

IN THE MATTER OF:) **FINAL ORDER**
)
DILLON D. DANIEL-HOFFMAN) OAH Case No. 2025-ABC-07220

Commission. The Commission called the following witnesses to testify: Mr. Daniel-Hoffman; Kim Kellogg, Associate Director of Secondary Programs at North Clackamas School District; William Ruehle, Director of Human Resources at North Clackamas School District; Geoff Gaydos, parent of a former student; and Casey Gaydos, parent of a former student. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman also testified on his own behalf, and he called the following witnesses to testify: Adrienne Cohen, math teacher and instructional coach at Milwaukie High School/Milwaukie Academy of the Arts; and Kaija Daniel-Hoffman, elementary school counselor, licensed clinical social worker, and Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's spouse. The record closed at the conclusion of the hearing on February 11, 2026.

ISSUES

1. Whether Mr. Daniel-Hoffman engaged in conduct that constituted gross neglect of duty. ORS 342.175(6) and OAR 584-020-0040(n) and (o).
2. Whether the Commission should sanction Mr. Daniel-Hoffman with a public reprimand and three years of probation with conditions. ORS 342.175(1) and ORS 342.177(3).

EVIDENTIARY RULINGS

Exhibits A1 through A11 and A13 through A16, offered by the Commission, and Exhibits R1 and R4 through R7, offered by Mr. Daniel-Hoffman, were admitted into the record without objection. The Commission withdrew Exhibit A12. Exhibits R2 and R3, offered by Mr. Daniel-Hoffman, were excluded due to lack of relevance.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman has been licensed by the Commission since 2011. (Ex. A8 at 1.) He currently holds a Professional Teaching License with endorsements in Advanced Mathematics (PK-12) and Legacy Middle Level (PK-12), effective December 13, 2022, through March 27, 2028. (*Id.* at 2.)

2. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman has the following experience as a teacher: advanced high school math teacher at Oregon City Service Learning Academy from August 2011 to August 2021; advanced high school math teacher at Milwaukie High School/Milwaukie Academy of the Arts in the North Clackamas School District (the District) from August 2021 to March 2024; and licensed advanced mathematics substitute teacher at the Oregon City School District from March 2024 to present. (Ex. R1 at 1; test. of Daniel-Hoffman.)

3. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman was nominated for the 2024-2025 Oregon Teacher of the Year through the Oregon Department of Education. (Ex. R4 at 1-2.) He was also nominated for the 2025-2026 Oregon Substitute Teacher of the Year. (Ex. R5 at 1.)

District Policies, Training, and Guidance

4. District staff receive annual training regarding District policies. (Test. of Ruehle; *see*

Ex. A15.) The District provides electronic copies of the policies to staff, and they must acknowledge each year that they have read and understood the policies. (Test. of Ruehle.)

5. The District's Staff and Volunteer – Student Relations policy provides, in part:

For the purpose of this policy “staff” or “staff member” includes district employees as well as volunteers. Staff will maintain the highest professional, moral and ethical standards in their conduct with students. The interactions and relationships between staff and students should be based upon mutual respect and trust; an understanding of the appropriate boundaries between adults and students in an educational setting; and consistent with the educational mission of district schools. Although staff should have a sincere interest in helping students succeed, partiality and the appearance of impropriety must be avoided. Excessive informal and/or social involvement with individual students is prohibited. Such conduct is not compatible with professional ethics and will not be tolerated.

Guidelines for Staff Behavior

Staff are expected to use good judgment in their relationships with students both inside and outside of the school context. Staff shall refrain from certain behaviors recognized as “boundary invading” behaviors that could lead to inappropriate staff-student relationships. Staff should maintain an appropriate professional student-staff relationship by:

1. Not demonstrating or expressing professionally inappropriate interest in a student's personal life;
2. Not accepting or giving or exchanging romantic or overly personal gifts or notes with a student;

* * * * *

4. Honoring appropriate adult boundaries with students in conduct and conversations at all times. Staff shall promote the equal treatment of all students and shall not have “special” relationships with a particular student.

a. For example, but not limited to, staff shall not:

- (1) Favor students by giving them special privileges, exchanging gifts or other favors or having secrets with students;

* * * * *

(8) Inviting individual students to the staff member's personal home without proper chaperones;

(9) Going to the student's home without parent/guardian supervision;

(10) Use e-mail, text-messaging, or instant messaging to discuss personal topics or interests with individual students[.]

(Ex. A14 at 1-2.)

6. The District's Personal Electronic Devices and Social Media – Staff policy provides, in part:

All electronic communications with students shall be appropriate and professional. When possible, all electronic communication should utilize district email. Any other electronic method of communication shall include at least three (3) people total or the subject and method of the communication shall be shared with the staff member's supervisor in a timely manner. Repeated private communications with the same student(s) may be investigated for evidence of potential grooming behavior or other sexual conduct, and may result in a report to TSPC or ODE for further investigation.

(Ex. A14 at 3.)

7. During Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's employment with the District, he took the following courses that included the topic of appropriate teacher-student relations: Homeless Education – Serving Students under McKinney-Vento; Sexual Harassment; Sexual Misconduct in Oregon; Bullying Prevention in Oregon Schools; and Abuse, Sexual Conduct and Appropriate Communication in Oregon. (Ex. A16 at 1; test. of Ruehle.)

8. As an education professional, teachers bear the responsibility to understand and maintain professional boundaries with students. The purpose of the requirement to maintain professional boundaries is to avoid developing unhealthy relationships with students. (Test. of Ruehle.)

9. On January 12, 2022, the school principal, Ms. Kellogg, met with Mr. Daniel-Hoffman to discuss concerns she had regarding his performance. She noted that he had a "big heart[.]" wanted "the best for kids[.]" and worked "really hard to make connections and build relationships with students." (Ex. A1 at 1.) Ms. Kellogg advised him, "There is a line between teacher and friend[.] and you can't be their friend." (*Id.* at 2.)

10. During the 2022/2023 school year, Ms. Kellogg and Mr. Daniel-Hoffman had a standing weekly meeting to discuss any issues that arose in the classroom or with students. They

also spoke of maintaining professional boundaries, including with the use of emails. (Test. of Kellogg.)

11. During the 2023/2024 school year, Ms. Kellogg and Mr. Daniel-Hoffman had additional conversations regarding professional boundaries with students. (Test. of Kellogg.)

Emails to Student

12. During the period December 2021 to January 2024, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman and a female student, “SG,” exchanged more than 100 emails. (Exs. A9 and A10.) SG was a freshman student in a math class taught by Mr. Daniel-Hoffman in the 2021/2022 school year. (Test. of Daniel-Hoffman.)

13. The emails were sent from and to Mr. Daniel-Hoffman’s personal and school district email addresses and did not include other recipients. The emails were friendly and informal, and they included discussions on various personal topics, including activities outside of school, links to songs and music-related videos, and photographs of Mr. Daniel-Hoffman’s family. (Exs. A9 at 1-5; A10 at 1-60.) In multiple emails, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman suggested that SG stop by his classroom or indicated that he looked forward to hearing more about their email discussions in-person. (See Ex. A10 at 5, 6, 9, 20, 23, 25, 38, 56 .)

14. On June 25, 2022, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman emailed SG to invite her and her parents to a bake and garage sale at his family’s residence. (Ex. A10 at 21-22.)

15. On September 12, 2023, SG emailed Mr. Daniel-Hoffman to thank him for a “little cake thing” he gave her. (Ex. A10 at 42.)

Visit to Student’s Residence

16. In May 2022, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman was confronted in his classroom by an angry and screaming parent.¹ The incident disturbed him, and he had a “mental breakdown” the next day. (Ex. A4 at 10.) As a result, he took some time off work, and while he was off work, other teachers informed him that students were spreading rumors about him regarding the incident. (*Id.*) He felt overwhelmed and unsafe at the school. (Test. of Daniel-Hoffman.)

17. On or about May 21, 2022, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman decided to go to SG’s residence, believing that if he explained the “basic facts” of the incident with the angry parent, SG could get other students to “stop causing problems[.]” (Ex. A4 at 10-11.) He arrived at SG’s residence without giving notice to SG, her parents, or the District. (Ex. A13 at 4-5; test. of G. Gaydos, C. Gaydos, Daniel-Hoffman.) SG’s father was home and was “surprised” by Mr. Daniel-Hoffman’s visit. (Test. of G. Gaydos.) SG’s father invited Mr. Daniel-Hoffman inside because he appeared upset. (*Id.*) Mr. Daniel-Hoffman explained the school incident to SG’s father, stating that the angry parent could have had a gun, and encouraged the father to speak to other parents about

¹ The angry parent’s son was “pantsed” by other children at school. The parent was upset about something Mr. Daniel-Hoffman said to her son when Mr. Daniel-Hoffman attempted to aid the child. (Ex. A4 at 10.)

school safety. SG's mother and SG came home while Mr. Daniel-Hoffman was still there. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman still appeared distraught and told them that he had not slept for days. He also asked SG's mother to speak to other parents about school safety, and he tried to convince SG to raise awareness about the incident amongst the students. (Ex. A13 at 3-5.) During their conversation, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman stated, "I really shouldn't be here, I could get fired." (*Id.* at 5; test. of G. Gaydos, C. Gaydos.) Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's visit to SG's residence lasted approximately one to two hours. (Ex. A13 at 5; test. of G. Gaydos.)

18. SG's parents felt awkward about the visit because they did not know Mr. Daniel-Hoffman very well, and SG was "a little in shock" that he came to her home. (Ex. A13 at 3-4.)

Interactions with Students at School

19. At least during the 2023/2024 school year, SG and a few other female students ate lunch in Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's classroom approximately every other day. During lunch, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman either sat at his desk or was in and out of the classroom while performing various tasks. At times, he would join the students' conversations and ask them questions about personal matters, such as how they are doing. (Ex. A13 at 2, 6-7; test. of Daniel-Hoffman.)

20. SG and Mr. Daniel-Hoffman regularly visited with each other in his classroom when others were not present and talked about personal matters, such as happenings in their lives and family matters.² (Ex. A13 at 2.)

21. During the period September 2023 to January 2024, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman hugged female students and visited SG in another teacher's classroom to deliver chocolates for her birthday, which was something that he did not do for all students. The District Administration received reports of the conduct. (Ex. A7 at 1; test. of Kellogg.)

22. On January 25, 2024, Ms. Kellogg met with Mr. Daniel-Hoffman to discuss concerns regarding his conduct. (Ex. A2; test. of Kellogg.) She provided him with the following written directives to maintain professional boundaries with students and limit distractions to other teachers' classrooms:

- Limit physical contact with students to what is required for your position as a classroom teacher. Ensure that any physical contact is appropriate, professional, and necessary for educational purposes.
- Limit gift giving to students to items that you would give to all of your students. Avoid personalized or selective gift-giving to maintain a fair and inclusive environment.
- Do not enter other teachers' classrooms during class time to

² The record is unclear regarding how long they engaged in this practice. In an email sent on March 2, 2022, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman suggested that SG stop by his class for a "recap." (Ex. A10 at 5.) This suggests that their conversations in his classroom had been occurring to some extent since at least that date.

communicate with students unless you have obtained prior approval from the respective teacher. For emergencies requiring communication with a student, utilize the main office staff.

- Limit communication with students while they are in other teachers' classrooms to avoid creating distractions. Minimize disruptions to other teachers' lessons and utilize appropriate channels for communication.
- Refrain from dancing or engaging in other distracting activities outside of other teachers' classrooms unless it is part of a pre-approved and agreed-upon activity with the involved teacher. Maintain a professional and focused environment in shared spaces.
- This information and/or directives are not to be discussed with students.

It's essential to comprehend that these directives and this meeting are designed to safeguard you. As a male teacher in a high school, maintaining robust professional boundaries, particularly with your female students, is crucial for your protection. These directives are crafted to assist you in navigating and upholding these boundaries effectively.

(Ex. A2 at 1.)

23. After the meeting on January 25, 2024, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman encountered the group of female students, including SG, eating lunch in his classroom. (Ex. A13 at 1; test. of Daniel-Hoffman, Kellogg.) He appeared troubled, and they asked him if he was "okay." (Test. of Daniel-Hoffman.) He told the students that Ms. Kellogg had talked to him about maintaining professional boundaries with students and how his behaviors could be construed as grooming. He also informed the students about the list of directives. (Test. of Daniel-Hoffman, Kellogg; Ex. A13 at 1, 6-8.) At the end of lunch, SG asked Mr. Daniel-Hoffman if she could have a piece of candy. As he handed her the candy, he stated, "I am not grooming you." (Ex. A13 at 1, 8; test. of Daniel-Hoffman.)

District Investigation

24. In early February 2024, the District received a report that Mr. Daniel-Hoffman went to SG's house during his first year of employment. The District began investigating Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's conduct. (Test. of Kellogg; Ex. A13.)

25. On February 8, 2024, the District placed Mr. Daniel-Hoffman on paid administrative leave pending the outcome of the investigation into "potential boundary issues concerning [his] interactions with a student." (Ex. A3 at 1.)

26. On February 21, 2024, the District sent Mr. Daniel-Hoffman a Pre-Dismissal Meeting Notice, notifying him that the District was considering dismissing him for violating the

district policies regarding staff and student relations and personal electronic devices and social media. The pre-dismissal meeting was set for February 22, 2024. (Ex. A5 at 1-2.) In a subsequent letter, the District informed Mr. Daniel-Hoffman that it planned to recommend his immediate dismissal and that he could resign before being dismissed. (*Id.* at 3.)

27. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman resigned from his position in lieu of being dismissed. (Test. of Daniel-Hoffman, Ruehle.)

28. On March 1, 2024, the District filed a School District Misconduct Report with the Commission regarding Mr. Daniel-Hoffman. (Ex. A6 at 1-2.)

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman engaged in conduct that constituted gross neglect of duty.
2. The Commission should sanction Mr. Daniel-Hoffman with a public reprimand and three years of probation with conditions.

OPINION

The Commission proposes to discipline Mr. Daniel-Hoffman based on allegations that he engaged in conduct constituting gross neglect of duty. As the proponent of the allegations, the Commission has the burden to establish, by a preponderance of the evidence, that the allegations are correct and that it should impose the proposed discipline. ORS 183.450(2) (“The burden of presenting evidence to support a fact or position in a contested case rests on the proponent of the fact or position”); *Reguero v. Teachers Standards and Practices Commission*, 312 Or 402, 418 (1991) (burden is on Commission in disciplinary action); *Dixon v. Board of Nursing*, 291 Or App 207, 213 (2018) (in administrative actions, burden of proof is by a preponderance of the evidence). Proof by a preponderance of the evidence means that the fact finder is persuaded that the facts asserted are more likely than not true. *Riley Hill General Contractor v. Tandy Corp.*, 303 Or 390, 402 (1987).

Gross Neglect of Duty

ORS 342.175(6) provides:

Violation of rules adopted by the commission relating to competent and ethical performance of professional duties shall be admissible as evidence of gross neglect of duty or gross unfitness.

OAR 584-020-0040(4) provides, in pertinent part:

Gross neglect of duty is any serious and material inattention to or breach of professional responsibilities. The following may be admissible as evidence of gross neglect of duty. Consideration may include but is not limited to:

* * * * *

(n) Substantial deviation from professional standards of competency set forth in OAR 584-020-0010 through 584-020-0030;

(o) Substantial deviation from professional standards of ethics set forth in OAR 584-020-0035[.]

In OAR chapter 584, division 20, the Commission promulgated administrative rules to define standards for the competent and ethical performance of the professional duties of Oregon educators. OAR 584-020-0010, titled “The Competent Educator,” provides, in pertinent part:

The educator demonstrates a commitment to:

(1) Recognize the worth and dignity of all persons and respect for each individual;

* * * * *

(5) Use professional judgment[.]

OAR 584-020-0025, titled “Management Skills,” provides, in pertinent part:

(2) The competent teacher demonstrates skills in:

(a) Establishing and maintaining classroom management that is conducive to learning;

* * * * *

(e) Using district lawful and reasonable rules and regulations.

OAR 584-020-0030, titled “Human Relations and Communications,” provides, in pertinent part:

(2) The competent teacher demonstrates:

* * * * *

(b) Skill in communicating with administrators, students, staff, parents, and other patrons.

OAR 584-020-0035, titled “The Ethical Educator,” provides, in pertinent part:

The ethical educator is a person who accepts the requirements of membership in the teaching profession and acts at all times in ethical

ways. In so doing the ethical educator considers the needs of the students, the district, and the profession.

(1) The ethical educator, in fulfilling obligations to the student, will:

* * * * *

(c) Maintain an appropriate professional student-educator relationship by:

(A) Not demonstrating or expressing professionally inappropriate interest in a student's personal life;

(B) Not accepting or giving or exchanging romantic or overly personal gifts or notes with a student;

* * * * *

(D) Honoring appropriate adult boundaries with students in conduct and conversations at all times.

Emailing a Student

The Commission alleges that Mr. Daniel-Hoffman engaged in conduct constituting gross neglect of duty pursuant to OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) and (o) when he exchanged numerous emails with a student using his school district and personal email accounts. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman does not dispute the allegations.

The evidence establishes that Mr. Daniel-Hoffman exchanged numerous private emails with SG during the period December 2021 through January 2024. In the emails, they discussed personal topics, such as music, family, and activities outside of school. Additionally, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman invited SG and her parents to attend a bake and garage sale at his residence. These communications raise significant concerns over appropriate teacher-student boundaries, demonstrating Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's lack of professional judgment in fostering a relationship with a student that was more akin to a friendship. Accordingly, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman violated OAR 584-020-0010(5).

By emailing SG, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman disobeyed the District's reasonable Personal Electronic Devices and Social Media – Staff policy, which requires electronic communications with students to be appropriate and professional, the utilization of district email, and the inclusion of at least three people on the communication. Additionally, he disobeyed the District's Staff and Volunteer – Student Relations policy, which prohibits staff from demonstrating professionally inappropriate interest in a student's personal life and failing to honor appropriate adult boundaries with students in conduct and conversations at all times. The emails included discussions of SG's personal life and demonstrated that Mr. Daniel-Hoffman failed to maintain appropriate adult boundaries due to the informal and overly friendly nature of

the communications. Accordingly, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman violated OAR 584-020-0025(2)(e) by his failure to comply with the District's reasonable rules and regulations.

Portions of the District's Staff and Volunteer – Student Relations policy mirror the language in OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(A) (not demonstrating or expressing professionally inappropriate interest in a student's personal life) and OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(D) (honoring appropriate adult boundaries with students in conduct and conversations at all times). Accordingly, by his multiple discussions of personal matters with a student, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's conduct also violated OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(A) and (D).

As shown above, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's electronic communications with a student violated the ethical and competency standards of an educator. Pursuant to ORS 342.175(6) and OAR 584-020-0040(4), his conduct constituted gross neglect of duty.³

Visit to Student's Residence

The Commission alleges that Mr. Daniel-Hoffman went to a student's residence on May 21, 2022, without providing notice to the student, the student's parents, or the District. The Commission further alleges that during the visit, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman "appeared visibly distraught," stated that he "hadn't slept in days," discussed an incident involving a disturbed parent at the school, expressed that he "did not feel safe," encouraged the student's parents to advocate for staff at the school, and stated, "I really shouldn't be here, I could get fired." Amended Notice at 3. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman did not dispute the allegations.

By arriving at SG's residence without giving notice to SG, SG's parents, or the District, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman failed to show respect for the individuals involved. His visit made the student and her parents uncomfortable and was contrary to the expectations of the District. Accordingly, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman violated OAR 584-020-0010(1).

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman demonstrated a lack of skill in communicating as a teacher with the student and her parents. His discussion with SG and her parents was unrelated to his position as a teacher to SG. Additionally, his statements regarding lack of sleep and risk of termination were personal in nature and put undue pressure on SG and her family. Furthermore, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman failed to honor appropriate adult boundaries with SG by appearing unexpectedly at her residence and by bringing his personal concerns to her attention. Accordingly, he violated OAR 584-02-0030(2)(b) and OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(D).

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman disobeyed the District's Staff and Volunteer-Student Relations policy regarding having a proper chaperone present when going to a student's residence because he appeared without giving notice and could not have known who was present. Accordingly, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman violated OAR 584-020-0025(2)(e) by his failure to comply with the District's reasonable rules and regulations.

³ The Commission removed a footnote from the Proposed Order that refers to a rule that the Commission is not relying on in this final order. This modification does not affect the reasoning or outcome in this case.

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman failed to use professional judgment by appearing unexpectedly at the student's residence, while in a distraught state, to discuss his personal concerns regarding school safety. Accordingly, he violated OAR 584-020-0010(5).

As shown above, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's visit to a student's residence violated the ethical and competency standards of an educator. Pursuant to ORS 342.175(6) and OAR 584-020-0040(4), his conduct constituted gross neglect of duty.⁴

Interactions with Students in the School

The Commission alleges that Mr. Daniel-Hoffman violated professional standards of competency and ethics by engaging in the following conduct: discussing directives to not violate student boundaries given to him by the District administration; giving a piece of candy to a student and stating, "I am not grooming you," in front of other students; having check-ins with a female student without others present, during which they discussed personal topics; initiating hugs with a female student; permitting a group of female students to have lunch in his classroom and inserting himself into their conversations on personal topics; giving candy and/or desserts to a female student without also providing them to other students. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman does not dispute that he engaged in the conduct.

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman demonstrated professionally inappropriate interest in students' personal lives by engaging in conversations on personal topics with SG and the other students who ate lunch in his classroom. This conduct violated OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(A). Additionally, he failed to honor appropriate adult boundaries with students by informing a group of students of the District's directives given to him regarding maintaining professional boundaries, hugging students, and developing a friendly relationship with SG. Accordingly, his conduct violated OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(D).

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman singled out SG by giving her a birthday gift and candy without providing the same gifts to other students. Accordingly, he violated OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(B).

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman disobeyed the District's Staff and Volunteer – Student Relations policy regarding demonstrating inappropriate interest in students' personal lives, giving overly personal gifts to a student, and honoring appropriate adult boundaries with students. Accordingly, he violated OAR 584-020-0025(2)(e) by his failure to comply with the District's reasonable rules and regulations. His conduct also demonstrated a lack of professional judgment by crossing professional boundaries with the students in violation of OAR 584-020-0010(5).

As shown above, Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's interactions with students violated the ethical and competency standards of an educator. Pursuant to ORS 342.175(6) and OAR 584-020-0040(4), his conduct constituted gross neglect of duty.

⁴ The Commission removed a footnote from the Proposed Order that refers to a rule that the Commission is not relying on in this final order. This modification does not affect the reasoning or outcome in this case.

Discipline

ORS 342.175(1) provides, in pertinent part:

The Teacher Standards and Practices Commission may suspend or revoke the license or registration of a teacher or administrator, discipline a teacher or administrator, or suspend or revoke the right of any person to apply for a license or registration, if the licensee, registrant or applicant has held a license or registration at any time within five years prior to issuance of the notice of charges under ORS 339.390 or 342.176 based on the following:

* * * * *

(b) Gross neglect of duty[.]

ORS 342.177(3) provides, in pertinent part:

* * * If the decision of the commission is that the charge described in ORS 342.175 (1) has been proven, the commission may take any or all of the following disciplinary action against the person charged:

(a) Issue a public reprimand.

(b) Place the person on probation for a period not to exceed four years and subject to such conditions as the commission considers necessary.

(c) Suspend the license or registration of the teacher or administrator for a period not to exceed one year.

(d) Revoke the license or registration of the teacher or administrator.

(e) Revoke the right to apply for a license or registration.

Based on Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's conduct that constituted gross neglect of duty, the Commission has the authority under ORS 342.177(3) to take disciplinary action against him. The Commission proposes to issue Mr. Daniel-Hoffman a public reprimand and place him on probation for three years with conditions, specifically that he complete Commission-approved training on professional boundaries. Mr. Daniel-Hoffman contends that the proposed public reprimand is too harsh, will negatively affect his career as a teacher, and shame him and his family. Additionally, he asserts that a public reprimand is redundant because he is required to report the reasons for his 2024 administrative leave and resignation from the District when he applies for teaching positions. He also argues that the conduct at issue occurred multiple years ago and that he has since demonstrated the ability to conform his conduct to the standards of competency and ethics in his substitute teaching position.

Mr. Daniel-Hoffman engaged in concerning conduct with a student from approximately

December 2021 to January 2024. The conduct at issue involved his ongoing failure to maintain professional boundaries with a student despite simultaneously receiving training and one-on-one guidance on professional boundaries from the District. Nevertheless, he continued to engage in behaviors that breached the District's policies and constituted a breach of his professional responsibilities as a teacher, demonstrating either an unwillingness or inability to conform his conduct to those policies and standards.

Given the extent of Mr. Daniel-Hoffman's misconduct, the Commission's proposed public reprimand and three years of probation, with the condition that he receives training on professional boundaries, is appropriate.

FINAL ORDER

For the foregoing reasons, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission issue the following order:

Dillon D. Daniel-Hoffman shall receive a public reprimand and three years of probation with the condition to complete Commission-approved training on professional boundaries.

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 2 day of July, 2026.

TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

By: _____

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Rachel Alpert". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Rachel Alpert, Executive Director

YOU ARE ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW MAY BE OBTAINED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM THE SERVICE OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW IS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF ORS 183.482 TO THE OREGON COURT OF APPEALS