

<b>YASCHE GLASS, et al.</b>	:	<b>BEFORE THE SCHOOL</b>
	:	<b>ETHICS COMMISSION</b>
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
<b>DARRYL WHITE, SR.,</b>	:	<b>Docket No. C38-04</b>
<b>SCHOMBURG CHARTER SCHOOL</b>	:	
<b>BOARD OF TRUSTEES,</b>	:	
<b>HUDSON COUNTY</b>	:	
	:	<b>DECISION</b>

**PROCEDURAL HISTORY**

This matter arises from a complaint filed on May 25, 2004, by Yasche Glass, Rebecca Posey, Crencenthia Brown, and Sheila Wilson-Tamborra alleging that respondent, Darryl White, Sr., a member of the Schomburg Charter School Board of Trustees (Board), failed to attend board member training as required by N.J.S.A. 18A:12-33, and that he violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b) of the School Ethics Act (Act), and N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(d) of the Code of Ethics for School Board Members in the School Ethics Act by appointing a certified administrator as the acting Chief School Administrator at an emergency meeting on Monday May 24, 2004, that was not publicized. The complainants also allege that respondent violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b), (c) and (k) when he voted on the salary approval of his wife on October 21, 2001. The respondent answered the complaint and certified that he attended board member training. Respondent also answered that the Board president asked Mrs. Hatchett to serve as acting Chief School Administrator because the Chief School Administrator had to go out of town for a few days for a family emergency. This action was ratified by the Board at the June meeting. Respondent argued that when his wife advised him that she intended to seek employment with the Schomburg Charter School, he submitted a letter of resignation to the Board. The Board attorney advised him that he did not have to resign, but that he should abstain from voting on any matters related to his wife. He subsequently abstained from all matters related to his wife.

On August 3, 2004, the Commission notified the parties that the complaint had been placed on the agenda for the August 24, 2004 Commission meeting. Respondent and his attorney, Tonya M. Smith, Esq., attended the meeting and respondent testified before the Commission. Complainants advised the Commission that they were unable to attend the meeting. At its public meeting on August 24, 2004, the Commission dismissed the allegation that respondent did not attend training as required pursuant to N.J.S.A. 18A:12-33. The Commission also voted to find no probable cause to credit the allegations that the respondent violated either the Act or the Code of Ethics for School Board Members and dismissed the complaint. The Commission adopted this decision at its meeting of September 30, 2004.

## FACTS

The Commission was able to discern the following facts based on the pleadings, the documents submitted and the testimony.

At all times relevant to the complaint, the respondent was a member of the Board. Respondent attended training in January 2002. At a Board meeting on May 18, 2004, Karen Jones, the Chief School Administrator, presented a resolution to the Board for approval, which provided a list of teachers that would be in charge of the charter school in the event of Ms. Jones' absence. The Board raised concerns that properly certificated staff needed to be in charge and the resolution was tabled. The Board president asked Mrs. Hatchett to serve as acting Chief School Administrator because Ms. Jones was absent due to a family emergency. Mrs. Hatchett served as acting Chief School Administrator for the week beginning May 24, 2004. At the next regularly scheduled Board meeting after her appointment, a resolution was approved by the Board, which ratified Mrs. Hatchett's appointment and authorized payment for her services. The Board did not hold an emergency meeting on May 24, 2004, to appoint Mrs. Hatchett.

The respondent testified that when his wife advised him that she intended to seek employment with the Schomburg Charter School, he submitted a letter of resignation to the Board. The Board attorney advised him that he did not have to resign, but that he should abstain from voting on any matters related to his wife. He testified that he subsequently abstained from all matters related to his wife. The minutes of the October 21, 2003 Board meeting do not show that there was any vote on the salary of respondent's wife. However, the minutes from the July 10, 2001 Board meeting show that respondent did vote on the salary of his wife.

## ANALYSIS

Complainants allege that respondent did not fulfill the requirement of N.J.S.A. 18A:12-33 by attending board member training. However, respondent did attend training in January 2002. The Commission finds no probable cause to credit this allegation.

Complainants also allege that respondent violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b) of the School Ethics Act (Act) and N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(d) of the Code of Ethics for School Board Members in the School Ethics Act by appointing Mrs. Hatchett as the acting Chief School Administrator at an emergency meeting on Monday, May 24, 2004, that was not publicized.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b) provides:

No school official shall use or attempt to use his official position to secure unwarranted privileges, advantages or employment for himself, members of his immediate family or others;

At the outset, the Commission notes that Mrs. Hatchett was not appointed acting Chief School Administrator at an emergency meeting on Monday, May 24, 2004. The Board did not hold an emergency meeting on that date. To find a violation of subsection 24(b), the Commission must find that the respondent used his official position to secure unwarranted employment for Mrs. Hatchett. There is no evidence to show that Mrs. Hatchett's employment as acting Chief School Administrator was unwarranted. She was certified as a principal and was qualified to serve as acting Chief School Administrator. Furthermore, the appointment was made due to an emergency created by Ms. Jones' notification, on a Sunday night, that she would not be in school the next morning. Therefore, the Commission cannot find that respondent used his official position to secure unwarranted employment for Mrs. Hatchett.

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

I will carry out my responsibility, not to administer the schools, but, together with my fellow board members, to see that they are well run.

Complainant bears the burden of proving any violations of the Code of Ethics for School Board Members under N.J.S.A. 18A:12-29. The facts show that the Board did not hold an emergency meeting on May 24, 2004. Mrs. Hatchett was asked by the Board president to serve as acting Chief School Administrator because Ms. Jones was absent due to a family emergency. That action was later ratified by the Board at the June meeting. There is no evidence that respondent engaged in any activity that could be considered administering the schools. Therefore, the Commission cannot find that respondent failed to carry out his responsibility, not to administer the schools, but to see that they are well run.

Complainant has also alleged that respondent violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b), (c) and (k) when he voted on the salary approval of his wife on October 21, 2003. The Commission was not provided with any information to indicate that respondent voted on the salary of respondent's wife at the October 21, 2003 Board meeting. However, the minutes show the respondent voted on the salary of his wife at the July 10, 2001 Board meeting. N.J.A.C. 6A:28-1.8(a) provides that complaints must be filed within one year of the alleged violation. Therefore, the Commission cannot find probable cause to credit the allegation that respondent violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b) or (c) by voting on the salary of his wife, because he voted on his wife's salary in July 2001, which is more than one year from the time of the filing of the complaint.

N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(k) provides:

Employees of the New Jersey School Boards Association shall not be precluded from providing assistance, in the normal course of their duties, to boards of education in the negotiation of a collective bargaining agreement regardless of whether a member of their immediate family is a

member of, or covered by, a collective bargaining agreement negotiated by a Statewide union with which a board of education is negotiating.

Respondent is not an employee of the New Jersey School Boards Association. Furthermore, subsection 24(k) is an exception to the conduct that school officials are prohibited from engaging in, which is established in N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(a) through (g). Therefore, the Commission cannot find probable cause to credit the allegations that Mr. White violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(k).

In summary, the Commission finds no probable cause to credit the allegations that the respondent administered the schools in violation of N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24.1(d). The Commission further finds no probable cause to credit the allegations that respondent used his official position to secure unwarranted employment for Mrs. Hatchett in violation of N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b). The Commission also finds no probable cause to credit the allegation that respondent violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-24(b), (c) and (k) by voting on the salary approval of his wife.

## **DECISION**

For the reasons expressed above, the Commission finds no probable cause to credit the allegations that respondent violated the Act or the Code of Ethics for School Board Members under the School Ethics Act and therefore dismisses the complaint in its entirety.

This decision is a final decision of an administrative agency. Therefore, it is appealable only to the Superior Court--Appellate Division. See, New Jersey Court Rule 2:2-3(a).

Paul C. Garbarini  
Chairperson

### **Resolution Adopting Decision – C38-04**

**Whereas**, the School Ethics Commission has considered the pleadings and the response filed by the parties and the documents submitted in support thereof; and

**Whereas**, the Commission finds no probable cause to credit the allegations that Respondent violated N.J.S.A. 18A:12-21 et seq.; and

**Whereas**, the Commission has reviewed the proposed decision of its staff dismissing the complaint; and

**Whereas**, the Commission agrees with the proposed decision;

**Now Therefore Be It Resolved** that the Commission hereby adopts the proposed decision to dismiss as its final decision in this matter and directs its staff to notify all parties to this action of the Commission's decision herein.

---

Paul C. Garbarini, Chairperson

I hereby certify that the Resolution  
was duly adopted by the School  
Ethics Commission at its public meeting  
on September 30, 2004.

---

Lisa James-Beavers  
Executive Director

PCG/LJB/MET/ethics/decisions/C38-04