

1 3. On July 12, 2011, Wells refused to be interviewed by the Commission regarding the
2 investigation into these matters.

3
4 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

5 Daniel Wells' conduct described in section #2 above constitutes gross neglect of duty in
6 violation of ORS 342.175(5)(1988), OAR 584-20-010(5) (1988) (*Use Professional Judgment*),
7 OAR 548-20-040(3)(m) (1988) as it incorporates OAR 584-20-035 (3)(a) (1988) (*Maintain the*
8 *dignity of the profession by respecting and obeying the law, exemplifying personal integrity*
9 *and honesty*), and OAR 584-20-040(3)(f)(1988) (*Any sexual contact with a student*).

10 Daniel Wells' conduct described in section #3 above, constitutes gross neglect of duty in
11 violation of OAR 584-020-0040(4)(p) (*Subject to the exercise of any legal right or privilege,*
12 *failure or refusal by an educator under investigation to respond to requests for information, to*
13 *furnish documents or to participate in interviews with a Commission representative relating*
14 *to a Commission investigation*).

15 The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS
16 342.175.

17 **FINAL ORDER**

18 The Commission hereby revokes the licensure of Daniel Charles Wells from the effective
19 date of this order.

20 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 20th day of September, 2012.

21 TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

22


23 By: _____
24 Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director
25
26
27

28 **NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS**

29
30 YOU ARE ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW MAY BE
31 OBTAINED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM THE SERVICE OF
32 THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW IS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF ORS 183.482 TO
33 THE OREGON COURT OF APPEALS.