1 2	BEFORE THE TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON			
3 4 5 6 7 8	In the Matter of the Educator License of THOMAS JOHN SPOELHOF  DEFAULT ORDER OF REVOCATION OF RIGHT TO APPLY FOR LICENSURE			
9	On June 13, 2016, the Teacher Standards and Practices Commission (Commission)			
10	issued a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Thomas John Spoelhof (Spoelhof) in which			
11	the Commission charged him with Gross Neglect of Duty. The Notice was sent via U.S. First			
12	Class Mail and U.S. Certified Mail Receipt 7015 0640 0004 7539 7004 to the address on file			
13	with the Commission. The Notice designated the Commission file as the record for purposes			
14	of proving a prima facie case. The Certified Mail was not returned to the Commission. The			
15	first class mail was not returned to the Commission. The Notice of Opportunity of Hearing,			
16	dated June 13, 2016, and signed by Victoria Chamberlain, then Executive Director, stated:			
17 18 19 20 21 22 23	REASONABLE CONTROL. IF YOU DO NOT REQUEST A HEARING OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT A HEARING, THE COMMISSION WILL ADOPT AN ORDER OF DEFAULT WHICH MAY INCLUDE THE REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF YOUR LICENSE OR OTHER DISCIPLINE."			
24 25	the second secon			
26	default and enters the following findings of fact, conclusions of law, and final order, based			
27	and the second s			
28				
29	FINDINGS OF FACT			
30	1. Spoelhof been licensed as a teacher in Oregon since September 3, 2014. Spoelhof			
31	previously held an Initial Teaching License, with endorsements in Language Arts			
32	(HS, ML) and Social Studies (HS, ML), valid from September 3, 2014, through May			
33	16, 2016. During all relevant times, Spoelhof was employed by the North Clackamas			
34	School District.			
35				
36	2. On January 20, 2015, the Commission received a report from the North Clackamas			
37	School District alleging Spoelhof had violated professional standards. Investigation			

determined that on or about August 21, 2014, Spoelhof submitted an application for employment for a teaching position at the North Clackamas School District. Copies of Spoelhof's application show that Spoelhof answered "No" to pre-employment disclosure question number seven (7) that states, "Have you ever been placed on leave by your employer for any alleged misconduct". Spoelhof also answered "No" to pre-employment disclosure question number five (5) that states, "Have you ever left any educational or school related employment, voluntary or involuntary, while the subject of an inquiry, review or investigation of alleged misconduct and/or ever left educational or school related employment when you had reason to believe an investigation for misconduct was underway or imminent?"

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

3. On January 12, 2015, the Commission received correspondence from Spoelhof where 12 he indicated "it has recently been brought to my attention... that I may have 13 answered two of the Commission's application for licensure character questions 14 incorrectly when I applied for Oregon licensure on June 25, 2014". Based on 15 Spoelhoh's inaccurate application, a license was issued to Spoelhof on September 3, 16 2014. As a result of both the report from North Clackamas School District and 17 Spoelhof's own correspondence, a review of Spoelhof's application was conducted. 18 Review of Spoelhof's Commission application for licensure indicates that Spoelhof 19 answered "No" to character question number one (1) "Have you ever left any 20 educational or school related employment, voluntary or involuntary, while the 21 subject of an inquiry, review or investigation of alleged misconduct? Have you ever 22 left educational or school related employment when you had reason to believe an 23 investigation for misconduct was underway or imminent?" Spoelhof also answered 24 "No" to character question number three (3), "Have you ever been placed on leave 25 by your employer for any alleged misconduct?" 26

27

4. Investigation determined that on March 6, 2014, Spoelhof received a "written record of behavior" (equivalent to a written reprimand) from Spoelhof's then recent employer, Paw Paw Public Schools in Michigan. The letter states that prior to Spoelhof's resignation submitted on February 24, 2014, and effective March 5, 2014, Spoelhof was the subject of an investigation related to possible misconduct.

Investigators learned that as part of this investigation Spoelhof was placed on leave
by his employer on February 11, 2014, while an investigation was conducted to
determine if Spoelhof had engaged in an offense, infraction, or other misconduct
which could result in a disciplinary consequence. The subject of the investigation in
Michigan included allegations that Spoelhof had allowed a homeless, female student
to reside at Spoelhof's residence, overnight, and on multiple occasions.
5. Based on the above information, Spoelhof should have answered affirmatively to the
school district's pre-employment disclosure questions, numbers seven (7) and five
(5), and the Commission's application character questions, numbers one (1) and
three (3). Failure to do so constitutes misrepresentation and/or falsification of an
official document related to licensure and employment.
CONCLUSIONS OF LAW
Spoelhof's conduct described above constitutes gross neglect of duty in in violation of
ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0010(5)
(Use professional judgment), OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c) (Falsification of any document or
knowing misrepresentation directly related to licensure, employment, or professional
duties); and OAR 584-020-0040(4)(0) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0035(3)(a)
(Maintain the dignity of the profession by respecting and obeying the law, exemplifying
personal integrity and honesty).
The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS
342.175.
FINAL ORDER
The Commission hereby revokes Thomas John Spoelhof's right to apply for an
Oregon educator license.
Oregon educator license.  IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 30th day of September, 2016.

By:	Morica	Beans
<i>J</i> .	Monica Beane, Exe	cutive Director

## NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS

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.