



**ETHICS ADVISORY PANEL
PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY BOARD OF EDUCATION**

14201 School Lane | Upper Marlboro, MD 20772 | 301-952-6115
boe.ethicspanel@pgcps.org | www.pgcps.org/offices/board-of-education

**ADVISORY OPINION OF THE PRINCE GEORGE'S COUNTY
BOARD OF EDUCATION ETHICS PANEL**

Background: On March 20, 2026, Ms. [REDACTED] Social Emotional Academic Development (SEAD) Program Coordinator, submitted a request for an advisory opinion under Board Policy 0107 (Ethics Regulations). Ms. [REDACTED] seeks to file a complaint against a former PGCPs employee for continuing to represent a student in matters involving the school system after having been a party to various matters regarding the same student when the employee was employed by PGCPs.

Issue Presented: Whether Dr. [REDACTED]'s continued representation of a student in matters against PGCPs violates Board Policy 0107.

Decision: After reviewing the request and the provisions of Board Policy 0107, the Ethics Panel finds that Dr. [REDACTED]'s continued representation could possibly be a violation of the ethics policy if she is compensated for her representation of that student.

Rationale and Policy Citations: Section IV.B.3. of Board Policy 0107 covers post employment. It provides that, "A former official may not assist or represent any other party other than the Board or school system for compensation in a case, contract, or other specific matter involving the Board of Education or the school system if that matter is one in which the former official significantly participated in as an official."

The following analysis is based solely on the information contained in the original complaint made by Ms. [REDACTED]. In this case, Dr. [REDACTED] is a former PGCPs employee who worked extensively with a PGCPs student, during her employment as a psychologist on the SEAD team at [REDACTED] school. During her tenure as a school psychologist, Dr. [REDACTED] played a critical role in matters relating to the student, "including participation in IEP meetings, counseling sessions, documented observations, and communication with the family and outside providers as his school psychologist". It is clear that Dr. [REDACTED] 'significantly participated' in this particular student's SEAD matter and as such, it would be a violation of Board Policy 0107 for Dr. [REDACTED] to continue to represent or assist in this student's SEAD matter if she is being compensated for her involvement. It is not clear from the information provided by the complainant, Ms. [REDACTED] if Dr. [REDACTED] is being compensated for her participation or whether Dr. [REDACTED] is volunteering her time.

Conclusion: Accordingly, the Ethics Panel determines that if Dr. [REDACTED] is being paid to represent her former student in matters against PGCPs, that she is in direct violation of the ethics policy. More information is required to determine if Dr. [REDACTED] is truly in violation of Board Policy 0107. We recommend this complaint go to the Board's Internal Audit Office for further investigation into this matter.

Date: May 8, 2026
Advisory Opinion 26-03

Sincerely,

Symone Stone
Chair, Ethics Advisory Panel