

BOARD MEMBER CONFLICT OF INTEREST*Category R*

As elected officials, school board members owe a duty of loyalty to the general public in protecting the school district's interests. Therefore, the Board declares that a conflict of interest is a personal, pecuniary interest that is immediate, definite, demonstrable, and which is or may be in conflict with the public interest.

A board member who has a personal or private interest in a matter proposed or pending before the Board will disclose such interest to the Board, will not deliberate on the matter, will not vote on the matter, and will not attempt to influence other members of the Board regarding the matter. Additionally, Board members should refrain from engaging in conduct or actions, that give the appearance of a conflict of interest, embarrass the Board, or personally embarrass another Board member.

It is not the intent of this policy to prevent the District from contracting with corporations or businesses with which a Board member is an employee. The policy is designed to prevent placing a Board member in a position where his or her interest in the public schools and his or her interest in his or her place of employment (or other indirect interest) might conflict, and to avoid appearances of conflict of interest even though such conflict may not exist. RSA 95:1 requires that "No person holding a public office, as such, in state or any political subdivision governmental service shall, by contract or otherwise, except by open competitive bidding, buy real estate, sell or buy goods, commodities, or other personal property of a value in excess of \$200 at any one sale to or from the state or political subdivision under which he holds his public office." Through the use of open competitive bidding or recusal of any Board member who has a conflict of interest, the Board will seek to obtain the best value for the district while avoiding impropriety or the appearance of impropriety.

Nepotism

The Board may employ a teacher or other employee if that teacher or other employee is the father, mother, brother, sister, wife, husband, son, daughter, son-in-law, daughter-in-law, sister-in-law, or brother-in-law of the Superintendent or any member of the Board. This paragraph shall also apply to any other person who shares the expenses of daily living with the Superintendent or any member of the Board. Such a relationship will not automatically disqualify a job applicant from employment with the school district.

However, the Board member shall declare his/her relationship with the job applicant and will refrain from debating, discussing, or voting on a nomination or other issue. In the case where the relationship is with the Superintendent, the Superintendent shall disclose the relationship to the Board as early as possible in the recruitment/selection process for the open position or in the case of someone currently employed by the district, before recommending any job related action pertaining to the individual. The Board shall determine whether, were the candidate selected, the supervisor – subordinate relationship between the Superintendent and the prospective employee will be sufficiently indirect, to not disqualify the candidate. If not disqualified, and prior to candidates for the position being screened and a nominee being selected, or the Board approving any job related action, the Superintendent and the Board shall agree on a mechanism to address the conflict of interest.

BOARD MEMBER CONFLICT OF INTEREST

Where practical, the Board may designate another district staff member to fulfill the role of the Superintendent for the selection of a nominee for the position or take appropriate alternative steps. The job applicant is expected to declare his/her relationship with the Board member or Superintendent as well.

This shall not apply to any person within such relationship or relationships who has been regularly employed by the Board prior to the inception of the relationship, the adoption of this policy, or a Board member's election.

Legal References:

Marsh v. Hanover, 113 NH 667 (1973) and

Atherton v. Concord, 109 NH 164 (1968)

RSA 95:1, Public Officials Barred From Certain Private Dealings

Revised: May 2017

Revised: May 2007

Revised: July 1998, November 1999, February 2004, May 2006

Reviewed: June 26, 2017

1st Reading: August 8, 2017

2nd Reading: August 22, 2017

Approved: August 22, 2017