#)
Subject: FW: EEC Letter re: 19-00042
Date: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 4:17:26 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

From: Opperman, Fallon <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 2:34 PM
To: Myers, Barbara <[REDACTED]@illinois.gov>
Subject: FW: EEC Letter re: 19-00042

Hi Barbara,

Please see DOC's response re the Kidd matter.

Thanks
Fallon

From: Krigel, Jason <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, October 21, 2025 1:48 PM
To: Opperman, Fallon <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Subject: RE: EEC Letter re: 19-00042

Hi Fallon,

Our Labor unit is not aware of any other on-going challenge to this termination. IDOC considers it final. Let me know if you need anything else.

Best,
Jason

Jason Krigel
Chief Public Safety Legal Counsel & Ethics Officer
Illinois Department of Corrections
555 W. Monroe Street, 6th Floor
Chicago, Illinois 60661
Cell: [REDACTED]

From: Opperman, Fallon <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:13 PM
To: Krigel, Jason <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>

Subject: RE: EEC Letter re: 19-00042

Thank you. I appreciate it.

From: Krigel, Jason <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:12 PM
To: Opperman, Fallon <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Subject: RE: EEC Letter re: 19-00042

Hi Fallon,

Let me check with our Labor unit. I don't think I'm familiar with this matter.

Best,
Jason

From: Opperman, Fallon <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 3:03 PM
To: Krigel, Jason <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Subject: FW: EEC Letter re: 19-00042

Hi Jason,

I hope you're doing well.

The EEC is asking us to confirm whether you consider Kidd's termination to be final now, based on these recent motions? Or is there any other information you would have about this matter?

Thanks,
Fallon

From: Myers, Barbara <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 20, 2025 2:20 PM
To: Opperman, Fallon <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Cc: Stratton, Haley D. <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>; Long, Kayley <[REDACTED]@Illinois.gov>
Subject: EEC Letter re: 19-00042

Hi Fallon:

A letter regarding OEIG Summary Report no. 19-00042 is attached. Thank you.

Barbara



State of Illinois - CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The information contained in this communication is confidential, may be attorney-client privileged or attorney work product, may constitute inside information or internal deliberative staff communication, and is intended only for the use of the addressee. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately by return e-mail and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments. Receipt by an unintended recipient does not waive attorney-client privilege, attorney work product privilege, or any other exemption from disclosure.



October 20, 2025

Susan Haling, Executive Inspector General
c/o Fallon Opperman, Deputy Executive Inspector General
Office of Executive Inspector General
for the Agencies of the Illinois Governor
69 W. Washington St., Ste. 3400
Chicago, IL 60602

VIA EMAIL to [REDACTED]@Illinois.gov

Re: OEIG Summary Report No. 19-00042, *Kidd and* [REDACTED] [IDOC Employee 1]

Dear EIG Haling:

On June 29, 2021, we received a letter from your office notifying us that Stacey Kidd, one of the subjects in the above-referenced summary report, filed a complaint for administrative review of the Civil Service Commission's decision to terminate her (Sangamon County Case No. 2021-MR-000696). It appears from the Circuit Court docket that Ms. Kidd's case was dismissed on October 14, 2025. A copy of the docket is attached. Would your office please confirm that Ms. Kidd's termination is final so the Commission can execute its publication process under Section 20-52 of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act? Please let me know if you have any questions. Thank you.

Sincerely,

[REDACTED]

Barbara K. Myers
General Counsel
Illinois Executive Ethics Commission
[REDACTED]@illinois.gov
[REDACTED]

Attachment

COURT DOCKET - SANGAMON COUNTY CIRCUIT CLERK
Case: 2021MR000696 KIDD STACEY vs ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF
Type: Review of Administrative Pr Judge: NOLL GAIL Jury Trial:
From: 00/00/0000 To: 99/99/9999 All Case Entries First Date First View
Filed: 5/26/2021 Status: Cause Stricken on 10/14/2025

PAGE: 1
DATE: 2025-12-08
TIME: 10.43.58

| | CASE PARTICIPANTS NAMES | ATTORNEYS |
|-----|------------------------------------|----------------|
| | ----- | ----- |
| Pla | KIDD STACEY | DRAPER CARL R |
| Def | ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS | EWICK THOMAS R |
| Def | ILLINOIS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION | ROBERTS TYLER |
| Def | SICKMEYER TIMOTHY D | ROBERTS TYLER |
| Def | FINCH G.A. | ROBERTS TYLER |
| Def | LUECHTEFELD DAVID | ROBERTS TYLER |
| Def | ROBINSON VIVIAN | ROBERTS TYLER |
| Def | SMITH TERESA C | ROBERTS TYLER |

DATE

05/26/2021 Complaint for Administrative Review Filed Plaintiff KIDD STACEY
Atty DRAPER CARL R

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/26/2021 Review of Administrative Proceedings Fee \$327.00
Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/27/2021 Certified/Registered Mail Fee \$10.00 Plaintiff KIDD STACEY

05/28/2021 Certificate of Mailing
all summons cert. mailed
Document COM Not Printed

05/28/2021 Certified Mail Receipt-Commissioner David Luechtefeld
7020-2450-0000-1080-8069

05/28/2021 Certified Mail Receipt-Illinois Department of Corrections
7020-2450-0000-1080-8113

05/28/2021 Certified Mail Receipt-Commissioner Teresa C Smith
7020-2450-0000-1080-8076

05/28/2021 Certified Mail Receipt-Commissioner Timothy D Sickmeyer
7020-2450-0000-1080-8106

05/28/2021 Certified Mail Receipt-Commissioner Vivian Robinson

05/28/2021 Certified Mail Receipt-0Commissioner G.A. Finch
7020-2450-0000-1080-8090

06/08/2021 Domestic Return Receipt-Il Depart of Corrections XXXX-2450-0000-
1080-8113

06/10/2021 Entry of Appearance Filed by
Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT Atty ROBERTS TYLER

06/10/2021 Appearance Fee Waived Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT
Atty ROBERTS TYLER

06/11/2021 Domestic Return Receipt-Commissioner Vivian Robinson 7020-2450-
0000-1080-8083

06/11/2021 Domestic Return Receipt-Commissioner Timothy D Sickmeyer 7020-2450-
0000-1080-8106

06/11/2021 Domestic Return Receipt-Commissioner David Luechtefeld 7020-2450-0000
1080-8069

06/11/2021 Domestic Return Receipt-Commissioner G A Finch 7020-2450-0000-
1080-8090

06/11/2021 Domestic Return Receipt-Commissioner Teresa C Smith 7020-2450-
0000-1080-8076

06/17/2021 Motion for Extension of Time Motion Filed by
Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT Atty ROBERTS TYLER

07/13/2021 Entry of Appearance Filed by
Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT Atty EWICK THOMAS R

COURT DOCKET - SANGAMON COUNTY CIRCUIT CLERK
Case: 2021MR000696 KIDD STACEY vs ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF
Type: Review of Administrative Pr Judge: NOLL GAIL Jury Trial:
From: 00/00/0000 To: 99/99/9999 All Case Entries First Date First View
Filed: 5/26/2021 Status: Cause Stricken on 10/14/2025

PAGE: 2
DATE: 2025-12-08
TIME: 10.43.58

DATE

07/29/2021 Notice of Filing of Answer Filed
Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT Atty EWICK THOMAS R
07/29/2021 Record - Part III Administrative Record Filed
Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT Atty EWICK THOMAS R
07/29/2021 Record - Part III of Administrative Record Filed by
Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT Atty EWICK THOMAS R
05/16/2022 Entry of Appearance Filed by
Defendant ILLINOIS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISS Atty GALLANT-JONES SANDRA
05/16/2022 Appearance Fee Waived Defendant ILLINOIS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISS
Atty GALLANT-JONES SANDRA
09/11/2023 Entry of Appearance Filed by
Defendant ILLINOIS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISS Atty COFFY DOWIN
09/11/2023 Motion for Substitution of Counsel Filed
Defendant ILLINOIS CIVIL SERVICE COMMISS Atty COFFY DOWIN
06/18/2025 Motion to Dismiss Filed by Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT
Atty BECKNER DEANNA
09/25/2025 Notice of Hearing Filed by Defendant ILLINOIS DEPARTMENT OF CORRECT
Atty BECKNER DEANNA
Motion To Dismiss Oct 14,2025 11:30AM Rm6D Judge NOLL
10/14/2025 Entry Motion Hearing
Cause comes before the Court for motion hearing. Plaintiff present by
Attorney Carl Draper. Present the State by AAG Deanna Beckner.
Argument heard. Defendant's Motion to Dismiss for Want of Prosecution
is ALLOWED. Case DISMISSED and CLOSED.
Judge:NOLL GAIL M
10/14/2025 Cause Stricken
Status:Cause Stricken Report:Terminated Oct 14,2025