

Before the School Ethics Commission
OAL Docket No.: EEC-16994-25
SEC Docket No.: C79-24
Final Decision (Settlement)

**Roger Chu, Christine Sheridan Celia, Christopher Dilkus, Regan Kaiden,
Mary Saverino, Kate Setzer and Sarah Sherman,
*Complainants***

v.

**Meghan Mikulski,
Collingswood Board of Education, Camden County,
*Respondent***

I. Procedural History

The above-captioned matter arises from a Complaint that was filed with the School Ethics Commission (Commission) on October 15, 2024,¹ by Roger Chu, Christine Sheridan Celia, Christopher Dilkus, Regan Kaiden, Mary Saverino, Kate Setzer, and Sarah Sherman (Complainants), alleging that Meghan Mikulski (Respondent), a member of the Collingswood Board of Education (Board), violated the School Ethics Act (Act), *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-21 et seq.* More specifically, the Complaint alleged that Respondent violated *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)*, *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(i)* and *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(j)* of the Code of Ethics for School Board Members (Code). Respondent filed a Written Statement on November 14, 2024.

At its meeting on July 22, 2025, and after reviewing the Complaint and the Written Statement, the Commission adopted a decision finding that there were sufficient facts and circumstances pled in the Complaint and in the Written Statement to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(f)*, *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(i)* and *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(j)* were violated as set forth in the Complaint, but insufficient facts and circumstances to lead a reasonable person to believe that *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(e)* and *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(g)* were violated as alleged in the Complaint. Based on its decision, the Commission also voted to transmit the matter to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for a hearing, where Complainants would carry the burden to prove that Respondent violated *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(f)*, *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(i)* and/or *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(j)*.

At the OAL, the parties agreed to amicably resolve the matter and, on or about January 29, 2026, the parties filed a fully executed settlement agreement. The Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) issued an Initial Decision (Settlement) on February 6, 2026, which concluded that the

¹ On September 30, 2024, Complainants filed a Complaint. On October 15, 2024, Complainants filed an Amended Complaint with the Commission.

settlement agreement was voluntary, consistent with the law, and fully dispositive of all issues in controversy between the parties, and should therefore, be approved.

At its meeting on March 24, 2026, the Commission reviewed the Initial Decision (Settlement), and at its meeting on April 28, 2026, the Commission voted to adopt the Initial Decision (Settlement) as its Final Decision. However, the Commission also voted not to take a position on the enforceability of the parties' written settlement agreement. Additionally, the Commission recommended that the Commissioner of Education (Commissioner) impose a penalty of reprimand, consistent with the terms of the settlement agreement.

II. Analysis

In their fully executed settlement agreement, the parties set forth the terms of their settlement. More specifically, the parties agreed, in relevant part, that Respondent will issue a public apology to the Superintendent at the next scheduled Board meeting following approval of the settlement, the wording of which will be shared with and approved by the Superintendent; upon issuance of the public apology, Respondent will be eligible for appointments to committee assignments; Complainant Chu will make a public statement at the next scheduled Board meeting following approval of the settlement that the ethics charge has been resolved and that Respondent has accepted a reprimand from the Commission; the parties have amicably agreed to the settlement as to all claims set forth in the Amended Complaint and before the OAL; and the parties agree that the appropriate discipline for those violations is the single action of issuing an Order of Reprimand against Respondent and Respondent will accept the reprimand from the Commission as a resolution of the ethics charge. *Initial Decision (Settlement)* (attachment).

After reviewing the terms of the parties' settlement agreement, the ALJ found that the settlement is voluntary, consistent with the law, and fully disposes of all issues in controversy between the parties. *Initial Decision (Settlement)* at 2. Having concluded that the parties' settlement agreement met the requirements of *N.J.A.C. 1:1-19.1* and should be approved, the ALJ incorporated the terms of the settlement into the Initial Decision. *Ibid.*

III. Decision

Following its review, the Commission does not find a reason why it should not defer to the parties' mutual decision to amicably resolve their dispute. As such, the Commission adopts the *Initial Decision (Settlement)* as its Final Decision, but does not take a position on the enforceability of the parties' written settlement agreement. Accordingly, consistent with the terms of the settlement agreement, the Commission recommends that the Commissioner impose a penalty of reprimand.

Pursuant to *N.J.S.A. 18A:12-29(c)*, this decision shall be forwarded to the Commissioner for review of the Commission's recommended penalty.

Robert W. Bender, Chairperson

Mailing Date: April 28, 2026

***Resolution Adopting Final Decision (Settlement)
in Connection with C79-24***

Whereas, at its meeting on July 22, 2025, the School Ethics Commission (Commission) voted to transmit the above-captioned matter to the Office of Administrative Law (OAL) for a hearing; and

Whereas, while at the OAL, the parties submitted a duly executed settlement agreement to the Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) for review; and

Whereas, the ALJ issued an Initial Decision on February 6, 2026, concluding that the settlement met the requirements of *N.J.A.C. 1:1-19.1* and should be approved; and

Whereas, at its meeting on March 24, 2026, the Commission considered the Initial Decision and discussed adopting the Initial Decision as its Final Decision, but not taking a position on the enforceability of the parties' written settlement agreement; and

Whereas, at its meeting on March 24, 2026, the Commission discussed recommending a penalty of reprimand, consistent with the terms of the settlement agreement; and

Whereas, at its meeting on April 28, 2026, the Commission reviewed and voted to approve the within decision as accurately memorializing its actions/findings from its meeting on March 24, 2026; and

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

Robert W. Bender, Chairperson

I hereby certify that this Resolution was duly adopted by the School Ethics Commission at its meeting on April 28, 2026.

Brigid C. Martens, Director
School Ethics Commission