



## CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

On May 9<sup>th</sup>, 2012, I mailed the foregoing Final Order in OAH Case No. 1102306 to:

By: First Class Mail and email


Ralph E. Wisner  
Attorney at Law  
1 Centerpointe Drive, Suite 570  
Lake Oswego OR 97035

Cally McKenzie  
Personnel Director  
Phoenix-Talent School District  
PO Box 698  
Phoenix OR 97535

By: Shuttle

Office of Administrative Hearings  
4600 25<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Suite 140  
Salem OR 97301

Judith Anderson  
Assistant Attorney General  
Department of Justice  
1162 Court Street NE  
Salem OR 97301-4096

  
Melody Hanson  
Director of Professional Practices



procedures by submitting student transcripts to TSPC without prior written consent from the students or their legal guardians. ORS 342.175(1)(b) and OAR 584-020-0025(2)(c).

4. If any of the above violations are established, what is the appropriate sanction?

### **EVIDENTIARY RULING**

Exhibits A1 through A4, offered by TSPC, were admitted into the record without objection. Mr. Hagler offered Exhibits R1 through R48. Exhibits R1, R5 through R17, R24, R28 through R34, R39 through R42, R44, R46 and R47 were admitted into the record without objection. Mr. Hagler withdrew Exhibits R20, R23, R25 through R27, R35, and R43.

TSPC objected to Exhibits R1 through R4, and Exhibit R36 as irrelevant. The objection was sustained as to Exhibit R36, and that Exhibit was not admitted into evidence. The objections were overruled with regard to Exhibits R1 through R4 and those Exhibits were admitted into evidence.

TSPC also objected to Exhibits R18 and R19 as irrelevant. Those objections were taken under advisement. The exhibits are copies of Circuit Court complaints involving litigation against the Phoenix-Talent School District. Mr. Hagler offered the exhibits, along with testimony from the attorney who filed the complaints, in support of his contention that the School District retaliated against him for cooperating in those lawsuits. However, Mr. Hagler presented no evidence to demonstrate that the School District was aware of his involvement in those cases. Mr. Hagler was not a party to the lawsuits and his name does not appear in the pleadings. TSPC's objections are sustained and Exhibits R18 and R19 are not admitted into evidence.

TSPC also objected to Exhibits R38 and R39 as irrelevant. Those objections were taken under advisement. Exhibit R38 is a letter, dated September 17, 2010, from Mr. Hagler's optometrist regarding an eye condition. Exhibit R39 is a letter from a co-worker vouching for Mr. Hagler's honesty and judgment. However, the letter states that the co-worker was not familiar with the facts of the allegations against Mr. Hagler. Neither letter is relevant to the present case. The objections are therefore sustained and Exhibits R38 and R39 are not admitted into evidence.

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

1. Joseph Hagler has been a licensed Oregon teacher since 1979. Since that time, he has taught at Phoenix High School in Phoenix, Oregon. Throughout his career, he has taught physical education, health and American history. He has also served as a coach for school wrestling, football, and baseball teams. (Ex. R1 at 1; test. of Hagler.)

2. On September 25, 2007, Mr. Hagler filed four complaints with the TSPC concerning the conduct of four Phoenix-Talent School District administrators in connection with the school's football and wrestling programs. Mr. Hagler alleged that the school district had allowed academically ineligible students to participate in both wrestling and football. In addition, he

alleged that the wrestling coach had encouraged players to use techniques that included grabbing the crotch and anus of opponents to gain an advantage. Mr. Hagler considered these techniques to be a form of sexual abuse. (Test. of Hagler; Ex. R21.)

3. TSPC maintains a complaint form on its website to allow individuals to file complaints against licensed school personnel. The form asks the person filing the complaint to attach a "list of relevant evidence" and to "[e]nclose documentation if available." (Ex. R24.)

4. When Mr. Hagler filed his complaints on September 25, 2007, he enclosed a copy of four student transcripts that, he asserted, demonstrated that the students were academically ineligible to participate in school athletic programs. Mr. Hagler did not get permission from the students or their legal guardians before submitting the transcripts to TSPC. (Test. of Hagler.)

5. Kelly Rasmussen is a prominent business man and civic leader in Medford, Oregon. Mr. Rasmussen is also Mr. Hagler's cousin. Although the two gentlemen had a close relationship as children, as of November 2008 they had not seen each other for several years. Mr. Hagler, who served as Mr. Rasmussen's best man at his wedding, was upset that Mr. Rasmussen had left his wife and was seeking a divorce. As a result, in 2008 Mr. Hagler did not want any contact with Mr. Rasmussen. (Test. of Hagler; test. of Rasmussen.)

6. Mr. Rasmussen was arrested on October 21, 2008 and was charged with multiple felonies, including charges of online sexual corruption of a child, in violation of ORS 163.432 and 163.433, and luring a minor, in violation of ORS 167.057. The charges stemmed from allegations that Mr. Rasmussen had been communicating with two individuals who described themselves as young girls, one age 11 and the other age 13. Law enforcement also alleged that Mr. Rasmussen had traveled to Clackamas County, Oregon with the intent to meet the girls. Both girls, however, were fictitious identities used by law enforcement personnel who were conducting a sting operation to identify potential online sexual predators. As a result of the sting operation, law enforcement arrested Mr. Rasmussen at the location where he had arranged to meet the fictitious 13-year-old girl. (Ex. A3.)

7. Mr. Rasmussen's arrest received significant media attention. The arrest was covered on local television and news websites. (Test. of McKenzie.) It was also the subject of a front-page story in the Medford Mail Tribune, the local newspaper. The story included a prominently displayed photograph of Mr. Rasmussen. (Test. of Hagler.)

8. On the first day that the story about Mr. Rasmussen's arrest was published, a colleague handed a copy of the newspaper to Mr. Hagler as they passed one another in the hall. The colleague told Mr. Hagler that he should see the story. Based on the colleague's expression, Mr. Hagler could tell that the story was bad news. (Test. of Hagler.)

9. Mr. Hagler subscribes to the Medford Mail Tribune, but typically retrieves it from his mailbox after he gets home from work. He generally avoids reading anything in the paper other than the sports section. Mr. Hagler does not watch television news, other than "Sportscenter" on ESPN. In 2008, Mr. Hagler did not have a personal computer in his home and did not read news websites. Mr. Hagler does not socialize much with adults. He attends a large church, but

generally sits alone and does not talk about issues other than those related to the church. (Test. of Hagler.)

10. Approximately two weeks after his arrest, Mr. Rasmussen sent out a text to approximately 50 people, including Mr. Hagler. The text did not refer to his arrest, but stated something to the effect that "all is well." (Test. of Rasmussen.) Mr. Hagler responded to the text and the two men spoke on the phone shortly afterward. Mr. Rasmussen did not discuss his arrest or his legal problems and Mr. Hagler did not ask him about those issues. (*Id.*) Mr. Hagler believed that Mr. Rasmussen sounded depressed. Mr. Hagler told Mr. Rasmussen that he should exercise and offered to help him with a workout routine. They also discussed attending a high-school football game together. Mr. Hagler asked Mr. Rasmussen if that would be permissible. Mr. Rasmussen asked Mr. Hagler why he was asking the question. Mr. Hagler told him that he had seen his picture in the paper and thought there could be a problem. Mr. Rasmussen told Mr. Hagler that his only restriction was that he could not be around a computer. Mr. Hagler then invited Mr. Rasmussen to work out at the school weight room after school hours. Mr. Rasmussen accepted the offer. (Test. of Hagler.)

11. Mr. Rasmussen went to Phoenix High School on November 10, 2008 to work out with Mr. Hagler. After arriving, Mr. Rasmussen began walking to the weight room and was met along the way by Mr. Hagler. Mr. Hagler unlocked the door to let them both in to the room. There were several students present in the room, but no other adults. The door to the weight room is always locked and students may only enter if let in by a teacher. Students are normally not allowed to exercise in the room without adult supervision. After entering the room, Mr. Hagler assisted Mr. Rasmussen with his work out, and also observed and supervised students in the room. Mr. Hagler never left the room while Mr. Rasmussen was present, but occasionally left him alone at an exercise station so that Mr. Hagler could observe and assist students. (Test. of Hagler.)

12. Mr. Rasmussen was in the weight room for approximately 20 to 40 minutes. He left, alone, through a door that took him outside near a running track and then walked to his car. As he left, he saw Brent Barry, a friend and school administrator, in the parking lot. The two men acknowledged each other, but did not have a conversation. Mr. Rasmussen then got into his car and left the school grounds. (Test. of Rasmussen.)

13. Shortly after Mr. Rasmussen left the school, Mr. Barry sent an e-mail to District administrators to let them know that Mr. Rasmussen had been there. (Ex. R29.)

14. Cally McKenzie, the District's human resource director, interviewed Mr. Hagler on November 12, 2008 regarding Mr. Rasmussen's presence in the weight room. (Ex. A1.) Bradford Jones accompanied Mr. Hagler as a representative of the Oregon Education Association. Mr. Jones and Mr. Hagler did not talk about the incident with Mr. Rasmussen prior to the meeting. (Test. of Jones.) Ms. McKenzie made an audio recording of the interview and later had it transcribed. (Exs. A1 (transcript) and R47 (audio recording).)

15. Early in the interview, Ms. McKenzie asked Mr. Hagler if he was aware of the allegations against Mr. Rasmussen. The following exchange then took place:

MR. HAGLER: I am aware of, kind of what the paper said, yeah. I didn't read all of it, but I did read enough to know that he's gotten himself in trouble.

MS. MCKENZIE: Okay, so you know that that includes in engaging [*sic*] in sexual explicit online communications with what he believed was an 11-year-old girl and a 13-year-old girl and he made arrangements to meet them in Portland and --

MR. HAGLER: [Interposing] That's not what I've heard. I just heard that he arranged to meet with them and that's all. There wasn't anything about the conversation that went on between them.

MS. MCKENZIE: Okay, but you know that these charges that he was arrested for allegedly trying to meet with an 11-year-old girl and a 13-year-old girl in Portland. He was arrested and arranged and --

MR. HAGLER: [Interposing] Yes, yes.

MS. MCKENZIE: -- that's all pending and all that kind of stuff.

MR. HAGLER: Yes.

(Ex. A1 at 2.)

16. Later in the interview, Mr. Hagler acknowledged that he allowed Mr. Rasmussen to work out in the school weight room when students were present. Mr. Hagler stated that another teacher was in the weight room when he first entered, but that she left shortly afterward, leaving approximately six students in the room with Mr. Hagler and Mr. Rasmussen. (Ex. A1 at 3-4.) Ms. McKenzie then questioned Mr. Hagler as follows:

MS. MCKENZIE: Considering the charges that are pending against him, that you're aware of, and I realize they have not been resolved, but there are some pretty intense bad charges and they are specifically against children, sexual crimes against children. Did you think it was a good idea to allow him in the weight room when our students are in there?

MR. HAGLER: I was not aware of those charges, I just thought it was computer stuff that --

\* \* \* \* \*

MS. MCKENZIE: [Interposing] But, I'm talking about at a school, our school with our students, I'm asking you -- so you're saying to me you didn't know these were sexual crimes against kids that you missed everything in the media and the news and the newspaper and --

[Crosstalk]

MR. HAGLER: -- anything said anything about sexual things. Like I said, I just know that he went to somebody's house and some policeman had picked him up there. Now whether he, you know, he said he didn't do anything. He said, you know, this is something that he was in Portland, he had flown to Portland or you know, I'm not really sure. I just know that he was in a real bad way and I would never do anything to endanger any student of mine.

(*Id.* at 4-5.)

17. On November 26, 2008, Ms. McKenzie issued a written reprimand to Mr. Hagler for allowing Mr. Rasmussen to work out in the school weight room with students present. The reprimand also stated that Mr. Hagler had not been forthright in the answers he gave during the November 12, 2008 interview. (Ex. A2.)

18. On October 5, 2010, TSPC investigator Jeffrey Van Laanen interviewed Mr. Hagler at the TSPC offices in Salem, Oregon. Mr. Hagler was accompanied by his attorney. During the interview, Mr. Hagler stated that, prior to November 10, 2008, he had seen Mr. Rasmussen's photograph on the front page of the newspaper and had scanned the first paragraph. He also stated that he knew from the article that Mr. Rasmussen was in trouble with the law and that it involved computers. He stated that he did not remember if he knew at that time that the allegations involved teenage girls and thought that it might have involved Mr. Rasmussen's use of computers in connection with his travel agency business. He denied knowing that Mr. Rasmussen had been accused of a sex crime or that he should not be allowed on school grounds. Mr. Hagler stated that the first time he learned that Mr. Rasmussen had been accused of sexual misconduct with minors was during the interview with Ms. McKenzie. (Ex. R44.)

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

1. Mr. Hagler committed gross neglect of duty by failing to use appropriate professional judgment, and by demonstrating a lack of skill in the supervision of students, when he allowed his cousin to use a school weight room when students were present. ORS 342.175(1)(b), OAR 584-020-0010(5), and OAR 584-020-0020(2)(d).

2. Mr. Hagler committed gross neglect of duty by giving false and misleading answers to questions from a school district administrator and a TSPC investigator regarding his cousin's use of the school weight room. ORS 342.175(1)(b) and OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c).

3. Mr. Hagler committed gross neglect of duty by failing to use and maintain student records as required by federal and state law and by school district policies and procedures by submitting student transcripts to TSPC without prior written consent from the students or their legal guardians. ORS 342.175(1)(b) and OAR 584-020-0025(2)(c).

4. Mr. Hagler's teaching license should be suspended for six months.



## OPINION

TSPC has proposed a six-month suspension of Mr. Hagler's teaching license for gross neglect of duty in violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b) as defined by TSPC rules. TSPC must prove its allegations by a preponderance of the evidence, and it must also establish that the proposed penalty is appropriate. 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"); *Harris v. SAIF*, 292 Or 683, 690 (1982) (general rule regarding allocation of burden of proof is that the burden is on the proponent of the fact or position); *Metcalf v. AFSD*, 65 Or App 761, 765 (1983) (in the absence of legislation specifying a different standard, the standard of proof in an administrative hearing is 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).

ORS 342.175(1)(b) authorizes the TSPC to impose discipline, including license suspension, on a teacher for "gross neglect of duty." TSPC has adopted a rule to define gross neglect of duty. OAR 584-020-0040(4) provides, in pertinent part:

(4) 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:

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) Knowing falsification of any document or knowing misrepresentation directly related to licensure, employment, or professional duties;

\* \* \* \* \*

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

TSPC's standards of competency include OAR 584-020-0010(5), which provides:

The Competent Educator

The educator demonstrates a commitment to:

\* \* \* \* \*

(5) Use professional judgment[.]

(Emphasis in original.)

In addition, OAR 584-020-0020(2)(d) provides:

(2) The competent teacher demonstrates:

\* \* \* \* \*

(d) Skill in the supervision of students[.]

Finally, OAR 584-020-0025 provides, in relevant part:

(1) The competent educator is a person who understands students and is able to relate to them in constructive and culturally competent ways. The competent educator establishes and maintains good rapport. The competent educator maintains and uses records as required, and as needed to assist the growth of students.

(2) The competent teacher demonstrates skills in:

\* \* \* \* \*

(c) Using and maintaining student records as required by federal and state law and district policies and procedures;

\* \* \* \* \*

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

The Notice on appeal contains three separate allegations of gross neglect of duty. First, TSPC alleged that Mr. Hagler committed gross neglect of duty by allowing Mr. Rasmussen to use the school weight room in November 2008. Second, TSPC alleged that Mr. Hagler committed gross neglect of duty by giving conflicting answers in response to interview questions by a school administrator, Ms. McKenzie, and a TSPC investigator, Jeffrey Van Laanen. Third, TSPC alleged that Mr. Hagler committed gross neglect of duty by submitting student transcripts to TSPC without first obtaining the prior consent of the students or their legal guardians.

### **1. Allowing Mr. Rasmussen into the School Weight Room**

Mr. Hagler conceded that he allowed Mr. Rasmussen to use the school weight room on November 10, 2008 while students were present. His sole contention is that he was unaware at the time that Mr. Rasmussen was then facing criminal charges based on allegations that he had traveled to Portland to meet two minor girls that he met online. Mr. Hagler contends that if he had known of the charges, he would not have allowed Mr. Rasmussen to use the weight room.

Mr. Rasmussen is a prominent Medford business man and civic leader. His arrest in October 2008 was widely reported and was the subject of numerous newspaper, television, and internet reports. Mr. Hagler (who is Mr. Rasmussen's cousin) admits that he had at least two

copies of a newspaper in his possession that included a front-page story about Mr. Rasmussen's arrest. However, Mr. Hagler asserts that he did not read the story in either paper, prior to allowing Mr. Rasmussen to use the weight room, because he was upset with Mr. Rasmussen due to apparently unrelated family issues. Mr. Hagler further asserts that he lives a "hermit-like" existence, with little exposure to local news or internet reports.

Mr. Hagler's assertions were not credible. First, it is implausible that he would be handed a copy of a newspaper article prominently featuring his cousin, and not at least glance at the headline. It is also implausible that he would receive the same newspaper at home and completely avoid understanding, as least in broad terms, the significance of the article, even if he did not read it in detail. Second, Mr. Hagler testified that, in a phone call prior to November 10, 2008, he asked his cousin if he had any restrictions that would prevent him from attending a high school football game. Such a question would be absurd unless Mr. Hagler had some notion that Mr. Rasmussen might be under some suspicion related to his involvement with minors. Third, if, as he asserted, he did not learn of his cousin's legal problems until after he allowed him into the weight room, it is likely he would have disclosed that fact to Ms. McKenzie during the November 12, 2008 interview. The focus of that interview was squarely on why Mr. Hagler let his cousin into the weight room. Although Mr. Hagler repeatedly downplayed his knowledge of the specific charges, he admitted that he had read a newspaper account and was aware that his cousin had flown to Portland to meet two young girls.

At the hearing, Mr. Hagler asserted that he read the newspaper article *after* he had allowed Mr. Rasmussen to use the weight room, but *before* his meeting with Ms. McKenzie. That assertion was also not credible. During an interview with Mr. Van Laanen in October 2010, Mr. Hagler stated that he first learned of the nature of the charges against his cousin *during* the interview with Ms. McKenzie. In both interviews he admitted to reading at least some portion of the newspaper article. If, as he now contends, he did not do so until after he allowed his cousin to use the weight room, it is likely that he would have mentioned that to Ms. McKenzie and Mr. Van Laanen, both of whom were asking him why he would let his cousin onto school property given the nature of the charges against him.

Mr. Hagler asserted that he felt pressure and anxiety during his interview with Ms. McKenzie. Because of that anxiety, Mr. Hagler contended that he had almost no memory of the interview after he left the room. Mr. Hagler also offered testimony and a report from his psychologist to suggest that Ms. McKenzie's interview techniques were prosecutorial and not objective.

However, the audio recording of the interview is inconsistent with Mr. Hagler's assertions. During the course of the interview, Mr. Hagler's voice is calm and measured; this was in marked contrast to Mr. Hagler's behavior during his testimony in this case. At the hearing, he was emotional and sometimes had difficulty maintaining his composure; he appeared and sounded extremely nervous and pressured. However, in the audio recording his voice sounded strong and confident. When he disagreed with Ms. McKenzie's statements or questions, he clearly, calmly, and forcefully expressed his opinions. Ms. McKenzie, while clearly concerned about the allegations, did not sound accusatory or vindictive. Given her knowledge that a person accused of a sex crime against a minor was present on school grounds, her concern

and need for information was appropriate. Early in the interview, Ms. McKenzie stated that she assumed that Mr. Hagler knew of the charges against his cousin. He admitted that he had read a newspaper account. Shortly afterward, Ms. McKenzie asked Mr. Hagler why he allowed Mr. Rasmussen on to school property. Her questions were direct and straight-forward. She did not badger him or attempt to coerce him. Mr. Hagler's responses were cogent and his tone of voice was measured and calm.

The evidence established, more likely than not, that Mr. Hagler knew his cousin was facing criminal charges related to minors when he allowed Mr. Rasmussen to use the weight room on November 10, 2008. Although there is no evidence to suggest that Mr. Hagler knew the precise nature or of the details relating to the charges, he had enough information to cause a reasonable person to inquire further before allowing Mr. Rasmussen on to school property when students were present. His conduct demonstrated a failure to use professional judgment, in violation of OAR 584-020-0010(5). Furthermore, by allowing Mr. Rasmussen into the weight room in the presence of high school students, Mr. Hagler demonstrated a lack of skill in the supervision of those students in violation of OAR 584-020-0020(2)(d). This amounted to gross neglect of duty under ORS 342.175(1)(b).

## **2. Conflicting Answers During Interviews**

TSPC alleged that Mr. Hagler gave conflicting answers regarding his knowledge of Mr. Rasmussen's legal problems when he was interviewed by Ms. McKenzie and, later, by Mr. Van Laanen. The evidence supports that allegation.

Mr. Hagler's answers to Mr. Van Laanen were not consistent with the answers he gave to Ms. McKenzie. In both interviews Mr. Hagler downplayed his knowledge of the charges against Mr. Rasmussen. However, in his interview with Ms. McKenzie Mr. Hagler, in his own words, acknowledged knowing that Mr. Rasmussen had flown to Portland to meet someone and was, instead, met by a policeman. He also affirmed Ms. McKenzie's assertion that Mr. Rasmussen had been accused of trying to meet two young girls and acknowledged having read enough of a newspaper account to know that his cousin had gotten in trouble. Furthermore, he asserted that he had "heard" that Mr. Rasmussen arranged to meet with young girls and that "there wasn't anything about the conversation that went on between them." Mr. Hagler's statements imply that he had either read or heard about the nature of the charges against his cousin and had read or heard enough that he could assert that the source of his information did not include anything about the nature of Mr. Rasmussen's conversations with the two minors. This statement is inconsistent with a brief scan of a portion of an article.

In contrast, Mr. Hagler told Mr. Van Laanen that he had merely scanned one paragraph of the newspaper and understood that the allegations were related to computers. He told Mr. Van Laanen that he initially thought the allegations might be related to Mr. Rasmussen's use of computers as part of his work as a travel agent and that he first learned that the crimes involved allegations of sexual misconduct during his interview with Ms. McKenzie.

Mr. Hagler's assertion that he did know the nature of the charges against his cousin at the time of his interview with Ms. McKenzie was inconsistent with his testimony at the hearing. At

the hearing, he claimed that he read the newspaper article reporting his cousin's arrest *before* the interview. At the very least, a reasonable person reading an article about an adult man being arrested for flying to another city to meet two minor girls would understand that the allegations likely involved sexual misconduct, even if the article did not include a detailed account of the online conversations. His assertions that he did not understand that his cousin had been accused of sexual impropriety, both to Ms. McKenzie and to Mr. Van Laanen, were not plausible. The evidence established, more likely than not, that Mr. Hagler knew of the nature of the charges against his cousin and knew that they involved sexual misconduct against minors.

OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c) defines gross neglect of duty to include "knowing misrepresentation directly related to licensure, employment, or professional duties." Mr. Hagler knowingly gave false answers to Ms. McKenzie and to Mr. Van Lannen when he said that he was unaware that the charges against his cousin involved allegations of sexual misconduct against minors. His statements to Ms. McKenzie were related to employment. His statements to Mr. Van Laanen were related to licensure. On both occasions, Mr. Hagler violated ORS 342.175(1)(b), as defined by OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c).

### **3. Submitting Student Transcripts to TSPC without Prior Consent.**

In September 2007, Mr. Hagler filed complaints with TSPC against four district administrators alleging that the district had allowed four students to participate in the school football program when they were academically ineligible to do so. Mr. Hagler submitted transcripts for all four students to demonstrate that they did not meet academic eligibility requirements. He did not have permission from the students, or their legal guardians, to release those transcripts.

TSPC alleges that Mr. Hagler's release of the transcripts violated OAR 584-020-0025(2)(c), which requires competent educators to use and maintain student records as required by federal and state law and by school district policies and procedures. Specifically, TSPC alleges that Mr. Hagler's disclosure violated the federal Family Educational Rights Privacy Act (FERPA), 20 U.S.C. §1232g.

FERPA does not regulate school districts or teachers directly. Rather, the statute prevents the federal Department of Education from providing federal funding to school districts that violate its provisions. With a few specifically enumerated exceptions (none of which apply to this case), the statute generally prohibits school districts that receive federal funding from disclosing a student's educational records without advance written consent from the student's parents. 20 U.S.C. §1232g(b).

Mr. Hagler argues that FERPA applies solely to educational agencies (such as a school district) and not to individual teachers. As such, he contends, FERPA imposed no restrictions on his disclosure of student transcripts to TSPC. Because he, as a teacher, was not restricted by FERPA, he contends, his release of the transcripts did not violate OAR 584-020-0025(2)(c). In that respect, Mr. Hagler is incorrect.

While FERPA explicitly applies solely to educational agencies, its protections would be meaningless unless they reached the conduct of individual educators and school administrators. As a matter of common sense, a school district is incapable of acting other than through individual employees and officers. If the school district were to allow individual teachers to ignore FERPA privacy protections, the district would be in violation of FERPA and would likely lose eligibility for federal funding.

More importantly, however, TSPC is not seeking to impose discipline on Mr. Hagler for violating FERPA itself. Rather, TSPC contends that Mr. Hagler's release of the transcripts violated OAR 584-020-0025(2)(c), which required Mr. Hagler to use and maintain student records in a manner consistent with federal law. Thus, under TSPC's rule, Mr. Hagler could not ignore FERPA protections, even if he would not face personal liability for a violation of the federal statute. Mr. Hagler's release of student transcripts without parental consent was not consistent with federal law and constituted a violation of OAR 584-020-0025(2)(c).<sup>1</sup>

Even if Mr. Hagler's release of the transcripts amounted to a violation of TSPC rules, however, Mr. Hagler asserts, on various grounds, that discipline is not warranted in this case.

**a. Equitable Estoppel and/or Invited Error**

Mr. Hagler asserts that TSPC, in essence, requested that he provide the transcripts at issue. Mr. Hagler correctly notes that TSPC's complaint form includes an instruction that the complainant should enclose relevant documentation if it is available. Mr. Hagler further notes that nothing in the complaint form cautions against enclosing student transcripts. Mr. Hagler therefore asserts that TSPC should not be allowed to impose discipline against him under the theory of equitable estoppel, or under the "invited error" doctrine. Mr. Hagler is incorrect on both theories.

First, the doctrine of invited error has no application to the facts of this case. As noted in *State v. Kammeyer*, 226 Or App 210, 214 (2009), the invited error doctrine "is generally applicable when a party has invited the trial court to rule in a particular way under circumstances that suggest that the party will be bound by the ruling or will not later seek a reversal on the basis of that ruling." The doctrine does not apply outside of the context of litigation. Rather, as noted by the court in *Kammeyer*, the doctrine merely prevents a party to litigation from asserting an error by a trial court where that party requested the allegedly erroneous ruling.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hagler also notes that documents provided to TSPC in connection with an investigation are confidential pursuant to ORS 342.176(4)(a). However, Mr. Hagler does not explain how such confidentiality is relevant to the alleged violation. To the extent that Mr. Hagler believes that such confidentiality excuses a failure to safeguard student records under FERPA, he has offered no authority for such a proposition. Nothing in 20 U.S.C. §1232g suggests that a school district may release documents to a state agency so long as the state agency will not disclose the documents to third parties. Similarly, Mr. Hagler argues that TSPC would have obtained the student transcripts eventually as part of its investigation of Mr. Hagler's four complaints. Such an observation, even if true, would not excuse Mr. Hagler's failure to maintain the confidentiality of student records under FERPA.