



OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE INSPECTOR GENERAL

CAROL POPE

P.O. Box 381
Petersburg, IL. 62675
(217) 558-1560 (Office)
(217) 341-9124 (Mobile)
carol.pope@ilga.gov

**** FOUNDED SUMMARY REPORT – CONFIDENTIAL ****
(Redacted)

August 5, 2019

Honorable Michael J. Madigan
Speaker of the House of Representatives
Room 300 State House
Springfield, IL 62706

Speaker Madigan,

This summary report of investigation is issued pursuant to Section 25-50(a) of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act, 5 ILCS 430.

On or about April 30, 2018, the Office of Legislative Inspector General (LIG) received a Case Initiation Form from Alaina Hampton, who expressly waived her right to confidentiality under Section 90(a) of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act. Hampton alleged that in August 2016, her supervisor, Kevin Quinn, began sending her inappropriate text messages. This continued for approximately five months, including during a time that Hampton alleged K. Quinn was a State employee being paid by State funds. Hampton stated that she asked K. Quinn to stop, but he did not, so she reported K. Quinn's conduct to K. Quinn's brother, Alderman Marty Quinn. After that, the harassment stopped.

This matter was investigated by my predecessor, Julie Porter. I have reviewed the investigatory interviews and documents and adopt them as my own. They are summarized below.

My predecessor referred this matter to the Office of the Illinois Attorney General on February 19, 2019, for a determination of whether criminal charges should be brought against Mr. K. Quinn. On July 29, 2019, the Attorney General's office notified me they were declining to bring a criminal prosecution against Mr. K. Quinn related to Alaina Hampton's allegations.

I conclude that K. Quinn violated the Illinois State Officials and Employees Ethics Act by refusing to cooperate with the investigation. I further conclude that, although K. Quinn's conduct

violated the sexual harassment provision contained in the current version of the Ethics Act, that version was not retroactive and does not apply to him.

1. Jurisdiction

Pursuant to Section 25-10(c) of the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act, the LIG has jurisdiction over former State employees regarding events occurring during any period of employment where the State employee's ultimate jurisdictional authority is a legislative leader. Pursuant to Section 1-5 of the Ethics Act, "employee" means "any person employed full-time, part-time, or pursuant to a contract and whose employment duties are subject to the direction and control of an employer with regard to the material details of how the work is to be performed."

Speaker Madigan is a current member of the General Assembly subject to the LIG's jurisdiction. K. Quinn is a former State employee who worked for a member of the General Assembly and—because the events at issue in this complaint occurred at a time that K. Quinn was still a State employee, he is subject to the LIG's jurisdiction. According to official records received from the Office of the Comptroller and information provided by that office, K. Quinn was paid by the State to work for the House Democratic Leadership between November 1, 2016, and July 31, 2017, and again from February 1, 2018, through February 15, 2018. He was paid a total gross amount of \$10,327 in 2016, \$64,829 in 2017, and \$4,064 in 2018.

K. Quinn's State personnel file includes certifications, each year from 2005 to 2017 (except 2015), stating that he was district office staff for Speaker Madigan, and that he had successfully completed the Ethics Training Program for Legislative Employees. In January 2018, K. Quinn also signed a form titled, "Acknowledgement of Prohibition of Sexual Harassment" and "Office of the Speaker."

K. Quinn also had contracts during the relative time period with Friends of Michael J. Madigan. In particular, he was a paid consultant for Friends of Michael J. Madigan from July 1, 2016, through November 28, 2016, and from August 1, 2017, through December 31, 2017.

2. Evidence Obtained

During this investigation, the following were obtained and reviewed:

- Text messages between Hampton and K. Quinn, August 28, 2016 through February 7, 2017
- Letter and envelope that Hampton sent to Madigan, November 1, 2017
- Text messages between Hampton and Heather Wier-Vaught, November 15, 2017 through January 15, 2018
- Email from Hampton to Marty Quinn, January 15, 2018
- Hampton's cell phone records, October 2017 through January 2018
- Text messages between Hampton and Individual A, September 2017 through December 2017
- February 2018 email from Individual A to Wier-Vaught
- "The Truth" by K. Quinn, May 2018
- K. Quinn personnel file, State of Illinois

- Illinois Comptroller records pertaining to K. Quinn and Hampton
- K. Quinn personnel file, Friends of Michael J. Madigan
- Hampton personnel file, Friends of Michael J. Madigan
- Timeline of investigation, prepared by Wier-Vaught

Hampton, Speaker Madigan, and Wier-Vaught were interviewed. Despite multiple requests, K. Quinn refused to be interviewed. Specifically, on August 16, 2018, Acting LIG Porter and her investigator attempted to interview K. Quinn at his residence. He asked them to leave and requested that they speak to his attorney Mike Kasper. In or around the end of October 2018, Kasper informed Porter that he would not be representing K. Quinn. Porter wrote to K. Quinn on November 16, 2018, alerting him that Kasper stated he was not representing K. Quinn. Porter informed K. Quinn that she was investigating a matter involving K. Quinn's conduct at the time that K. Quinn was a State employee, and that K. Quinn was within her jurisdiction as LIG and was required to cooperate with her investigation. K. Quinn responded by email on January 16, 2019. He stated that due to ongoing litigation, he respectfully declined the request to meet. K. Quinn provided a document called "The Truth," dated May 2018, describing his position concerning Hampton's allegations. Porter already had this document, as K. Quinn had made it public months earlier.

3. Factual Findings

Hampton has volunteered for political campaigns in Illinois since at least 2012. It was not full-time work for her and she traveled abroad frequently. Hampton regards Marty Quinn, Chicago's 13th Ward Alderman, as a friend and mentor. Hampton at times reported to the 13th Ward office for campaign-related activities.

Kevin Quinn's Harassment of Hampton

Around February or March 2016, Hampton met Kevin Quinn, who began texting her about work-related matters. K. Quinn asked Hampton to do campaign work, such as door-to-door canvassing on behalf of certain candidates. Hampton often was not paid for this work. At times, the Democratic Party of Illinois (DPI) did pay Hampton for her campaign activities. K. Quinn was the person who directed Hampton about what paperwork she needed to submit to DPI in order to get paid.

In August 2016, K. Quinn invited Hampton to the 13th Ward fundraiser, and she agreed to attend. The day before the fundraiser, K. Quinn sent Hampton messages that she found strange. The first one said words to the effect of, "Can you get a beer with me after the event? I want to talk about your future with the ward." Hampton said yes, because he was talking about work and that was all she cared about. K. Quinn was unable to go for the drink and asked to reschedule. Hampton said, "Sure." K. Quinn then texted Hampton words to the effect of, "I'm separated from my wife."

K. Quinn's messages became increasingly personal, and Hampton had the impression that K. Quinn was obsessed with her. Hampton found K. Quinn's messages inappropriate, because she

regarded him as one of her supervisors.¹ Hampton told K. Quinn clearly that she only wanted to talk about work.

For example, on or about November 13, 2016, K. Quinn and Hampton had the following text-message exchange:

K. Quinn: ...I would love to travel with you.
K. Quinn: Or just grab a beer. This is my last go. If no for a beer okay. It maybe sometime to get a drink. Fantastic. It can be whenever.
Hampton: I can't. I'm not interested. It would be very uncomfortable given my working relationship with MQ and the ward office.
K. Quinn: So you do not find me attractive?
Hampton: I do not see you in that way.
K. Quinn: Too old.
K. Quinn: Too old. I understand. Well you ever change your mind let me know.

Then, in December 2016, K. Quinn asked if Hampton had told anyone that he asked her out numerous time. He continued, on or about December 18, 2016:

K. Quinn: ...Should I withdraw my request?
Hampton: What are you talking about?
K. Quinn: To take you out for a drink. It's not going to happen. Right?
Hampton: Correct.
K. Quinn: And would be different if I was not affiliated with the 13th ward.
K. Quinn: Said differently, if I didn't know you and you didn't know me and I bumped into you at a Starbucks and began to talk and I asked you out. You would say no?

When Hampton did not respond, K. Quinn sent her another message:

K. Quinn: Sorry to once again bother you. I just wanted to know if you can answer my previous question. Thanks.

Around January 2017, K. Quinn texted Hampton words to the effect of, "I look forward to working with you for the next two years." This induced a panic attack. Hampton's anxiety increased significantly, overall. She hated seeing K. Quinn's name pop up on the screen of her phone. She did not know how to manage the situation. She feared that if she did not respond to K. Quinn, K. Quinn would tell Marty Quinn or Speaker Madigan that Hampton was uncooperative.

Around February 2017, K. Quinn was still sending Hampton text messages. On February 9, 2017, Hampton went to speak to Marty Quinn. She wrote the worst of K. Quinn's messages on

¹ According to Wier-Vaught, K. Quinn was not actually a supervisor for Hampton, at least in the Friends of Michael J. Madigan organization. As to Friends of Michael J. Madigan, Hampton's paid work in 2017 was limited to approximately six or seven days. Wier-Vaught did not know how much unpaid campaign work or work for other organizations, Hampton might have been doing at the relevant times.

a pad of paper. She told Marty Quinn words to the effect of, “I don’t know how to tell you this, but Kevin has been sending me inappropriate messages for the past five months.” At Marty Quinn’s request, Hampton read some of the messages out loud to Marty Quinn. Marty Quinn asked if Hampton told K. Quinn to stop, and she said that she had.

Marty Quinn said he would have a conversation with K. Quinn. Hampton asked for permission to block K. Quinn’s texts, which Marty Quinn granted. Marty Quinn said that Hampton would not have to communicate with K. Quinn any more. Marty Quinn also said that the situation would not compromise Hampton’s relationship with him or Madigan. Later the same day, Marty Quinn telephoned Hampton and told her that he had had a conversation with K. Quinn and K. Quinn would not contact Hampton any more. Marty Quinn did not say whether or not he had informed Madigan about the situation; Hampton did not ask.

Hampton’s Report of Kevin Quinn’s Harassment to Madigan

In April 2017, Hampton took a job with a different campaign organization. The candidate Hampton worked for was adverse to a party who was allied with Marty Quinn and Madigan’s organizations. Hampton continued to work for that organization, and then others, throughout 2017. During this time, Hampton was not doing well emotionally, and she wanted to find a way to report what had happened to Madigan and get closure. Hampton decided to mail a letter to Madigan’s house. She believed that Madigan would receive and read it, and that—if mailed to his house—no one else would see it. Hampton mailed a letter to Madigan on or about November 1, 2017. The letter described what had transpired with K. Quinn.

Around November 14, 2017, Wier-Vaught called Hampton, and the two met downtown the next day.² Hampton and Wier-Vaught generally described the meeting the same way. Both reported that Hampton described what happened with K. Quinn, Hampton’s interactions with Marty Quinn, and Hampton’s concern about how these incidents were affecting Hampton’s relationship with Marty Quinn and Madigan.

Hampton recalls some comments by Wier-Vaught that Hampton found insensitive and inappropriate. For example, according to Hampton, Wier-Vaught said words to the effect of, “If this were more serious, we would be meeting at a law office and not this coffee shop.” According to Hampton, Wier-Vaught also said words to the effect of, “If you came here for \$25,000 and a front-page story in the Tribune, I will hand over the text messages to the paper myself.”

Wier-Vaught recalls trying to conduct the interview sensitively, following guidelines that the EEOC had recently issued concerning sexual harassment investigations. Among other things, Wier-Vaught recalls asking such questions as, what happened; how did that make you feel; what remedies do you want; do you need accommodations. According to Wier-Vaught, Wier-Vaught specifically asked Hampton if she wanted Kevin Quinn to be discharged. Hampton said no, she was not looking to make waves. Wier-Vaught said she would have conversations with K. Quinn

² Wier-Vaught reported that all of her interactions with Hampton about this matter were in Wier-Vaught’s capacity as counsel to Friends of Michael J. Madigan. Wier-Vaught stated that the organization had waived privilege as to some items but not others, and she substantively answered questions as to items for which the organization waived privilege.

and Marty Quinn about this, and it would not be swept under the rug. Wier-Vaught's impression was that Hampton's main concern at the time was that she wanted to speak with and reestablish her relationship with Marty Quinn, whom she regarded as her mentor.

Separate Text Messages Around the Same Time

Around the same time that Hampton reported the harassment to Madigan and Wier-Vaught, she also showed K. Quinn's text messages to a friend, Individual A. According to Individual A, Hampton showed him several of the text messages and asked what he thought she should do. Individual A said he would think about it and asked what Hampton wanted to do. Hampton said she had thought about going public with it but stated, "I would never do anything to hurt the Speaker or Marty." According to Individual A, Hampton also made several jokes about using the texts as blackmail for money, but Individual A took the comments to be in jest. Ms. Hampton stated that at the time of this alleged conversation (September 2016), she had only experienced harassment by K. Quinn for one month. She did not even consider going public with her claims until December of 2017 or January of 2018. Ms. Hampton denied ever making a statement about blackmail, in jest or otherwise, then or at any other time. It should be noted that Individual A declined to be interviewed by my predecessor. Thus, his credibility and demeanor could not be judged.

On December 11, 2017, Hampton and Individual A exchanged the following text messages:

Hampton: I'm excited to see you Saturday. I have a lot to tell you.
Hampton: I told the Speaker about Kevin.
Individual A: I'm excited to see you too.
Individual A: When did that happen?
Hampton: A month ago. I sent a letter to his house.
Individual A: Any fallout?
Hampton: Heather called me and we met up. I asked her to read the messages for my own closure. Obviously they were concerned about me releasing it to the press she could tell I wasn't trying to hurt anyone.
Hampton: She wants to facilitate a meeting between me and Marty so I'm looking forward to that.
Individual A: Hm. How did Heather react to the messages?
Hampton: She believed me.
Hampton: But no action has been taken.
Hampton: In fact I texted her today that's the first time I've heard from her since.
Hampton: I didn't have any expectations so it's not a big deal.
Individual A: So you did this before shit blew up in Springfield with Silverstien etc?
Hampton: After actually, but the purpose wasn't to scare them. I never got closure and that's what I was looking for.
Hampton: I mean, you know I'd never do anything to hurt the Speaker or Marty
Individual A: I get that
Hampton: As far as everyone knows, I haven't told anyone so don't worry about being questioned
Individual A: I wouldn't care if you did honestly

- Hampton: Yeah I just didn't want to get anyone in trouble. She asked if I told [REDACTED] and I told her [REDACTED] knew when it first started but doesn't know the extent of it. I told her she doesn't talk to me anymore. Heather said she'd made sure the situation doesn't hurt my career and that if I want to work with DPI again I can or if I want something related she'll help. I told her the only thing I'd ever want is to have my relationship back with the ward office and I'll never have it back because I'm afraid to be there so there is not much they can do.
- Hampton: She was understanding. I don't really have any complaints and I feel better telling MJM and that's all that matters.
- Individual A: Probably a rough month for Kevin, but... That's what happens.

Wier-Vaught's Next Steps

According to Wier-Vaught, Wier-Vaught met individually with Marty Quinn and with Kevin Quinn. She also met with them together. Ultimately, Wier Vaught recommended that Kevin Quinn be reprimanded, receive sexual-harassment training, and be subject to a non-fraternization policy.

Wier-Vaught stated that she cannot share the details of her discussion with Marty Quinn, except as follows: Wier-Vaught asked Marty Quinn to describe his February discussion with Hampton, and Marty Quinn's description matched Hampton's. In addition, Marty Quinn was not thrilled that Hampton said she was going to work for an opponent. It was not good that someone from the Madigan organization went to work for an opponent. Wier-Vaught advised Marty Quinn that Hampton wanted to meet with him. Marty Quinn said that he had no interest in talking to her right now, in the midst of a primary season and at a time when Hampton was working for an opponent.

As to Kevin Quinn, Wier-Vaught informed K. Quinn that Hampton had contacted Madigan concerning the text messages. K. Quinn admitted sending the messages and was remorseful. He said that he did not realize, at the time, that the messages were unwanted, even though the messages on their face showed that Hampton did not welcome the messages. According to Wier-Vaught's account of her discussion with K. Quinn, Hampton and K. Quinn were having some phone discussions at the time and he suggested that there was additional context based on those conversations. Wier-Vaught confronted K. Quinn with the sexual harassment policy and he said that he was wrong and should not have sent the messages. K. Quinn denied that he engaged in these kinds of communications with anyone else.

According to Wier-Vaught, in the joint meeting with the Quinns, Wier-Vaught and Marty Quinn reprimanded K. Quinn and told him his conduct was inappropriate. There were no set guidelines for what the penalty should be under these circumstances. It was a reprimand, and not a termination, because:

- K. Quinn and Hampton were no longer in contact, and he stopped sending the messages when told to do so;
- According to the political organizations' personnel files and Wier-Vaught's investigation, no one had complained about K. Quinn before;
- K. Quinn was remorseful;

- Hampton said she did not want K. Quinn fired; and
- Out of respect for Hampton's request, Wier-Vaught was concerned that a termination would create attention that she believed Hampton did not want.

Hampton's Further Communication with Wier-Vaught

About a month went by. On December 12, 2017, Hampton texted Wier-Vaught, asking about a campaign that Hampton wanted to work on. Wier-Vaught responded that she had been meaning to follow up with Hampton and asked if she could give Hampton a call the next day. But, according to Hampton, Wier-Vaught did not call Hampton at that time.

According to Wier-Vaught, Wier-Vaught passed on Hampton's interest to Marty Quinn. He remained uninterested in talking with Hampton, due to her work on the competing campaign. Wier-Vaught had nothing to do with political staffing and found it odd that Hampton reached out to her about volunteering.

On January 15, 2018, Hampton learned that someone else was being sent to staff the campaign she had mentioned to Wier-Vaught. Hampton texted Wier-Vaught immediately stating that she wanted to follow-up on the previous discussion. According to Hampton, Wier-Vaught said she would call early that afternoon, but she did not. Around 5:00 that afternoon, Hampton emailed Marty Quinn asking if he had time to talk with her this week. Within approximately 20 minutes, according to Hampton, Hampton received a call from Wier-Vaught. According to Hampton, Wier-Vaught seemed distracted. She said words to the effect of, "Did I ever follow up with you about our previous conversation?" According to Hampton, Wier-Vaught said that K. Quinn had been reprimanded and was no longer in a supervisory role. She also said that, "We" were not getting involved in the campaign that Hampton was interested in. According to Hampton, Wier-Vaught seemed nonchalant about the situation.

Wier-Vaught's Consultation with Madigan

According to Wier-Vaught, Madigan was out of town in December 2017 and the beginning of January 2018. When he returned, Wier-Vaught advised him concerning her meetings with K. Quinn and Marty Quinn. Madigan asked whether K. Quinn was doing anything inappropriate today. Wier-Vaught told him no. Wier-Vaught also explained that she and Marty Quinn had reprimanded K. Quinn and required him to receive training, and they thought that was sufficient. Madigan asked why not fire him, and Wier-Vaught explained the same factors set forth above. Madigan said he wanted to think about it.

At the same time, according to Wier-Vaught, K. Quinn was going through a divorce and was charged criminally in a domestic violence situation with his wife. K. Quinn pled guilty. Wier-Vaught was aware that K. Quinn's wife had filed for an order of protection and that the divorce was messy. This was well known among the staff. There was also another incident involving K. Quinn's poor judgment on the political side, having nothing to do with harassment; Wier-Vaught said that she could not disclose more.

According to Wier-Vaught, this additional information caused Wier-Vaught and Madigan to discuss whether K. Quinn should be terminated. They also learned that Hampton was talking to people about K. Quinn's conduct. Madigan decided to terminate K. Quinn.

On February 9, 2018, according to Wier-Vaught, Marty Quinn and Madigan decided that K. Quinn would be asked to resign, or would be terminated, from the political committees. That day, an email was sent to some staff telling them that K. Quinn was no longer around. Rumors started swirling. Over the weekend, speculation grew. On the following day, Madigan issued a press release, stating that K. Quinn had been terminated for a number of reasons.

According to Hampton, K. Quinn was fired the same day that Hampton filed her EEOC charge.

Kevin Quinn's "The Truth" Document

In a document called "The Truth," which K. Quinn provided to the press in or around May 2018 and sent to Porter in January 2019, he denied trying to make Hampton feel uncomfortable. He stated that he stopped all communication with her after he was reprimanded in February 2017. K. Quinn points out alleged inconsistencies in Hampton's public statements, and he denies ever being Hampton's official supervisor.

Analysis

Based on the above facts, I have sought to determine whether:

- K. Quinn engaged in misconduct, namely sexual harassment or other improper conduct, during a period of employment when he reported to Speaker Madigan;
- K. Quinn's refusal to cooperate with the investigation constitutes a violation of the Ethics Act.

Kevin Quinn: Sexual Harassment under the Ethics Act

Since November 16, 2017, the Illinois State Officials and Employees Ethics Act has specifically prohibited sexual harassment, as follows: "All persons have a right to work in an environment free from sexual harassment. All persons subject to this Act are prohibited from sexually harassing any person, regardless of any employment relationship or lack thereof." 5 ILCS 430/5-65(a).

The Ethics Act defines "sexual harassment" as follows:

For purposes of this Act, "sexual harassment" means any unwelcome sexual advances or requests for sexual favors or any conduct of a sexual nature when: (i) submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment; (ii) submission to or rejection of such conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment decisions affecting such individual; or (iii) such conduct has the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with an individual's work performance or creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working environment. For purposes of this definition, the

phrase “working environment” is not limited to a physical location an employee is assigned to perform his or her duties and does not require an employment relationship.

5 ILCS 430/5-65(b).

If that provision applies here, then I find that K. Quinn’s conduct constitutes a violation of the sexual harassment provision in the Ethics Act. The sexual harassment provision governs “all persons subject to this Act”—which includes K. Quinn, who was a State employee during the time he was sending text messages to Hampton. Moreover, the sexual harassment provision applies “regardless of any employment relationship or lack thereof.” As a result, it does not matter whether K. Quinn was Hampton’s actual supervisor or in some other capacity.

The messages that K. Quinn sent to Hampton plainly had the effect of creating an intimidating, hostile, and offensive working environment for Hampton. Again, the sexual harassment provision makes plain that the “working environment” in question is not any particular physical location and “does not require an employment relationship.” The working environment at issue, here, was Hampton’s campaign work for various Democratic organizations, where she received direction from K. Quinn, who expressed himself to Hampton as someone who had an interest in and relevance to Hampton’s development as a political worker for Madigan’s organizations.

Despite my conclusion that K. Quinn violated the sexual harassment provision in the Ethics Act, I must also consider that his misconduct occurred between August 2016 and February 2017, before the sexual harassment provision was added to the Ethics Act. This provision was not added to the Ethics Act until November 2017. In making the change, the General Assembly declined to state whether it intended the sexual harassment provision to operate retroactively. See *Perry v. Dept. of Financial and Professional Regulation*, 2018 IL 122349, ¶ 40 (first step is to determine whether legislature expressly prescribed new law’s temporal reach). In such a situation, the presumption is that the law does not apply retroactively. *Id.* at ¶ 42. And because I believe that the addition of the sexual harassment provision is a substantive change in the law, and not merely procedural, I conclude that I should apply the presumption. *Id.* at ¶¶ 43-44 (merely procedural changes to statutes apply retroactively, but substantive changes do not).

Thus, I do not believe the sexual harassment provision of the Ethics Act applies to K. Quinn, and, even though his conduct meets the Ethics Act’s requirements, I do not believe that I can pursue a formal charge against K. Quinn for sexual harassment under the Ethics Act.

Other Violation

Because there was not an official employment relationship between K. Quinn and Hampton, I do not believe that I can appropriately consider K. Quinn’s treatment of Hampton under Illinois employment-based harassment or sexual-harassment laws. I have considered the Illinois cyberstalking statute, 720 ILCS 5/12-7.5, but as stated above, the Attorney General’s office has declined to criminally prosecute K. Quinn. I have also considered whether K. Quinn’s conduct constitutes a violation of 720 ILCS 5/26.5-3, a criminal statute that prohibits harassment via

electronic communications, and again, in deferring to the Attorney General's judgment, they have declined to prosecute K. Quinn under this statute.

Kevin Quinn's Refusal to Cooperate

Although K. Quinn was no longer a State employee at the time of the investigation, the Ethics Act nevertheless obligates him to cooperate with the LIG's investigations. Specifically, the Ethics Act provides:

It is the duty of every officer and employee under the jurisdiction of the Legislative Inspector General...to cooperate with the Legislative Inspector General and the Attorney General in any investigation undertaken pursuant to this Act. Failure to cooperate includes, but is not limited to, intentional omissions and knowing false statements. Failure to cooperate with an investigation of the Legislative Inspector General or the Attorney General is grounds for disciplinary action, including dismissal. Nothing in this section limits or alters a person's existing rights or privileges under State or federal law.

5 ILCS 430/25-70. Because, under 5 ILCS 430/25-10(c), I have jurisdiction over "current and former State employees regarding events occurring during any period of employment," I have jurisdiction over K. Quinn, and his failure to cooperate is a violation of the Ethics Act.

Conclusions and Recommendations

I conclude that K. Quinn violated the State Officials and Employees Ethics Act based on his refusal to be interviewed as part of this investigation. My recommendation would have been termination. This action has been taken. Because K. Quinn is no longer a State of Illinois employee, he cannot be disciplined. I recommend that a memo from the Speaker be placed in K. Quinn's official State personnel file that he violated Section 25-70 of the Illinois State Officials and Employees Ethics Act and that he never be rehired as a State employee or contractor.

Finally, since this is a founded summary report, it should be published, together with the response of the ultimate jurisdictional authority. Since K. Quinn's conduct resulted in termination, the Ethics Act mandates publication of the report. 5 ILCS 430/25-52(a). Transparency concerning the LIG's findings of misconduct is crucial to the sound functioning of the Office of the Legislative Inspector General. Public reporting of founded summary reports is critical to achieving accountability. This is a founded summary report concerning K. Quinn. This report should be published in redacted form.

Pursuant to Section 25-50 of the Ethics Act, you are required to respond to this summary report in writing within 20 days. Your response is to include a description of the corrective action to be taken, including whether you agree with my recommendations.

Sincerely,


Carol Pope
Legislative Inspector General