



**STATE OF NEVADA**

**BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS**

In re **Deanna Wright**, Member and  
President, Board of Trustees,  
Clark County School District,  
State of Nevada,

Ethics Complaint No. 18-106C

Subject. /

**PANEL DETERMINATION<sup>1</sup>**  
NRS 281A.725

The Nevada Commission on Ethics ("Commission") received this Ethics Complaint No. 18-106C ("Complaint") regarding the alleged conduct of Deanna Wright ("Wright" or "Subject"), a member and the President of the Clark County School District ("CCSD") Board of Trustees ("Board"), in violation of the Ethics in Government Law set forth in NRS Chapter 281A ("Ethics Law"). The Commission issued its Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation on November 1, 2018, which Order instructed the Executive Director to investigate alleged violations of NRS 281A.400(1) and (2) and NRS 281A.420(1) and (3) regarding Wright's failure to disclose and abstain from acting on a collective bargaining agreement that addressed her spouse's salary as a CCSD teacher.<sup>2</sup>

Wright is a public officer as defined in NRS 281A.160. The Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to NRS 281A.280 because the allegations contained in the Complaint relate to the Subject's conduct as a public officer and have associated implications under the Ethics Law.

On April 17, 2019, a Review Panel ("Panel") consisting of Chair Cheryl A. Lau, Esq. (Presiding Officer) and Commissioners Barbara Gruenewald, Esq. and Philip K. O'Neill reviewed the following: 1) the Complaint; 2) Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation; 3) Subject's Response to the Complaint; and 4) Executive Director's Recommendation to the Review Panel.<sup>3</sup>

Under NAC 281A.430, the Panel unanimously finds and concludes that the facts establish credible evidence to support a determination that just and sufficient cause exists for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter regarding the alleged violations of NRS 281A.420(1) and (3) related to Wright's obligation to disclose and abstain. However, pursuant to NRS 281A.730, the Panel reasonably believes that Wright's conduct may be appropriately addressed through corrective action under the terms and conditions of a deferral agreement instead of referring these allegations to the Commission for further

<sup>1</sup> Except as provided by law, a Panel Determination shall not be cited as precedent.

<sup>2</sup> The Commission declined to investigate the alleged violation of NRS 281A.400(3) and 281A.430 for lack of sufficient evidence.

<sup>3</sup> All materials provided to the Panel, except the Ethics Complaint and the Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation, represent portions of the investigatory file and remain confidential pursuant to NRS 281A.750.

proceedings. The Deferral Agreement must confirm Wright's acknowledgement of the following:

- Compliance with the Ethics Law for a period of 2 years after approval of the deferral agreement, including the following:
  1. Wright does not become the subject of another ethics complaint arising from an alleged violation of the Ethics Law during the deferral period for any conduct as a public officer or employee under the Commission's jurisdiction for which the review panel determines that there is just and sufficient cause for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter.
  2. The Executive Director does not acquire any new or additional information relevant to the facts and circumstances relied upon by the Panel herein that would warrant further proceedings by the Commission.
- The Review Panel's public admonishment.
- The Executive Director's authority to monitor compliance with the deferral agreement.
- Wright's willingness to present the approved deferral agreement to the Board in a manner authorized and approved by the Executive Director.
- Wright's encouragement of the Board to engage in Ethics Law training presented by the Executive Director or her authorized designee.
- The obligation to comply with the terms of the deferral agreement and consequences associated with noncompliance, including the authority of the Review Panel to refer the Complaint to the Commission for further proceedings, which could include an adjudicatory hearing on the merits.
- Upon satisfactory compliance with the deferral agreement, the Complaint will be dismissed.

Unless an extension of time is authorized or directed by the Commission Counsel on behalf of the Review Panel, the Executive Director and Subject shall provide a proposed deferral agreement to the Panel through its Commission Counsel on or before May 8, 2019, which deadline may be extended by Commission Counsel for good cause. If the Panel does not approve the deferral agreement or if the Subject declines to enter into a deferral agreement, the Panel will issue an order referring this matter to the Commission for further proceedings.

Under NAC 281A.435, the Panel unanimously finds and concludes that the facts do not establish credible evidence to substantiate just and sufficient cause for the Commission to render an opinion in the matter regarding the allegations of NRS 281A.400(1) and (2).

Dated this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2019.

NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

By: /s/ Cheryl A. Lau  
Cheryl A. Lau, Esq.  
Chair/Presiding Officer

By: /s/ Barbara Gruenewald  
Barbara Gruenewald, Esq.  
Commissioner

By: /s/ Philip K. O'Neill  
Philip K. O'Neill  
Commissioner

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I certify that I am an employee of the Nevada Commission on Ethics and that on this day in Carson City, Nevada, I transmitted a true and correct copy of the foregoing **PANEL DETERMINATION** via U.S. Certified Mail and electronic mail as follows:

Deanna Wright  
Trustee  
Board of Trustees  
Clark County School District  
5100 West Sahara Avenue  
Las Vegas, NV 89146

Certified Mail: 9171 9690 0935 0037 6382 28

Email: [piscesdee@aol.com](mailto:piscesdee@aol.com)

Dated: 4/22/19



\_\_\_\_\_  
Employee, Nevada Commission on Ethics