

260-03SEC

IN THE MATTER OF MARY ADAMS, :  
FAIRFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION, : COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION  
CUMBERLAND COUNTY. : DECISION  
\_\_\_\_\_ :

SYNOPSIS

The School Ethics Commission determined that respondent Board member violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24(c) of the School Ethics Act for voting on three separate occasions on bill lists containing bills that were submitted by Adams Printing, which was owned by her husband and where she was an employee. After considering the nature of the charge and respondent's submission, the Commission recommended a penalty of reprimand.

Upon review of the record, the Commissioner, whose decision was restricted solely to a review of the Commission's recommended penalty, concurred with the Commission's recommendation and, thus, ordered respondent reprimanded as a school official found to have violated the School Ethics Act.

This synopsis is not part of the Commissioner's decision. It has been prepared for the convenience of the reader. It has been neither reviewed nor approved by the Commissioner.

May 30, 2003

IN THE MATTER OF MARY ADAMS,   :  
 FAIRFIELD BOARD OF EDUCATION,   : COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION  
 CUMBERLAND COUNTY.   :  
 \_\_\_\_\_ : DECISION

The record of this matter and the decision of the School Ethics Commission (“Commission”), including the recommended penalty of reprimand, have been reviewed.

This matter comes before the Commissioner to impose a sanction upon Respondent Mary Adams, member of the Fairfield Board of Education, based upon findings of fact and conclusions of law by the Commission that she violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24(c) of the School Ethics Act by voting on three separate occasions on bill lists containing bills that were submitted by Adams Printing, which is owned by her husband and where she is an employee.

Upon issuance of the decision of the Commission, respondent was provided 13 days from the mailing of the decision to file written comments on the recommended penalty for the Commissioner’s consideration. However, no comments were submitted by respondent, or on her behalf.

Initially, it must be emphasized that, pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12:12-29(c) and *N.J.A.C.* 6A:3-9.1, the determination of the Commission as to violation of the School Ethics Act is **not reviewable by the Commissioner herein**. Only the Commission may determine whether a violation of the School Ethics Act occurred. The Commissioner’s jurisdiction is limited to reviewing the sanction to be imposed based upon a finding of a violation by the Commission.

Therefore, this decision is restricted solely to a review of the Commission's recommended penalty.

Upon a thorough review of the record, the Commissioner determines to accept the Commission's recommendation that reprimand is the appropriate penalty in this matter for the reasons expressed in the Commission's decision.

Accordingly, IT IS hereby ORDERED that Mary Adams shall be reprimanded as a school official found to have violated the School Ethics Act.

IT IS SO ORDERED.\*

COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

Date of Decision: May 30, 2003

Date of Mailing: May 30, 2003

---

\* This decision may be appealed to the State Board of Education pursuant to *N.J.S.A.* 18A:6-27 *et seq.* and *N.J.A.C.* 6A:4-1.1 *et seq.*