



STATE OF NEVADA

BEFORE THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

In re **Carlton Craig**, Professor/Director,
School of Social Work, University
of Nevada, Las Vegas,
State of Nevada,

Ethics Complaint
Case No. **19-056C**

Subject. /

REVIEW PANEL DETERMINATION
NRS 281A.730; NAC 281A.440

The Nevada Commission on Ethics (“Commission”) received Ethics Complaint No. 19-056C (“Complaint”) on July 8, 2019, regarding the alleged conduct of Carlton Craig (“Craig”), Director of the School of Social Work at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas (“UNLV”). The Commission issued its *Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation* on August 22, 2019, which instructed the Executive Director to conduct an investigation regarding Craig’s alleged violations of NRS 281A.400(1), (2), (3) and (9) and NRS 281A.420(1).

Craig is a public employee as defined in NRS 281A.150, and the Commission has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to NRS 281A.280 because the allegations contained in the Complaint relate to Craig’s conduct as a public employee and have associated implications under the Ethics Law.

On May 13, 2020, a Review Panel (“Panel”) consisting of Barbara Gruenewald, Esq. (Presiding Officer) and Commissioners Brian Duffrin and Amanda Yen, Esq., reviewed the following: 1) Ethics Complaint No. 19-056C; 2) Order on Jurisdiction and Investigation; 3) Craig’s Response to the Complaint; 4) Investigatory Exhibits; and 5) Executive Director’s Recommendation to the Review Panel.¹

Under NAC 281A.430, the Review Panel unanimously finds and concludes that the facts do not 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 allegations pertaining to 281A.400(1), (2), (3) and (9) and NRS 281A.420(1).

///

///

///

¹ 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.

Specifically, the fact that Craig has a commitment in a private capacity to his spouse, Patricia Cook-Craig, does not, in and of itself, violate the Ethics Law, as long as Subject has not taken any action related to Cook-Craig's employment. The evidence from the Commission's investigation does not reflect that Subject took any action related to Cook-Craig's employment.

This matter is hereby dismissed.

Dated this 13th day of May, 2020.

THE REVIEW PANEL OF THE NEVADA COMMISSION ON ETHICS

By: /s/ Barbara Gruenewald
Barbara Gruenewald, Esq.
Presiding Officer

By: /s/ Brian Duffrin
Brian Duffrin
Commissioner

By: /s/ Amanda Yen
Amanda Yen, Esq.
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 **REVIEW PANEL DETERMINATION** via U.S. Certified Mail and electronic mail addressed as follows:

Carlton Craig
c/o David M. Gardner, Esq.
Senior Deputy Attorney General
Office of the Attorney General
555 E. Washington Ave., Ste. 3900
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Certified Mail No.: 9171 9690 0935 0037 6387 30

Email: DGardner@ag.nv.gov

Dated: 5/13/20



Employee, Nevada Commission on Ethics