

Before the School Ethics Commission
Docket No.: C67-24
Decision on Probable Cause

Ryan Battershill,
Complainant

v.

Iveta Wentink,
Wayne Board of Education, Passaic County,
Respondent

I. Procedural History

The above-captioned matter arises from a Complaint that was filed with the School Ethics Commission (Commission) on September 4, 2024,¹ by Ryan Battershill (Complainant), alleging that Iveta Wentink (Respondent), a member of the Wayne Board of Education (Board), violated the School Ethics Act (Act), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-21 *et seq.* More specifically, the Complaint avers that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(b) (Count 4), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) (Counts 2, 3, 5, 6 and 8), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) (Counts 2, 3, and 6), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) (Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7), and *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) (Counts 2, 3, 6 and 7) of the Code of Ethics for School Board Members (Code). Respondent filed a Written Statement on October 30, 2024.

The parties were notified by correspondence dated May 13, 2025, that the above-captioned matter would be discussed by the Commission at its meeting on May 20, 2025, in order to make a determination regarding probable cause. Following its discussion on May 20, 2025, the Commission adopted a decision at its meeting on June 17, 2025, finding that there are insufficient facts and circumstances pled in the Complaint and in the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that the Act was violated as alleged in the Complaint.

II. Summary of the Pleadings

A. The Complaint

By way of background, Complainant maintains the Board served a cease-and-desist letter to his wife “in an apparent attempt to force a board member to chill free speech.” Thereafter, according to Complainant, Respondent was interviewed for a TapInto article and made “public

¹ On August 25, 2024, Complainant filed a deficient Complaint; however, on September 4, 2024, Complainant cured all defects and filed an Amended Complaint that was deemed compliant with the requirements detailed in *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-6.3.

libel attacks using her board position and in the voice of a board member [related] to actions that are clearly beyond the authority of a board member.” Complainant further maintains Respondent’s comments in the article “were deliberately made and directed, without question, for the sole purpose of causing harm and damage to a private citizen (Jennifer Battershill).” Moreover, Complainant contends Respondent’s statements were “inaccurate, misleading, and false statements that included libel.” Further, Complainant notes that the cease-and-desist letter “breaks the oath of office” because by “stating that a private citizen may not post on social media or comment on the action of a public figure and intimidating them through published newspaper articles, [Respondent] is breaking this oath and breaking ethics codes.”

With the above in mind, and in Count 1, Complainant asserts that Respondent published “specific texts and privately posted social media posts through planted ‘fake friends’” in violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g). Complainant further asserts “[a]s a board member responding to a board issue publicly without any disclaimer, [Respondent] obtained privately posted information from a private citizen,” and then provided that information to the press for publication, “for the direct purpose of needlessly causing injury to the parent of four children” in the District.

In Count 2, according to Complainant, Respondent has “previously sexually harassed [him] in board meetings and made [him] feel incredibly uncomfortable,” and therefore, he limits his Board interactions with Respondent. As a result, Complainant contends that Respondent has complained that he does not wish to speak to her and then blames this non-communication on Complainant’s spouse. Therefore, Complainant alleges that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) by “addressing a private citizen [Complainant’s spouse] as the problem . . . and pointing out her inability to use the correct communication channels while constantly trying to contact a married man, she has taken public action and compromised the board.” Complainant also alleges that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) because Respondent “continues to attempt to reference [Complainant’s] wife” and “attempts to use [her] position as a board member talking in the context of a board issue without a disclaimer for personal gain of satisfaction . . . inflicting misery on a private citizen.” He further alleges that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) because the “private citizen is not a board agenda item, not a member of the district, and well beyond the board’s authority; all matters of families and the community are private, confidential matters to the board unless they consent to be discussed publicly” and violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) because Respondent “created and acted on a complaint that she could not contact [Complainant] through non-board-approved channels at any time they chose, where they could not be tracked or recorded.”

In Count 3, Complainant asserts that Respondent continually attacks Complainant’s spouse, a private citizen. According to Complainant, in the article, Respondent calls his spouse, “a liar,” “falsely claims” that his spouse “attacks people,” and calls her “narcissistic.” Complainant maintains that although Board members “are entitled to freedom of speech in their private lives, this was clearly stated by a board member in the press in an article about board business and thus should be limited to the concerns of the board; even without that, it is printed libel to make false claims and damage the reputation of another individual.” Therefore, Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) because she took action and provided statements with the Board’s name, condemning a private citizen, which compromised

the Board; violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) because she “used the position on the board to attack a private citizen and thus use[d] the schools for personal gain of attempting to humiliate a private citizen in public”; violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) by “making false claims and statements about what’s happened . . . and name calling . . . has brought the reputation of a private citizen to the public . . . provided inaccurate information which has needlessly injured an individual’s reputation and caused emotional damage”; and violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) because Respondent “chose to act on her false beliefs and create falsehoods” rather than taking the “proper course of action,” which was to “seek an administrative solution, refer the issue to the president, handle it within the board, privately with the individual or even ignore it.”

In Count 4, Complainant maintains that Respondent commented that he and his spouse “demanded” that Respondent and another Board member not be on the stage during graduation to hand Complainant’s child a diploma. Complainant further maintains that the article quotes Respondent as saying, “So, the two women did not feel inclined to cooperate.” Therefore, Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(b) because Respondent “would be clearly involved with impacting the mental health of a student, despite this, she did not make a decision that would protect the welfare of children; she did not seek to maintain public schools that meet the individual needs of all children regardless of social standing.”

In Count 5, Complainant asserts inaccuracies in connection with a statement that Respondent provided, and which was published in the article. While the article provides that, “Just days before the graduation . . . [Complainant’s spouse] . . . “screamed at’ [another Board member], calling her ‘the b-word and the c-word,’ and saying, ‘There will be consequences for this,’” Complainant notes the comment is “inaccurate as it was a heated discussion between [another board member] and the private citizen about a rumor” According to Complainant, “Respondent falsely painted this as the private citizen expressing concerns over her son rather than defending herself and her reputation from a public figure’s rumors.” Complainant contends Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) because she “falsely took action to publish an inaccurate account that compromised the board and misrepresented the argument of a private citizen and public official, which is covered by free speech” and violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) because by releasing a “private conversation between a private citizen and a board member in the capacity of being a board member,” Respondent “falsely took action to publish an inaccurate account that compromised the board and misinterpreted the argument of a private citizen and public official; which is covered by free speech.”

In Count 6, Complainant claims Respondent’s statement in the article that “marital problems have seeped into board business,” is “a fabrication pointed against the private citizen, and not a board matter.” Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) because “[b]y acting as a board member in an article about board business and publishing a cease-and-desist letter signed by the board president without a disclaimer,” Respondent “took private action that was not approved by the board and published false and misleading information that compromised the board”; violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) because she acted “as a board member in an article about board business with the publication of a cease-and-desist letter . . . without a disclaimer, used her position to attempt to undermine, humiliate, degrade the marriage of a private citizen for personal gain of herself and friends in social standing”; violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) because “[r]eleasing information about the board and the private

citizens' [(sic)] marriage is clearly not keeping all matters pertaining to the schools confidential" and violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(j)* because by choosing to "act on her false beliefs and creat[ing] falsehoods and name-calling by calling a publicly printed news article" and as such, "she failed to 'act on the complaints at public meetings only after failure of an administrative solution.'"

In Count 7, and as it relates to Respondent's comment in the article about "time and money spent on legal advice," among other things, Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(j)* because Respondent failed to seek an administrative solution and instead "acted on the article in a public meeting before attempting to find an administrative approach" and violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(g)* because the "board lawyer and the legal advice are not related to the issues generated by" a private citizen and the "lawyer's time and effort have been spent defending the highly inappropriate cease-and-desist letter and the directed libel attacks," which have "caused [] Respondent to injure a private citizen and provide inaccurate information needlessly."

In Count 8, Complainant maintains that by posting the cease-and-desist letter, Respondent violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(e)*, "as the board had not taken any action in executive or public session" with respect to the cease-and-desist letter, and by "publicly supporting the action as a board member without the action of the board," Respondent took "private action that has compromised the board."

B. Written Statement

Respondent initially notes "much of the Complaint focuses upon the 'Cease and Desist Letter' sent by the Board . . . not a communication from the Respondent." Respondent further notes, "while [Complainant] takes exception to the fact that the Respondent and other Board [m]embers spoke to the local press about this matter – after inquiries were made, he has no issue with himself or his wife speaking to the same publication."

Respondent first addresses violations of *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(g)* in Counts 1, 2, 3, 5 and 6. As to Count 1, Respondent maintains that "it appears that the Complainant is claiming that the Respondent 'obtained privately posted information from a private citizen.'" Respondent further maintains that "anything posted to social media is never truly 'private' or 'confidential' due to the very nature of online communications." Moreover, Respondent noted Complainant did not allege that Respondent "shared any information gleaned by her service as a Board member"; therefore, this allegation in Count 1 should be dismissed. As to Counts 2, 3, 5 and 6, Respondent argues that none of the comments that Complainant references "meet the standards" to support a violation of *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(g)*. Respondent argues that despite Complainant's assertions that "all matters of families and the community are private, confidential matters to the board unless they consent to be discussed publicly," none of the information within the article related to a matter before the Board, but rather involved interactions between Respondent or other Board members and Complainant's wife. Moreover, Complainant did not "identify any 'confidential matters' discussed or disclosed other than sweeping statements that anything involving the family of a Board member is out of bounds."

Regarding allegations of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) in Counts 2, 3, 5, and 6, Respondent argues Complainant has not provided any evidence to demonstrate that Respondent “made any personal promises or took any private action which could have compromised the Board.” According to Respondent, there is “interpersonal conflict between Board members” and unfortunately it has become a public topic of conversation, but that “is not an abuse of authority by Respondent.” Respondent further argues that she expressed her opinions/concerns at a public Board meeting about Facebook posts that “were problematic and had caused comments by others on the inappropriate nature of the posts.” Respondent contends that she was not discussing Board business, but rather “the fraught relationship between two individuals.” Moreover, Respondent maintains, “the selected quotations were not submitted as a letter to the editor or other direct communication from” Respondent, and therefore, “there is no proof that Respondent did not advise the TapInto writer that she was speaking as an individual and not on behalf of the Board.”

As to the alleged violations of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) in Counts 2, 3 and 6, Respondent argues “What ‘benefit’ could there possibly be to the Respondent by speaking about this issue to the local press?” Respondent notes Complainant and his spouse also “spoke to the press and denigrated the character of [Respondent]”; therefore, applying this same logic, Complainant must have also received a benefit. According to Respondent, the Complaint “incomprehensibly alleges that ‘satisfaction for the Respondent by inflicting misery on a private citizen’ is an actual ‘benefit’ to another person.” Additionally, Respondent notes Complainant “nonsensically claims that the Respondent ‘used here [(sic)] position to attempt to undermine, humiliate, degrade that marriage of a private citizen for personal gain of herself and friends in social standing.’”

Regarding the alleged violations of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) in Counts 2, 3, 6 and 7, Respondent maintains that it appears Complainant takes issue with “presumably [Respondent’s] own disagreement with the method by which [Complainant] wanted to be contacted.” Respondent further maintains that Complainant alleges that Respondent “failed to ‘act on the complaints at public meetings only after failure of an administrative solution,’” because she commented on a matter that was not a Board issue. Respondent argues her remarks related “to the business and continued operation of the Board, including [Complainant’s] refusal to attend meetings in person.” Respondent further argues her remarks did not reveal any Board confidences. Per Respondent, “The law does not permit [Complainant] to use the First Amendment as a sword to air his (and his wife’s) grievances and to deprive his perceived enemies of its use as a shield.”

As to a violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(b) in Count 4, and the commentary regarding the high school graduation, Respondent notes the “so-called ‘decision’ to attend the graduation would have occurred over a month before the statement regarding same, and therefore, could not have happened [(sic)] when Complainant alleges it did.” Moreover, a “decision” could not have been made on July 25 regarding an event that took place over a month before. Respondent further notes that “attending a graduation” is not a “decision contrary to the educational welfare of children.”

Regarding a violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) in Count 8, Respondent asserts that Complainant does not make “a direct allegation against” Respondent, but rather simply states that “all eight other members of the [Board] supported the cease-and-desist notice.” Respondent

further asserts her support of the action, along with seven other Board members, during a meeting, cannot be considered action, “let alone private action that may compromise the Board,” “[n]or any personal promise be gleaned from the allegations in the Complaint.”

As to a violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) in Count 7, Respondent notes that a statement made during a Board meeting cannot be “any kind of private action.” Furthermore, Respondent argues this Count is related to the cease-and-desist letter, which was sent by Board counsel, “presumably after permission of the Board.” Respondent further argues Complainant did not allege that Respondent “directed that the letter be sent- or went outside of her authority as a Board member to do so.”

Finally, Respondent maintains, “it was difficult to determine the exact nature of the factual claims based on the statements made therein,” and therefore, “[t]o the extent that something was not specifically refuted, all allegations and contentions in the Complaint are denied.”

III. Analysis

This matter is before the Commission for a determination of probable cause pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7. A finding of probable cause is not an adjudication on the merits but, rather, an initial review whereupon the Commission makes a preliminary determination as to whether the matter should proceed to an adjudication on the merits, or whether further review is not warranted. Pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7(a), probable cause “shall be found when the facts and circumstances presented in the complaint and written statement would lead a reasonable person to believe that the Act has been violated.”

Alleged Violations of the Act

Complainant submits that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(b), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f), *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g), and *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j), and these provisions of the Code provide:

b. I will make decisions in terms of the educational welfare of children and will seek to develop and maintain public schools that meet the individual needs of all children regardless of their ability, race, creed, sex, or social standing.

e. I will recognize that authority rests with the board of education and will make no personal promises nor take any private action that may compromise the board.

f. I will refuse to surrender my independent judgment to special interest or partisan political groups or to use the schools for personal gain or for the gain of friends.

g. I will hold confidential all matters pertaining to the schools which, if disclosed, would needlessly injure individuals or the schools. In all other matters, I will provide accurate information and, in concert with my fellow board members, interpret to the staff the aspirations of the community for its school.

j. I will refer all complaints to the chief administrative officer and will act on the complaints at public meetings only after failure of an administrative solution.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(b)

In Count 4, Complainant maintains that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(b)* when she and another Board member appeared on stage during graduation to hand Complainant's child a diploma when Complainant did not want them to appear on stage. Respondent argued that "attending a graduation" is not a "decision contrary to the educational welfare of children."

In order to credit a violation of *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(b)*, pursuant to *N.J.A.C. 6A:28-6.4(a)*, Complainant shall include factual evidence that Respondent willfully made a decision contrary to the educational welfare of children, or evidence that Respondent took deliberate action to obstruct the programs and policies designed to meet the individual needs of all children, regardless of their ability, race, color, creed or social standing.

Following its assessment, the Commission finds that there are insufficient facts and circumstances presented in the Complaint and the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(b)* was violated in Count 4. Complainant has not shown how Respondent's actions constituted a decision contrary to the educational welfare of children, or provided any evidence that Respondent took deliberate action to obstruct the programs and policies designed to meet the individual needs of all children, regardless of their ability, race, color, creed or social standing. Accordingly, and pursuant to *N.J.A.C. 6A:28-9.7(b)*, the Commission dismisses the alleged violation of *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(b)* in Count 4.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(e)

In Counts 2, 3, 5 and 6, Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(e)* when she took action to publish inaccurate accounts and misrepresented the actions of a private citizen that could compromise the Board. Respondent argues Complainant has not provided any evidence to demonstrate that Respondent "made any personal promises or took any private action which could have compromised the Board." Respondent also states that the interpersonal conflict between Board members has become a public topic of conversation, but that it "is not an abuse of authority by Respondent."

In order to credit a violation of *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(e)*, pursuant to *N.J.A.C. 6A:28-6.4(a)*, Complainant shall include factual evidence that Respondent made personal promises or took action beyond the scope of her duties such that, by its nature, had the potential to compromise the board.

After review, the Commission finds that there are insufficient facts and circumstances presented in the Complaint and the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) was violated in Counts 2, 3, 5 and 6. Complainant fails to show any personal promises that Respondent made regarding this matter. In addition, while Respondent did comment in an article about the cease-and-desist letter, as she only commented on public information, Complainant has failed to show how this action would have compromised the Board. Consequently, and pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7(b), the Commission dismisses the alleged violation(s) of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(e) in Counts 2, 3, 5, and 6.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(f)

In Counts 2, 3, and 6, Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) when she used her position on the Board to attack a private citizen by commenting in an article. Respondent argues that she did not receive any benefit by speaking to the press.

In order to credit a violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f), pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-6.4(a), Complainant shall include evidence that Respondent took action on behalf of, or at the request of, a special interest group or persons organized and voluntarily united in opinion and who adhere to a particular political party or cause; or evidence that Respondent used the schools in order to acquire some benefit for herself, a member of her immediate family or a friend.

Following its assessment, the Commission finds that there are insufficient facts and circumstances presented in the Complaint and the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) was violated in Counts 2, 3, and 6. The Complaint fails to explain how the statements made in the interview would constitute evidence that Respondent used the schools in order to acquire some benefit for herself, a member of her immediate family or a friend. Accordingly, and pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7(b), the Commission dismisses the alleged violation(s) of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(f) in Counts 2, 3, and 6.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(g)

In Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7, Complainant asserts that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12 24.1(g) when she shared the texts and posts of a private citizen on her social media account and released conversations between a private citizen and a Board member. Respondent notes that anything posted to social media is not private or confidential. Respondent also argues that nothing in the article related to a matter before the Board and Complainant did not identify any confidential matters that were discussed or disclosed.

In order to credit a violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g), pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-6.4(a), Complainant shall include factual evidence that Respondent took action to make public, reveal or disclose information that was not public under any laws, regulations or court orders of this State, or information that was otherwise confidential in accordance with board policies, procedures or practices. Factual evidence that Respondent violated the inaccurate information provision of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) shall include evidence that substantiates the inaccuracy of the information provided by Respondent and evidence that establishes that the inaccuracy was

other than reasonable mistake or personal opinion or was not attributable to developing circumstances.

Following its assessment, the Commission finds that there are insufficient facts and circumstances presented in the Complaint and the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) was violated. Complainant fails to allege that Respondent disclosed confidential Board information or provided inaccurate information that related to a Board matter. Consequently, and pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7(b), the Commission dismisses the alleged violation(s) of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(g) in Counts 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 and 7.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(j)

In Counts 2, 3, 6, and 7, Complainant asserts Respondent violated *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) when she chose to act on her beliefs, talked to a newspaper, and failed to seek an administrative solution with regard to the ongoing issues with Respondent and Complainant. Respondent argues her remarks related “to the business and continued operation of the Board, including [Complainant’s] refusal to attend meetings in person.”

In order to credit a violation of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j), pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-6.4(a), Complainant shall include evidence that Respondent acted on or attempted to resolve a complaint, or conducted an investigation or inquiry related to a complaint (i) prior to referral to the chief administrative officer, or (ii) at a time or place other than a public meeting and prior to the failure of an administrative solution.

After review, the Commission finds that there are insufficient facts and circumstances presented in the Complaint and the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) was violated. The Complaint lacks evidence that Respondent acted on or attempted to resolve a complaint related to the staff or Superintendent, or conducted an investigation or inquiry related to a complaint (i) prior to referral to the chief administrative officer, or (ii) at a time or place other than a public meeting and prior to the failure of an administrative solution. Therefore, and pursuant to *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7(b), the Commission dismisses the alleged violation(s) of *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-24.1(j) in Counts 2, 3, 6 and 7.

IV. Decision

In accordance with *N.J.S.A.* 18A:12-29(b), and for the reasons detailed herein, the Commission hereby notifies Complainant and Respondent that there are insufficient facts and circumstances pled in the Complaint and in the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that the Act was violated as alleged in the Complaint and, consequently, dismisses the above-captioned matter. *N.J.A.C.* 6A:28-9.7(b).

The within decision is a final decision of an administrative agency and, therefore, it is appealable only to the Superior Court-Appellate Division. *See, New Jersey Court Rule 2:2-3(a)*. Under *New Jersey Court Rule 2:4-1(b)*, a notice of appeal must be filed with the Appellate Division within 45 days from the date of mailing of this decision.

Robert W. Bender, Chairperson

Mailing Date: June 17, 2025

***Resolution Adopting Decision
in Connection with C67-24***

Whereas, at its meeting on May 20, 2025, the School Ethics Commission (Commission) considered the Complaint and the Written Statement submitted in connection with the above-referenced matter; and

Whereas, at its meeting on May 20, 2025, the Commission discussed finding that the facts and circumstances presented in the Complaint and the Written Statement would not lead a reasonable person to believe that the Act was violated, and therefore, dismissing the above-captioned matter; and

Whereas, at its meeting on June 17, 2025, the Commission reviewed and voted to approve the within decision as accurately memorializing its actions/findings from its meeting on May 20, 2025; and

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Commission hereby adopts the decision and directs its staff to notify all parties to this action of its decision herein.

Robert W. Bender, Chairperson

I hereby certify that the Resolution was duly adopted by the School Ethics Commission at its public meeting on June 17, 2025.

Dana C. Jones
School Ethics Commission