

Hiring & Employment Monitoring Report

First Quarter 2026



2026 HEM Initiative

HEM Roundtable Discussions Beginning Soon

OEIG Hiring & Employment Monitoring (HEM) Division staff will be initiating in-person meetings with agencies to provide insight into HEM's work, why it is necessary, and how we can better assist agencies in their hiring. Our work has evolved significantly since the HEM Division was established in 2016, and we are eager to share our focus and objectives with agency Human Resources (HR) staff. These Roundtable Discussions will also include an opportunity for agencies to provide important feedback on their hiring processes and compliance with the Comprehensive Employment Plan (CEP), which is under review and being updated. HR Directors are encouraged to include their team members who work on hiring in these meetings. For agencies with large HR hiring teams, HEM is willing to schedule multiple sessions.

HEM will be sending out invitations on a rolling basis, but if you are interested in getting your agency on the schedule, please contact HEM directly at OEIG.HEM@illinois.gov. Come join us and bring your questions – we look forward to meeting with you!

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

Susan M. Haling
Executive Inspector General

Neil P. Olson
General Counsel

Fallon Opperman
Deputy Inspector General &
Chief of Chicago Division

Erin K. Bonales
Director, Hiring & Employment
Monitoring Division

Christine Benavente
Deputy Inspector General –
Executive Projects

Angela Luning
Deputy Inspector General &
Chief of Springfield Division

Ogo Akpan
Chief Fiscal Officer & Chicago
Operations Manager

HEM Compliance Reviews

Between January 1 and March 31, 2026, HEM's work included the following.

Actions Taken During the First Quarter 2026	Count
Hiring-related reviews opened	29
Complaints referred to HEM	11
Hiring sequences monitored	1
Desk audits completed	14
Hiring reviews transferred to the OEIG Investigative Division	0
Hiring reviews administratively closed	4
Advisories issued	20

HEM Exempt List Reviews

The following chart represents the Exempt List reviews conducted this quarter.

HEM Exempt List Reviews	Count
Exempt appointment notifications/certifications received and reviewed this quarter for positions on the Exempt List	84 (No objections)
Exempt position description clarifications received this quarter	82 (No objections)
Exempt List addition requests received this quarter	10
Exempt List addition requests approved or not objected to this quarter	6
Exempt List addition requests objected to this quarter	1
Agency withdrawal of Exempt List requests this quarter	1
Exempt List deletion requests received this quarter	3
Exempt List deletion requests approved or not objected to this quarter	3
Exempt List modification requests received this quarter	0
Exempt List modification requests approved this quarter	0
Exempt List requests pending at the end of the quarter	3

Exempt List Determinations – First Quarter 2026

Agency/Entity	Working Title	OEIG Determination
Illinois Department of Early Childhood	Chief Transition Design Officer	Approved Deletion
Illinois Department of Early Childhood	Deputy Education Officer - Comprehensive Services	Approved Addition
Illinois Department of Early Childhood	Deputy Education Officer for Early Learning	Approved Addition
Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services	Pharmacy Policy Advisor	Withdrawn
Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services	Rural Health Transformation Program Director	Approved Addition
Illinois Department of Human Services	Chief Deputy General Counsel	Approved Addition
Illinois Department of Human Services	Chief Deputy General Counsel	Approved Addition
Illinois Department of Public Health	Division Chief of Rural Health	Approved Addition
Illinois Department of Public Health	Division Chief of Contact Tracing	Approved Deletion
Illinois State Police	Firearm Safety Counsel	Approved Deletion
Office of the Illinois State Fire Marshal	Fire Service Outreach Director	Objection

HEM Exempt PSC Reviews

The following chart represents the exempt personal services contract (PSC) reviews conducted by HEM this quarter pursuant to paragraph 68 of the Comprehensive Employment Plan (CEP).

HEM Exempt PSC Reviews	Count
Exempt PSCs received for review this quarter	0
Exempt PSCs approved or not objected to this quarter	0

Non-Exempt PSC Reporting

On February 23, 2026, the Illinois Department of Central Management Services Personnel Compliance Office (CMS Compliance) provided the State's PSC Report for the fourth quarter of calendar year 2025. The following table summarizes this information:

Data from the State's PSC Report – Fourth Quarter 2025	Count
State entities that submitted a PSC report to CMS	50
State entities that decreased their use of PSCs from the previous quarter	16
State entities that increased their number of PSCs	8
State entities that did not have a change in PSCs	26
State entities that reported not utilizing any PSCs	14

Political Contact Reporting

This quarter, HEM received a total of nine Political Contact reports. One report involved a description of prior work experience for a politician listed on an applicant's Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS) job application. A second report stated that an Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) employee received an email from a politician inviting people to work as a poll investigator for the upcoming election. A third report was made by IDOC regarding a politician who had reached out with concerns about the political contact reporting requirement. A fourth report noted that a Human Resources employee from the Illinois Senate contacted CMS regarding time balances for an employee transferring from that office to the agency. In these four instances, CMS Compliance responded that these did not meet the definition of a political contact, and nothing additional was needed.

The five remaining reports are summarized below. CMS Compliance agreed with all of the agency responses.

- In a report filed by the IDOT Director of Legislative Affairs, an Illinois State Senator called to ask about hiring practices at IDOT's Murphysboro Yard. The Senator alleged that veteran's preference was not being followed but did not mention any specific names. The IDOT Director of Legislative Affairs did not divulge any information, and CMS Compliance agreed with this response.
- In another report filed by the IDOT Director of Legislative Affairs, a staffer for an Illinois State Senator inquired on behalf of a constituent who claimed he had been wrongly terminated from IDOT. The IDOT Director of Legislative Affairs provided the staffer with contact information for IDOT's Personnel Office, and CMS Compliance agreed with this response.
- A third report filed by the IDOT Director of Legislative Affairs stated that a staffer for an Illinois State Representative reached out regarding a constituent's relative who was employed by IDOT and had been denied a transfer. The IDOT Director of Legislative Affairs provided the staffer with contact information for IDOT's Personnel Office, and CMS Compliance agreed with this response.
 - A separate report was filed by the IDOT Director of Highways Project Implementation who received this same request in-person from the Illinois State Representative. The IDOT Director reported that the State Representative had given her a printed copy of the constituent's email. HEM spoke with the IDOT Director who shared that while she had not followed up with the State Representative, she did discuss the transfer situation with the District Administrative Managers but did not tell them why she was asking. According to the IDOT Director, she had not yet done anything with the information they gave her. HEM asked her not to share it with the legislator and to direct the legislator to IDOT's Personnel Office if he contacted her again.
- A fifth report was filed by the IDHS Bureau Chief of Recruiting & Hiring who reported that a staffer for an Illinois State Representative had reached out for contact information, indicating that they were writing a recommendation letter for someone applying for an IDHS Public Service Administrator position; IDHS noted that neither the applicant's name nor other identifying information was included. IDHS responded to the staffer that the agency cannot consider any application materials that refer to political affiliation. CMS Compliance agreed with the response.

HEM Advisories

The following chart lists out the Advisories issued this quarter that resulted in HEM finding that the agency's selection for the position was merit-based and justifiable without any recommendations.

Advisories with No Recommendations – First Quarter 2026

Advisory	Agency	Position Title	Type of Review
25-HEM-0082	IDOR	Northern Field Services Manager	Desk Audit
25-HEM-0079	IEPA	Environmental Protection Geologist	Desk Audit
23-HEM-0016	IEMA - OHS	Favorite Staffing Contractors	Complaint Referral
25-HEM-0092	DCFS	Senior Advisor to the Director, Special Projects (Cook)	Desk Audit
25-HEM-0083	IDES	Assistant Regional Unemployment and Employment Manager (Kane)	Desk Audit
26-HEM-0001	DCEO	Assistant Deputy Director of the Office of Energy & Business Utility (Cook)	Desk Audit
25-HEM-0097	ILETSB	Assistant to the Associate Director of Information Services (Sangamon)	Desk Audit
25-HEM-0086	IDHS	Northern Deputy Chief Labor Relations Advisor	Desk Audit
25-HEM-0093	ILCC	Program Specialist	Desk Audit
25-HEM-0091	IDOI	Administrative Law Judge	Desk Audit

HEM Advisory Summaries

Advisories that included a HEM recommendation are summarized below. In those cases where HEM requested a formal response, the agency's response is also summarized.

Compliance with Anti-Nepotism Policies

25-HEM-0077

In response to a complaint referral alleging that an Illinois Department of Human Services (IDHS) employee (Employee A) intentionally skipped more senior employees in favor of her relative, Employee B, for a Security Therapy Aide IV temporary assignment, HEM reviewed Employee B's temporary assignment history. According to IDHS temporary assignment documentation, Employee A informed staff to skip employees who were early in a Security Therapy Aide II probationary status. HEM was unclear when this management decision was made for this temporary assignment and if the decision was specific to this assignment or a general rule to be followed in all temporary assignments. HEM requested a response on whether Employee A's involvement, if any, is compliant with its policies and directives and if not, what action IDHS intends to take to ensure that Employee A is not involved with personnel or employment decisions for Employee B.

In response, IDHS stated that bypassing an employee for a temporary assignment due to having only been in the position for two and a half weeks was appropriate and consistent with past practice. However, IDHS also stated that Employee A was involved in the temporary assignment of her relative, Employee B, and had not recused herself. IDHS Office of Human Resources (OHR) recommended the Division of Behavioral Health and Recovery discipline Employee A. Additionally, IDHS shared that it has hired a Facility Compliance Director who has already conducted an audit of temporary assignment processes within the facilities and implemented a consistent, detailed process that will be monitored for compliance. Lastly, IDHS confirmed it will send a nepotism policy reminder email to all staff.

25-HEM-0075

In response to a complaint referral alleging that another IDHS employee, Employee C, received temporary assignments because of her familial relationship to IDHS Employee D, HEM reviewed Employee C's temporary assignments. According to IDHS documents, Employee C was temporarily assigned twice to a Human Services Casework Manager position. Employee D signed documents requesting Employee C's first assignment and its renewal. During its review, HEM learned that Employee C was requested for the second assignment based on her performance in the first assignment. According to personnel and payroll records, Employees C and D shared the same address during these temporary assignments. HEM requested a response from IDHS as to whether Employee D's involvement in Employee C's temporary assignment is compliant with its policies and directives and if not, what action IDHS intends to

take to ensure that Employee D is not involved with personnel or employment decisions for Employee C, who continues to work within the same programmatic division as Employee D.

In response, IDHS stated that the temporary assignment selection of Employee C did not appear to be in line with the AFCSME contract. IDHS stated that IDHS Family & Community Services (FCS) management will be required to attend training for proper IDHS Labor temporary assignment procedures within three months. IDHS also stated that Employee D was involved in the temporary assignment of her relative, Employee C, and had not recused herself. IDHS OHR recommended FCS discipline Employee D, and in response, FCS indicated that it would impose a 5-day suspension to Employee D. Lastly, IDHS stated that it will send a nepotism policy reminder email to all staff.

Bypass Requests

25-HEM-0080

HEM conducted a desk audit review of the Integrated Eligibility System Manager at the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services (HFS). While HEM found the selection decision to be merit-based and justifiable, HEM raised concerns regarding the agency's bypass process. In this sequence, both the top-ranked and fourth-ranked candidates were bypassed due to falsification of the Self-Disclosure of Criminal History form, also known as the CMS284B. HFS explained that it is agency practice that when a candidate fails to disclose a conviction, the background is denied and the candidate is bypassed. HEM noted that the Illinois Human Rights Act's prohibitions on the use of conviction, except in particular circumstances, strongly suggests that there should be a well-supported basis for disqualification. In this instance, although the basis was falsification and not the actual criminal record, there appeared to have been little inquiry regarding the type of offenses and the candidates' explanations for not disclosing. HFS also did not send the bypasses to CMS Compliance for review and approval, which the CEP requires. Based on HEM's review of the CMS Compliance Query Portal, HFS only sent four bypass requests to CMS Compliance in all of 2025, none of which involved criminal records issues. Furthermore, HEM's review of all the 2025 bypass requests sent to CMS Compliance showed that in at least five instances, CMS Compliance conferred with CMS Legal about an agency bypass request based on non-disclosure of an offense and CMS Legal denied the bypass request in each of them. HEM requested a response to this Advisory from HFS that includes the extent that and basis for which HFS sends bypass requests to CMS Compliance and the extent that and basis for which they bypass without CMS Compliance approval.

In response, HFS acknowledged that moving forward, it should and will conduct the formal analysis and interactive assessment steps outlined in CMS' memorandum regarding the Illinois

Human Rights Act. HFS confirmed it will analyze whether there is a sufficient relationship between the job at issue, the candidate's criminal history, and the surrounding circumstances of the offense. Should HFS make a preliminary adverse decision or disqualification, HFS stated that it will provide a Preliminary Decision Notice and then afford the applicant five (5) business days to respond before issuing a final decision notice. HFS stated that in any situation where an applicant does provide a response, HFS will confer with CMS Compliance to obtain approval before issuing the final decision notice. HEM followed up with HFS and confirmed that HFS will confer with CMS Compliance to obtain approval before issuing a final decision, even if an applicant does not respond to the preliminary decision notice. HFS also stated that the HFS Division of Personnel and Administrative Services leadership would complete the CMS Bypass training no later than March 31, 2026, and ensure that all relevant agency Human Resources (HR) staff in their subordinate chains would also complete the training by March 31, 2026.

Disclosure Forms

25-HEM-0094

HEM conducted a desk audit of the hiring sequence for a CMS Hiring Resource Team (HRT) Manager. HEM noted that an HRT employee is assigned to every State hiring sequence as the Hiring Lead to oversee the sequence and provide approval for the agency to proceed at different phases of the hiring process, such as posting the position, inviting applicants to interview, and extending employment offers. HEM further noted that the Hiring Lead also validates applicants against the position's minimum qualifications and determines which applicants are minimally qualified, and thus eligible for further consideration. Lastly, HEM observed that Hiring Leads report to HRT Managers, such as the position being filled. While HEM found the selection decision for the instant HRT Manager position to be merit-based and justifiable, it made a recommendation regarding Relationship Disclosure and Conflict of Interest Certification Forms (Disclosure Forms). HEM found that the Hiring Lead assigned to this sequence did not complete a Disclosure Form, although they worked in the same area as the position being filled. HEM confirmed with CMS that the Hiring Lead knew six of the applicants for whom they conducted minimum qualifications screening, including the selected candidate. HEM recognized that Hiring Leads do not generally complete Disclosure Forms, but emphasized that in this sequence, the Hiring Lead had working relationships with applicants that should have been disclosed. HEM stated it would follow up with CMS regarding Hiring Lead disclosure obligations when validating supervisory and other sequences within HRT. HEM also found that one of the interviewers, who was also the Proctor, reviewed the Disclosure Forms completed by the other two interviewers and certified that they did not have any conflicts of interest that would prevent them from serving as scoring panel members. HEM reminded CMS that it is best practice to assign an

employee who is not otherwise involved in the hiring sequence to vet the Disclosure Forms, rather than having an interviewer sign off on their co-interviewers' forms.

Disclosure Forms & CMS Validation of Minimum Qualifications

25-HEM-0034

HEM conducted a desk audit review of the hiring sequence for a Paralegal Assistant at the Illinois Capital Development Board (CDB). While HEM found the selection decision to be merit-based and justifiable, it made several recommendations. The position had one minimum qualification: “knowledge, skill, and mental development equivalent to completion of four (4) years of college with related coursework in such areas as legal, pre-legal, English statistics or directly related coursework.” (Emphases added.) The CMS Hiring Lead disqualified an applicant despite having four years and three months of experience as a Paralegal II at the City of Springfield. CMS’ disqualification of this applicant ultimately turned on the purported inability to confirm that the applicant had completed related coursework or that she had relevant experience even though the applicant attached a resume and answered the application question, which reflected she was qualified. HEM requested a response from CMS on its guidance regarding validating and screening paraprofessional titles, including what qualifies the Paralegal Assistant as a paraprofessional title and how years of experience should be counted or substituted to account for a lack of education.

HEM also recommended that CDB ensure that relationships are disclosed and forms completed with sufficient time to make changes to the interview panel, if necessary, without causing delays to the interview schedule. HEM recommended that the Agency Personnel Officer (APO) or designee follow up with participants on their disclosed relationships, including professional ones, and document discussions in the comment section of the Disclosure Form in support of their determination of whether a participant can proceed further.

In response to the Advisory, CMS stated that the Hiring Lead’s assessment was erroneous and the applicant at issue’s Paralegal II experience can be substituted for the educational requirement. However, CMS also stated that while the applicant had enough work experience to substitute for the equivalent of the required years of college, without a transcript or documentation of completed coursework and with only the applicant’s response to the application question, the Hiring Lead would not have sufficient information about the nature of the Paralegal work to determine if the Minimum Qualification is met with the level of certainty needed to validate the candidate as qualified. CMS explained that where job experience may imply completion of coursework required by one of its Classification Specifications, there is an opportunity to involve the agency Subject Matter Expert (SME) to assist in determining if the

candidate's work experience can satisfy a coursework requirement. CMS stated it will revise its internal processes to align with this consideration.

Interview Pools

25-HEM-0090

In response to a complaint referral, HEM reviewed the hiring sequence for an Assistant Chief of Operations at the Illinois Prisoner Review Board (PRB). This sequence utilized Standardized Hiring Plan (SHP) B, in which there is no SME review and qualified applicants are randomized for interview selection. HEM obtained emails from the CMS Hiring Lead assigned to this sequence between herself and a PRB Employee (Employee E). These emails reflected that before any interviews were conducted, Employee E asked the Hiring Lead if internal PRB applicants who were not randomized high enough could nevertheless be added to the interview pool. The Hiring Lead appropriately denied Employee E's request, stating the agency could not give preference to internal candidates. However, the emails further reflected that after PRB conducted 16 interviews in March 2025, in which four candidates exceeded the minimum interview score to be eligible for hire, Employee E asked the Hiring Lead to provide additional randomized candidates to interview and the Hiring Lead processed Employee E's request. This resulted in a PRB employee (Candidate F) being interviewed in April 2025 and ultimately selected for the position.

In the Advisory, HEM indicated that Employee E's actions gave the appearance of circumventing the selected process (SHP B) to ensure certain applicants be interviewed and this did not align with the hiring principles set forth in the CEP. In response, CMS acknowledged "there was some human error in this sequence" and that the Hiring Lead "should have exercised professional judgment" and consulted with CMS management at various points in the process. CMS further indicated that it had addressed these issues with the Hiring Lead and is creating a case study based on this sequence to help educate other Hiring Leads. CMS also noted it is working on modifying the SuccessFactors software to prevent hiring agencies from accessing the Interview Pool Report and seeing the order in which candidates appear on the list.

PRB responded that when this sequence occurred, the agency lacked a dedicated HR employee and that Employee E had been performing these responsibilities in addition to her primary duties. PRB acknowledged it should have considered using a different SHP for this sequence that included a SME review but said it did not pursue this due to staffing shortages. PRB indicated it had recently hired a full-time HR Specialist who reports directly to the PRB Chief Fiscal Officer, obviating the need for Employee E to perform or oversee HR functions going forward. PRB also confirmed Employee E erred in processing Candidate F's certification, as

Candidate F should have served a six-month probationary period instead of a four-month period. PRB also confirmed it had not submitted paperwork to CMS regarding Candidate F's leave, nor had it submitted paperwork for other PRB employees who took leave in 2025. PRB said it had since completed documentation for Candidate F's leave and would do so for the other affected employees. Lastly, PRB expressed its commitment to following the CEP and ensuring hiring sequences are conducted appropriately.

Position Relocation & Reusing Interview Materials

25-HEM-0088

In response to a complaint referral, HEM reviewed two hiring sequences for Eligibility Policy Writer ("Policy Writer") positions at HFS. The two sequences held interviews in August and October 2025, respectively, and the same candidate (Candidate G) was selected for both positions. While HEM concluded that Candidate G was well-qualified for the Policy Writer positions and did not identify any issues with the candidate rankings in either sequence, HEM found that HFS had authorized Candidate G to work from HFS' Chicago office although both Policy Writers were posted as Springfield-based positions. In response to HEM's follow-up, HFS confirmed that the Policy Writers primarily work remotely, but are typically required to report to the office two days per month.

HEM noted that relocating a position after interviews have occurred raises questions about the fairness of a hiring sequence and inferences of favoritism or special treatment, and that the specific work location identified in a job posting greatly influences the pool of individuals who will apply. HEM recommended that going forward, HFS obtain approval from CMS Compliance *before* moving a position to a different location and, preferably, before candidates are identified and interviews are conducted. In addition, based on HFS' and CMS' confirmation that CMS Classifications had still not approved the relocation of Candidate G's current position, HEM requested a response from CMS on advising agencies to wait for its approval before onboarding candidates into positions in counties that differ from the posting location. HEM also found that HFS used eight of the nine same interview questions and ideal answers for the two Policy Writer positions, although some of the same candidates were interviewed in both sequences. HEM therefore recommended that going forward, when HFS posts vacancies for the same position in close proximity to one another, the agency develop different interview materials for the postings. Lastly, HEM reminded HFS that all hiring sequence documentation must be uploaded to the official hiring sequence record in SuccessFactors.

CMS and HFS provided a joint response to this Advisory. In the response, CMS stated it would reiterate to agency HR staff the importance of posting vacancies in the correct work locations

and that requested location changes should be based on an agency's operational needs, not those of a particular candidate or employee. The response further stated that HFS would ensure that separate interview tools are created for similar positions. HFS also stated that it would remind staff to ensure all hiring sequence documentation is uploaded to the appropriate requisition in SuccessFactors.

Reusing Interview Materials

25-HEM-0050

HEM conducted a desk audit review of the hiring sequence for a Deputy Chief Internal Auditor at the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO). This was a repost of a previous failed sequence, in which the only candidate who met the minimum interview score declined the position. After interviews were conducted in the instant sequence, DCEO found that it had inadvertently omitted the last two interview questions – worth a combined 10% of the total interview score – from the interview tool. This error artificially deflated the candidates' scores, resulting in no candidate meeting the minimum interview score. DCEO flagged this issue for CMS Compliance, which provided approval to lower the interview score. However, HEM found that DCEO had made, but failed to recognize, this same error in the previous "failed" sequence and determined that if not for DCEO's mistake, additional candidates from the previous sequence would have met the minimum interview score to be eligible for hire.

DCEO further erred in the second sequence by offering the position to the second-ranked candidate instead of the first-ranked candidate by mistake. After the second-ranked candidate accepted the position, CMS Compliance approved DCEO's request to bypass the first-ranked candidate. While HEM acknowledged CMS' basis for approving the bypass request, HEM urged DCEO to exercise appropriate caution to ensure something like this does not happen again. HEM further noted that the omission of the last two interview questions in the two sequences also raised concerns and that the agency could likely have avoided a repost if it had identified this issue in the previous sequence.

HEM made two recommendations regarding the second sequence. HEM noted that the two sequences used the same interview questions and ideal answers, although one candidate was interviewed in both sequences. HEM recommended that in the event a position needs to be reposted after interviews have occurred, DCEO develop new interview materials to avoid giving any candidates interviewed in both sequences an unfair advantage. HEM also reiterated its recommendation from a previous Advisory that DCEO ensure employees who serve as interviewers understand that when an initial candidate score is modified, the interviewer's

original score should remain in the “Initial Score” column unaltered. HEM recognized that both sequences occurred prior to DCEO’s current HR Director starting at the agency and requested to monitor an upcoming DCEO sequence to evaluate current processes, which is in process.

Posting of Assignments Requirements

25-HEM-0096

In response to two complaint referrals, HEM reviewed the selection process for 47 recent assignments to the Intelligence and Investigations Division (IID) at various Illinois Department of Corrections (IDOC) facilities to confirm the sequences were conducted in accordance with the governing Administrative Directive (A.D.). In particular, HEM reviewed the “Opinion” section of the candidate interview summaries, which was completed in some of the sequences. HEM found that this was a brief summary of the interviewers’ reasons for selecting – or not selecting – a particular candidate, which appeared to comport with the A.D. In addition, HEM determined that 11 of the sequences deviated from the posting requirements of the A.D. in that the postings gave employees less than 10 days to apply and/or asked applicants to provide certain documentation that the A.D. specified the facility would be responsible for compiling.

HEM concluded that IDOC is generally making IID selection decisions in accordance with the A.D. and is generally doing so in a uniform manner. However, based on its review of the two complaints, HEM made two recommendations. First, HEM recommended that IDOC work to ensure all future postings for IID vacancies specify that applicants shall have 10 days from the initial posting date to apply and omit language asking applicants to provide their disciplinary records, timesheets, and performance evaluations. Second, while HEM recognized that the A.D. does not require facilities to include an “Opinion” section in the candidate interview summaries, to ensure consistency in the IID selection process, HEM encouraged IDOC to provide facilities with guidance on whether it should be included in every IID assignment sequence. If included, HEM reminded IDOC that the section should only contain information acquired through the candidate interview and related documentation, and that any subjective considerations obtained outside of the selection process should not be included.

Documenting the Sequence

25-HEM-0087

HEM conducted a desk audit review of the hiring sequence for a Fiscal Supervisor position at the Illinois Department of Labor (IDOL). While HEM found the selection decision to be merit-based and justifiable, it made two recommendations. First, HEM recommended that in the future, IDOL ensures it uploads accurate and complete documentation regarding the position and

sequence to SuccessFactors, including the correct position description and all required Disclosure Forms. Second, HEM recommended IDOL ensure employees who serve as interviewers/proctors understand the requirements for documenting required scoring discussions and any resulting score changes. HEM also reminded IDOL that it is encouraged for agencies to schedule candidate interviews at least 90 minutes apart to ensure adequate time for scoring.

HEM Advisory Update

25-HEM-0068

Last quarter, HEM issued Advisory 25-HEM-0068 regarding the desk audit of an Illinois Guardianship and Advocacy Commission (IGAC) Guardianship Representative. HEM recommended that IGAC and CMS discuss the position and its requirements, specifically the first preferred qualification of a 4-year college degree in related social services, human services, or a related field that was weighted at 60% of the application score. During HEM's review, IGAC stated that this qualification was heavily weighted because the agency could no longer require a degree as a minimum requirement. CMS and IGAC provided a joint response in which CMS stated that the posting should have more accurately reflected the skills and abilities that IGAC prefers for the position rather than using a degree as a preferred qualification. CMS also stated that it will provide additional training to agencies on using preferred qualifications effectively. This will also include guidance to agency HR teams that while a college degree can still be a preferred qualification, it should not be the highest-weighted preferred qualification. As requested, CMS provided the updated position description reflecting the lower weighting of the degree as a preferred qualification.

IGAC and CMS also agreed with HEM's recommendation to ensure consistency between the posting language, application questions, and screening rubrics. CMS also recommended, and IGAC agreed, to ensure SMEs complete CMS training prior to participation in a hiring sequence. IGAC HR also agreed that it will no longer pre-populate dates on disclosure forms. Finally, IGAC confirmed that it will require that disclosure forms for all screeners, SMEs, and interview panel members be submitted, reviewed, and formally approved by the agency personnel officer or designee prior to participation in any screening, review, or interview activity.

Investigative Division

The OEIG’s Investigative Division receives over 3,500 complaints every fiscal year from members of the public, State employees, contractors, bidders, and anonymous sources. The OEIG evaluates all new complaints to determine the appropriate action, including opening an investigation, referring the allegations to the appropriate entity, or making a referral to HEM. In addition, the OEIG also has the authority to self-initiate an investigation based on information discovered in other investigations or available via public sources.

Hiring-Related Complaints

During the first quarter of 2026, the OEIG received 47 hiring-related complaints. The following charts reflect the actions that were also taken regarding hiring-related complaints during this quarter.



Actions Taken on Hiring-Related Complaints First Quarter 2026	Count
Referred intra-office to HEM	11
Opened by the OEIG Investigative Division	6
Referred to the subject agency or other appropriate entity	34
In initial review	1
Closed without report	6

Hiring-Related Investigations

The following are the Investigative Division's numbers at the close of this quarter.

Hiring-Related Investigations	Count
Hiring-related investigations pending at the close of the quarter	13
Hiring-related investigations closed this quarter	3
Founded reports related to hiring issued this quarter	1
Founded reports related to hiring made available to the public this quarter	0

This quarter, the Executive Ethics Commission (EEC) did not make any OEIG founded reports related to hiring available to the public. Previous publicly released reports are available at <https://oeig.illinois.gov>.

Hiring-Related References

OEIG Hiring & Employment Monitoring Quarterly/Annual Reports

<https://oeig.illinois.gov/hem/hem-reports.html>

Comprehensive Employment Plan (CEP) for Agencies Under the Jurisdiction of the Governor

<https://cms.illinois.gov/content/dam/soi/en/web/cms/personnel/employeeresources/documents/comprehensive-employment-plan.pdf>

CMS Exempt List

<https://cms.illinois.gov/content/dam/soi/en/web/cms/documents/exemptlist-w-incumbents.pdf>

CMS Political Contact Reporting (For State Employees)

<https://ilgov.sharepoint.com/sites/CMSPoliticalContactReporting>

Personnel Code

<https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/ilcs/ilcs3.asp?ActID=236&ChapterID=5>

OneNet Trainings

<https://onenettraining.illinois.gov/onenettraining/page.aspx>

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

Chicago Office:
69 W. Washington St., Suite 3400
Chicago, IL 60602
(312) 814-5600

Hotline: (866) 814-1113
TTY: (888) 261-2734
oeig.illinois.gov

Springfield Office:
607 E. Adams St., 14th Floor
Springfield, IL 62701
(217) 558-5600

