



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION
40 Fountain Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 222-3790 (Voice/TT)
Email: ethics.email@ethics.ri.gov
Website: <https://ethics.ri.gov>

NOTICE OF OPEN MEETING

DATE:	Tuesday, July 14, 2026
TIME:	9:00 a.m.
PLACE:	Rhode Island Ethics Commission Hearing Room – 8 th Floor 40 Fountain Street Providence, RI 02903
LIVESTREAM:	The Open Session portions of this meeting will be livestreamed at: https://us02web.zoom.us/j/85801568090 This is an in-person meeting held at the physical location listed above. Livestream access is being provided only as a convenience, but it is not an official meeting place and we do not guarantee virtual access to view or participate in the meeting. If the livestream virtual broadcast of the meeting is interrupted or cut off for any reason, the meeting will continue in person.



STATE OF RHODE ISLAND
RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION
40 Fountain Street
Providence, RI 02903
(401) 222-3790 (Voice/TT)
Email: ethics.email@ethics.ri.gov
Website: <https://ethics.ri.gov>

AGENDA

10th Meeting

1. Call to Order.
2. Motion to approve minutes of Open Session held on June 23, 2026.
3. Director's Report: Status report and updates regarding:
 - a.) Complaints and investigations pending;
 - b.) Advisory opinions pending;
 - c.) Access to Public Records Act requests since last meeting;
 - d.) Financial disclosure; and
 - e.) General office administration;
4. Advisory Opinions:
 - a.) Michael Peno Jr., a social caseworker employed by the Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from simultaneously engaging in advocacy work in his private capacity under the circumstances described herein and, if not so prohibited, what limitations, if any, the Code of Ethics would place upon him. [Staff Attorney Radiches on behalf of Attorney Papa]
 - b.) Jessica Lance, a former director of special projects with the Providence Department of Planning and Development, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether she is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from now working in her private capacity on a new phase of a project which she oversaw as part of her former municipal duties and, if not so prohibited, what implications the Code of Ethics' revolving door provisions would have on her private work on the project during the one-year period following her severance from municipal employment. [Staff Attorney Radiches on behalf of Attorney Papa]

5. Education Update. [Staff Attorney Radiches]
6. Motion to go into Executive Session, to wit:
 - a.) Motion to approve minutes of Executive Session held on June 23, 2026, pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-46-5(a)(2) & (4).
 - b.) Annual Discussion and review re: Legal Counsel's contract pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-46-5(a)(1).
 - c.) K. Joseph Shekarchi vs. Rhode Island Ethics Commission, Superior Court C.A. No. PC-2026-03423, pursuant to R.I. Gen. Laws § 42-46-5(a)(2).
 - d.) Motion to return to Open Session.
7. Motion to seal minutes of Executive Session held on July 14, 2026.
8. Report on actions taken in Executive Session.
9. Annual Discussion and potential vote re: Legal Counsel's contract.
10. New Business proposed for future Commission agendas and general comments from the Commission.
11. Motion to adjourn.

ANYONE WISHING TO ATTEND THIS MEETING WHO MAY HAVE SPECIAL NEEDS FOR ACCESS OR SERVICES SUCH AS A SIGN LANGUAGE INTERPRETER, PLEASE CONTACT THE COMMISSION BY TELEPHONE AT 222-3790, 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE SCHEDULED MEETING. THE COMMISSION ALSO MAY BE CONTACTED THROUGH RHODE ISLAND RELAY, A TELECOMMUNICATIONS RELAY SERVICE, AT 1-800-RI5-5555.

Posted on July 9, 2026

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: July 14, 2026

Re: Michael Peno Jr.

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, a social caseworker employed by the Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families, a state employee position, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether he is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from simultaneously engaging in advocacy work in his private capacity under the circumstances described herein and, if not so prohibited, what limitations, if any, the Code of Ethics would place upon him.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, a social caseworker employed by the Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families, a state employee position, is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from simultaneously engaging in advocacy work in his private capacity under the circumstances described herein and provided that he follows the guidance provided in this advisory opinion.

The Petitioner is employed as a social caseworker with the Family Services Unit at the Rhode Island Department of Children, Youth and Families (DCYF). He represents that he has been employed with the DCYF for the past four years and that he works with children and families in the child welfare system. He cites among his duties the following: assessing safety, coordinating services, supporting permanency planning, and providing case status updates to the Family Court and the Office of the Court Appointed Special Advocate.

The Petitioner states that in his private capacity, he has been developing a community-based advocacy initiative focused on family preservation and, among other things, the impact of parent-child no-contact orders on children and families involved in the child welfare system. The Petitioner explains that the purpose of the initiative is to better understand systemic barriers to the success and preservation of families in the welfare system through aggregated data, community engagement, and education, with a goal of initiating broader policy discussions and legislative action. By way of an example, the Petitioner notes that there has been an uptick in parent-child no-contact orders (NCOs) issued outside of Family Court which may hinder the DCYF's provision of services that may be in the best interest of the child or the family should the child or the parent become

open to the DCYF. The Petitioner believes that parent-child NCOs should be issued only in circumstances involving sexual assault, severe physical abuse, and drug exposure, which he notes are ordinarily the bases for the Family Court's issuance of parent-child NCOs. He explains that, in contrast, parent-child NCOs are sometimes issued by other courts for various other reasons, such as when children are left unsupervised at home while a parent is working.

In his private capacity, the Petitioner would like to identify barriers to family preservation and advocate for policy and legislative changes to remove those barriers. He states that in order to do so, he plans to request, utilizing the Access to Public Records Act (APRA), and analyze publicly available data, including such kept by the DCYF, related to system trends. He further states that he would like to use that data to conduct outreach to community members and families in order to better understand lived experiences. The Petitioner adds that he would like to engage in policy discussions and educational efforts related to child welfare and the judicial process with, among others, members of the judiciary, various police departments, the Office of Attorney General, and the General Assembly. The Petitioner explains that he would like to collaborate with community partners and stakeholders, including legal and advocacy organizations, on initiatives that support families. He also plans to collaborate with a fellow community advocate/peer recovery coach who has had personal experience with the DCYF.

The Petitioner represents that some of the families that he may work with in his private capacity could be open or become open to the DCYF, but he notes that he will recuse himself from working with any such families in his public capacity, and that their cases will be assigned to a fellow social caseworker. The Petitioner further represents that in order to maintain clear boundaries between his role as a DCYF employee and his independent advocacy efforts, he will not use any confidential information received through his public position, access restricted data, or represent his views as those of the DCYF. The Petitioner states that he will receive no financial benefit or other remuneration for his private advocacy work. Given this set of facts, the Petitioner seeks guidance regarding whether the Code of Ethics prohibits him from conducting the advocacy work outlined above in his private capacity, while simultaneously engaging in his public employment with the DCYF and, if not so prohibited, what limitations, if any, the Code of Ethics would place upon him.

The Code of Ethics states that a public employee shall not have any interest, financial or otherwise, direct or indirect, or engage in any business, employment, transaction, or professional activity which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties or employment in the public interest. R.I. Gen. Laws § 36-14-5(a). A public employee has an interest which is in substantial conflict with the proper discharge of his duties or employment in the public interest if he has reason to believe or expect that he, any person within his family, his business associate, or any business by which he is employed or which he represents will derive a direct monetary gain or suffer a direct monetary loss by reason

of his official activity. R.I. Gen. Laws § 36-14-7(a). Further, §§ 36-14-5(c) and 36-14-5(d) prohibit the use and/or disclosure of confidential information acquired by a public employee during the course of or by reason of his official employment, particularly for the purpose of obtaining financial gain. Section 36-14-5(d) also prohibits the use of public office to obtain financial gain. Finally, the Code of Ethics provides that a public employee shall not accept other employment that would impair his independence of judgment as to his official duties or require or induce him to disclose confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties. § 36-14-5(b).

The Ethics Commission recently addressed an inquiry by a somewhat similarly situated petitioner in Advisory Opinion 2025-54. There, the Ethics Commission opined that an environmental scientist with the Rhode Island Department of Health, Center for Drinking Water Quality was not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from serving in her private capacity as a co-author for a paper intended to be published in a scientific journal which incorporated the use of data that the petitioner had compiled as part of her public duties and later requested and received in her private capacity through the state's Access to Public Records Act. Although that petitioner intended to make use of certain data that she had compiled as part of her professional duties, the data was a public record that she requested and obtained in her private capacity by submitting an APRA request. Further, that petitioner did not receive any monetary or other compensation for her contribution to the paper; therefore, the Ethics Commission opined that her proposed activity neither constituted secondary employment nor use of her public office or confidential information for financial gain. Similarly, in Advisory Opinion 2019-45, the Ethics Commission opined that a trooper with the Rhode Island State Police was not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from participating, on his own time and without compensation, as a consultant for a Netflix movie based on events in his life, including the rescue of a missing teenage boy by him and his K-9 partner, notwithstanding that the petitioner's wife was to be paid for her recollection of certain events depicted in the movie. The Ethics Commission reasoned that by agreeing to act as a consultant to maintain the accuracy of the events leading to the rescue, on his own time and without compensation, the petitioner would not be using his public position to obtain a direct monetary gain for his wife. Finally, that petitioner represented that the story of the rescue was made public on the internet and by other media sources and that he would not release any confidential information acquired by him in the course of his official duties.

Here, the instant Petitioner also seeks an advisory opinion relating to activity that would not be taken in his official capacity as a state employee. The Petitioner informs that although he would like to make use of certain data maintained by the DCYF, that data would be a public record that he would request under the Access to Public Records Act. He notes that he would not use any confidential information that he acquired through his public office and that, while advocating in his private capacity, he would clearly indicate that the views he expresses are his own and not those of the DCYF. The Petitioner emphasizes that he would not receive any monetary or other compensation for his private

advocacy efforts; thus, his proposed activity neither constitutes secondary employment nor use of his public office or confidential information received through his public office for financial gain under the Code of Ethics. Finally, the Petitioner states he would recuse himself from working in his public capacity with families or individuals that he interacts with while conducting his private advocacy work. Accordingly, given the Petitioner's above representations, and the review of the relevant provisions of the Code of Ethics and prior advisory opinions issued, it is the opinion of the Ethics Commission that the Petitioner is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from simultaneously conducting his desired advocacy work in his private capacity, provided that these efforts are conducted on his own time, and without use of public resources or confidential information received through his public employment.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. An advisory opinion rendered by the Commission, until amended or revoked by a majority vote of the Commission, is binding on the Commission in any subsequent proceedings concerning the person who requested the opinion and who acted in reliance on it in good faith, unless material facts were omitted or misstated by the person in the request for the opinion. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, agency policy, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of judicial or professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

§ 36-14-5(a)
§ 36-14-5(b)
§ 36-14-5(c)
§ 36-14-5(d)
§ 36-14-7(a)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2025-54
A.O. 2019-45

Keywords:

Compensation
Conflict of Interest
Private Employment
Secondary Employment

RHODE ISLAND ETHICS COMMISSION

Draft Advisory Opinion

Hearing Date: July 14, 2026

Re: Jessica Lance

QUESTION PRESENTED:

The Petitioner, a former director of special projects with the Providence Department of Planning and Development, a municipal employee position, requests an advisory opinion regarding whether she is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from now working in her private capacity on a new phase of a project which she oversaw as part of her former municipal duties and, if not so prohibited, what implications the Code of Ethics' revolving door provisions would have on her private work on the project during the one-year period following her severance from municipal employment.

RESPONSE:

It is the opinion of the Rhode Island Ethics Commission that the Petitioner, a former director of special projects with the Providence Department of Planning and Development, a municipal employee position, is not prohibited by the Code of Ethics from now working in her private capacity on a new phase of a project which she oversaw as part of her former municipal duties, provided that she adheres to the restrictions contained in this advisory opinion.

The Petitioner was employed as a director of special projects by the Providence Department of Planning and Development until February 19, 2026, when she ended her employment with the city. She states that, in that capacity, she managed the design and construction of the Woonasquatucket River Greenway (Greenway) project. The start of the Greenway project was announced by the Providence Planning and Development Department in partnership with the Woonasquatucket River Watershed Council (WRWC)¹ was described on the city's website as "a climate-friendly infrastructure investment that will enhance a one-mile stretch of the Woonasquatucket River Greenway[.]" establishing "an off-road, shared-use path that connects Downtown Providence behind the Providence Place Mall to

¹ The Petitioner describes the WRWC as a private non-profit organization that "sparks economic development through [their] work restoring the Woonasquatucket River and communities around it, and by enhancing, extending and bringing people to the Woonasquatucket River Greenway."

Eagle Square in Olneyville, while improving the Greenway's urban/natural river interface.”² The Petitioner adds that her duties relative to the Greenway project included the management of funds from the Rhode Island Department of Transportation, Rhode Island Department of Environmental Management, local Capital Improvement Program and other grant sources, and the management of the team of consultants and project partners, including those from the Horsley Witten Group (Horsley)³ and the WRWC. The Petitioner states that the initial phase of the Greenway project included the design, engineering, and construction of the physical infrastructure of the greenway itself and that a ribbon cutting ceremony for its completion was held on June 15, 2026.

The Petitioner represents that on June 1, 2026, she began her new private employment with Horsley as a staff planner. The Petitioner states that Horsley has contracted with the WRWC to assist with the completion of a new, separate phase of the Greenway project led by WRWC that includes additional design for lighting, wayfinding, and public art opportunities. The Petitioner further states that her duties will be to lead project tasks including site analysis, visioning, evaluation of concepts, implementation planning and recommendations, and coordination of internal designers and external subconsultants for the Woonasquatucket Greenway placemaking, public art, lighting, wayfinding, and landscaping improvements. The Petitioner represents that this work will not include formal reviews or approvals required by the city's Department of Planning and Development. She notes that the city may review the plans for constructability, but she does not know at this time what other involvement, if any, the city may have in this phase of the project. The Petitioner adds that she will be working with the WRWC's design team, but she will not be appearing before the city, nor will she be required to sign anything that may be sent to the Department of Planning and Development. The Petitioner explains that she anticipates, though she is not certain, that there could be community meetings where she, in her new private capacity, and representatives of the city, possibly members of her former department, may be present to present information about this phase of the project and to answer any questions that the members of the public in attendance may have. Given this set of facts, the Petitioner seeks guidance from the Ethics Commission regarding whether she may participate in the project on behalf of her new employer and, if so permitted, what implications the Code of Ethics' revolving door prohibitions would have on her private work on the project during the one-year period following her severance from municipal employment.

The Code of Ethics prohibits a public employee from representing herself or any other person before any municipal agency by which she is employed. R.I. Gen. Laws § 36-14-

² See <https://www.providenceri.gov/city-of-providence-announces-woonasquatucket-river-greenway-improvement-project/> (last visited June 29, 2026).

³ The Petitioner describes Horsley as a private engineering, design, and environmental consulting firm.

5(e)(1) & (2). This prohibition extends for a period of one year after the public employee has officially severed her position with the agency. § 36-14-5(e)(4). The “revolving door” language of § 36-14-5(e) is designed to minimize any undue influence that a former employee may have over her former agency and colleagues by reason of her past employment there. Under the Code of Ethics, a person represents herself or another person before a municipal agency if she participates in the presentation of evidence or arguments before that agency for the purpose of influencing the judgment of the agency in her own favor or in favor of another person. R.I. Gen. Laws § 36-14-2(12) & (13); 520-RICR-00-00-1.1.4 Representing Oneself or Others, Defined (36-14-5016). A “person” is defined as an individual or business entity. § 36-14-2(7). Additionally, § 36-14-5(c) prohibits the use and/or disclosure of confidential information received through one’s public employment for pecuniary gain. Finally, the Code of Ethics also provides that a public employee shall not use her public office or confidential information received through her holding public office to obtain financial gain for herself, any person within her family, her business associate, or any business by which she is employed or which she represents. § 36-14-5(d).

The Ethics Commission has issued numerous advisory opinions interpreting § 36-14-5(e)(4)’s requirements with respect to former state and municipal employees interacting with their former agencies during the one-year period following the severance of their state or municipal employment. In Advisory Opinion 99-108, for example, the Ethics Commission opined that a former Cranston Department of Economic Development Director was prohibited from appearing or representing her private employer before the Department of Economic Development for a period of one year after she ended her employment with the city. The petitioner could, however, perform ministerial activities involving her former employer, such as hand-delivering documents, reviewing files, or other non-substantive activities. The Ethics Commission also opined that the revolving door restrictions did not extend to the petitioner having substantive involvement in matters before city divisions, agencies, or departments other than the Economic Development Department, provided that in her previous employment with the City of Cranston she did not exercise supervisory or policy-making authority within the particular division or agency. Lastly, the Ethics Commission noted that the petitioner was prohibited from using any confidential information obtained while working for the city for financial gain. See also A.O. 2018-50 (opining that the former director of the City of Central Falls Planning and Economic Development Department could participate in his private employer’s development/fundraising services to a multi-institutional collaborative effort across three communities, including Central Falls, provided that the petitioner did not utilize any confidential information obtained through his prior public employment and did not represent himself or others before the Central Falls Planning and Economic Development Department); A.O. 2008-62 (opining that a former social caseworker in the Long Term Care Unit within the Department of Human Services (DHS) was not prohibited from working as an independent contractor assisting a private attorney with the preparation of medical assistance applications on behalf of the attorney’s clients, given that the attorney was the one filing the applications with DHS, and provided that the petitioner did not have

any direct contact with or appear to represent the clients, the attorney, or anyone else, before DHS or any of its members or staff, for a period of one year after the date of her official severance from her position).

Here, considering the Petitioner's representations, and consistent with our past advisory opinions in this area, it is the opinion of the Ethics Commission that the Petitioner is not prohibited from working in her private capacity on the new phase of the Greenway project. However, the Petitioner is prohibited by the Code of Ethics from representing herself or others, including Horsley and/or the WRWC, or acting as an expert witness, before the Providence Department of Planning and Development for a period of one year following the severance of her employment with that department. Finally, the Petitioner may not use any confidential information she obtained while working for the city to obtain financial gain for herself or her new employer.

Notably, the revolving door provisions contained in § 36-14-5(e) are designed to minimize any undue influence that a current or a former employee may have over his or her current or former agency or colleagues by reason of his or her employment there. However, the prohibitions do not extend to the performance of ministerial acts, duties, or functions that are not substantive in nature, and do not involve agency decision-making. Examples of such ministerial interactions include, but are not limited to, hand-delivering documents, and requesting or reviewing public records.

On the other hand, when interpreting § 36-14-5(e)'s prohibitions as to acts which are other than ministerial, the Ethics Commission has previously advised public officials and employees that activities that would constitute representation generally include the presentation of information or arguments for the purpose of influencing the judgment of the agency on matters concerning themselves or others. For the instant Petitioner, such prohibited activities include, but are not limited to, attendance and participation in meetings between her former department and Horsley and/or the WRWC regarding the project,⁴ personal involvement in matters related to the Greenway project and substantive presentation or appearance before her former department on behalf of herself or others, acting as expert witnesses on behalf of Horsley and/or WRWC, submitting applications or other documents on her behalf or on behalf of others, including Horsley or WRWC bearing the Petitioner's signature. The Petitioner is cautioned that prohibited interactions are not limited to business meetings, and could occur at a restaurant, on the phone, in an email, or in any social or political gathering. It is the content of a discussion, rather than its venue,

⁴ These prohibitions would not apply to the Petitioner's participation, as an employee of Horsley, in community meetings, along with representatives of the city, including representatives of the Providence Department of Planning and Development, where such meetings are to present the project to members of the public and answer any potential questions they may have.

that is most relevant in applying the Code of Ethics' revolving door/post-employment restrictions.

Additionally, the revolving door restrictions do not extend to the Petitioner having substantive involvement in matters before city divisions, agencies, or departments other than the Providence Department of Planning and Development, provided that in her previous employment with the City of Providence she did not exercise supervisory or policy-making authority within the particular division or agency. Lastly, until the expiration of one year following the date of leaving her municipal employment, the Petitioner is advised, when in doubt, to seek further guidance from the Ethics Commission regarding the Code of Ethics' potential application to her interactions with her former department.

This Draft Opinion is strictly limited to the facts stated herein and relates only to the application of the Rhode Island Code of Ethics. An advisory opinion rendered by the Commission, until amended or revoked by a majority vote of the Commission, is binding on the Commission in any subsequent proceedings concerning the person who requested the opinion and who acted in reliance on it in good faith, unless material facts were omitted or misstated by the person in the request for the opinion. Under the Code of Ethics, advisory opinions are based on the representations made by, or on behalf of, a public official or employee and are not adversarial or investigative proceedings. Finally, this Commission offers no opinion on the effect that any other statute, regulation, agency policy, ordinance, constitutional provision, charter provision, or canon of judicial or professional ethics may have on this situation.

Code Citations:

§ 36-14-2(7)

§ 36-14-2(12)

§ 36-14-2(13)

§ 36-14-5(c)

§ 36-14-5(d)

§ 36-14-5(e)

520-RICR-00-00-1.1.4 Representing Oneself or Others, Defined (36-14-5016)

Related Advisory Opinions:

A.O. 2018-50

A.O. 2008-62

A.O. 99-108

Keywords:

Post-Employment

Revolving Door

RHODE ISLAND
ETHICS COMMISSION



ANNUAL EDUCATION REPORT

July 14, 2026

Respectfully submitted,

Lynne M. Radiches

Staff Attorney/Education Coordinator

LIVE ETHICS TRAINING – FY2026
SUMMARY

Totals:

Number of Trainings	Number of Training Hours	Number of Attendees
40	36	1,422

Breakdown by Month

Month	Trainings	Training Hours	Attendees	In-Person	ZOOM (Other)	Hybrid (In-Person & Zoom/Other)
July 2025	1	.5	42	0	1	0
August 2025	2	1.5	47	1	1	0
September 2025	6	5.5	231	3	2	1
October 2025	4	5	93	3	0	1
November 2025	3	2.5	99	2	1	0
December 2025	2	1.5	55	1	1	0
January 2026	8	8	380	8	0	0
February 2026	1	.5	26	0	1	0
March 2026	4	3.5	141	1	2	1
April 2026	2	1	43	0	2	0
May 2026	4	4	132	2	2	0
June 2026	3	2.5	133	2	1	0

Breakdown by Category

Category	Number of Trainings	Number of Attendees
Municipalities	10	299
State	18	769
New State Employees	11	341
Other	1	13

**Alphabetical Listing by Category of the Groups that Received
Live Ethics Training During FY2026**

Municipal

Central Falls Elected & Appointed Officials and Employees
Exeter Elected & Appointed Officials
Exeter Employees
Foster Elected & Appointed Officials
Johnston Elected & Appointed Officials
Little Compton Elected & Appointed Officials
North Kingstown Elected & Appointed Officials
North Kingstown Employees
Smithfield Elected & Appointed Officials
Warwick Housing Authority

State

Board of Elections
Board of Elections: Members, Municipal Boards of Canvassers & Employees of Rhode
Island Board of Elections (2)*
Cannabis Control Commission
Health Services Council
Health Source Rhode Island
Institute for Labor Studies & Research (ILSR) Ethics in Action Class (2)*
New State Employees (11)*
Rhode Island Commerce Corporation (2)*
Rhode Island Department of Transportation Employees (5)*
Rhode Island Division of Purchases
Rhode Island House of Representatives
Rhode Island Senate

Other

Rhode Island Municipal Purchasing Agents Association (RIMPAA)

*indicates number of trainings presented to a particular group

PRERECORDED ETHICS TRAINING SUMMARY

FY2026

(July 1, 2025 – June 30, 2026)

TOTAL: 729

Breakdown by Quarter:

Quarter 1 <i>July 1, 2025 – Sept. 30, 2025</i>	Quarter 2 <i>Oct. 1, 2025 – Dec. 31, 2025</i>	Quarter 3 <i>Jan. 1, 2026 – Mar. 31, 2026</i>	Quarter 4 <i>Apr. 1, 2026 – June 30, 2026</i>
48	N/A	475*	206
July 2025 - 8	Oct. 2025 - N/A	Jan. 2026 - 59	Apr. 2026 - 40
Aug. 2025 - 15	Nov. 2026 - N/A	Feb. 2026 - 13	May 2026 - 73
Sept. 2025 - 25	Dec. 2025 - N/A	March 2026 - 380	June 2026 - 93

*This number includes those trainings completed by an additional 13 municipal elected & appointed officials and employees and 10 state employees during FY2026-Q2. This information was unavailable at that time due to the state's transition to the Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) system in the fall of 2025.

NOTE:

Beginning in FY2026-Q3, reports continued to reflect the number of state employees who completed the prerecorded training through the RI Learning Center, as recorded by the state and reported to the education coordinator. However, reports now reflect the number of links to the training sent by the education coordinator to municipal employees and to municipal and state elected & appointed officials and members of boards, commissions, and agencies. At this time, the education coordinator has no way to determine whether someone to whom a link was provided completed the training. The presumption is that those to whom a link has been provided will complete the training.

**ETHICS-ON-DEMAND MADE AVAILABLE TO ALL
MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES**

On June 25, 2026, the education coordinator sent the following email to the mayors, managers, and/or administrators for each of Rhode Island's municipalities:

Hello,

I am contacting leaders from all Rhode Island municipalities in order to promote the completion of ethics training from the Rhode Island Ethics Commission by all municipal employees.

By watching this 30-minute PowerPoint at their computers, participants will be presented with information about the Ethics Commission and the Rhode Island Code of Ethics which sets forth standards of conduct for all Rhode Island state and municipal elected and appointed officials, employees, and members of state and local boards, commissions, and agencies.

Although live and in-person training from the Ethics Commission remains available upon request, offering municipal employees the option of taking the training at their computers as their public duties allow makes learning about the Code of Ethics by which they are bound more readily accessible.

Below is a link to the training. The PowerPoint does have a voiceover, so the volume should be up when an employee is watching it. Please distribute the link to all your municipal employees. If you have any questions or require additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me. Thank you!

<https://ethics.ri.gov/EthicsTrainingOnDemand>

Best,

Lynne M. Radiches

The circulation of the above email correspondence made the prerecorded ethics training available to more than 16,000 municipal employees. An estimated breakdown of the number of employees from each municipality for whom ethics training has been available appears on the next page.

ETHICS-ON-DEMAND

Municipality	Estimated Number of Employees
Barrington	300
Bristol	215
Burrillville	85
Central Falls	Information N/A
Charlestown	135
Coventry	40
Cranston	2,800
Cumberland	1,107
East Greenwich	155
East Providence	400
Exeter	44
Foster	45
Glocester	61
Hopkinton	55
Jamestown	62
Johnston	251
Lincoln	110
Little Compton	50
Middletown	197
Narragansett	180
New Shoreham	40
Newport	270
North Kingstown	280
North Providence	400
North Smithfield	70
Pawtucket	675
Portsmouth	32
Providence	6,000
Richmond	38
Scituate	65
Smithfield	210
South Kingstown	260
Tiverton	145
Warren	80
Warwick	884
West Greenwich	40
West Warwick	295
Westerly	422
Woonsocket	400
TOTAL	16,898