



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

11  
12 3. On January 12, 2015, the Commission received correspondence from Spoelhof where  
13 he indicated "it has recently been brought to my attention... that I may have  
14 answered two of the Commission's application for licensure character questions  
15 incorrectly when I applied for Oregon licensure on June 25, 2014". Based on  
16 Spoelhof's inaccurate application, a license was issued to Spoelhof on September 3,  
17 2014. As a result of both the report from North Clackamas School District and  
18 Spoelhof's own correspondence, a review of Spoelhof's application was conducted.  
19 Review of Spoelhof's Commission application for licensure indicates that Spoelhof  
20 answered "No" to character question number one (1) "*Have you ever left any*  
21 *educational or school related employment, voluntary or involuntary, while the*  
22 *subject of an inquiry, review or investigation of alleged misconduct? Have you ever*  
23 *left educational or school related employment when you had reason to believe an*  
24 *investigation for misconduct was underway or imminent?*" Spoelhof also answered  
25 "No" to character question number three (3), "*Have you ever been placed on leave*  
26 *by your employer for any alleged misconduct?*"

27  
28 4. Investigation determined that on March 6, 2014, Spoelhof received a "written record  
29 of behavior" (equivalent to a written reprimand) from Spoelhof's then recent  
30 employer, Paw Paw Public Schools in Michigan. The letter states that prior to  
31 Spoelhof's resignation submitted on February 24, 2014, and effective March 5, 2014,  
32 Spoelhof was the subject of an investigation related to possible misconduct.

1 Investigators learned that as part of this investigation Spoelhof was placed on leave  
2 by his employer on February 11, 2014, while an investigation was conducted to  
3 determine if Spoelhof had engaged in an offense, infraction, or other misconduct  
4 which could result in a disciplinary consequence. The subject of the investigation in  
5 Michigan included allegations that Spoelhof had allowed a homeless, female student  
6 to reside at Spoelhof's residence, overnight, and on multiple occasions.

- 7  
8 5. Based on the above information, Spoelhof should have answered affirmatively to the  
9 school district's pre-employment disclosure questions, numbers seven (7) and five  
10 (5), and the Commission's application character questions, numbers one (1) and  
11 three (3). Failure to do so constitutes misrepresentation and/or falsification of an  
12 official document related to licensure and employment.

#### 13 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

14 Spoelhof's conduct described above constitutes gross neglect of duty in violation of  
15 ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0010(5)  
16 (*Use professional judgment*), OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c) (*Falsification of any document or*  
17 *knowing misrepresentation directly related to licensure, employment, or professional*  
18 *duties*); and OAR 584-020-0040(4)(o) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0035(3)(a)  
19 (*Maintain the dignity of the profession by respecting and obeying the law, exemplifying*  
20 *personal integrity and honesty*).

21  
22 The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS  
23 342.175.

#### 24 FINAL ORDER

25 The Commission hereby revokes Thomas John Spoelhof's right to apply for an  
26 Oregon educator license.

27 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 30<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016.

28 ////

29 ////

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

By: Monica Beane  
Monica Beane, Executive 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.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that I served the foregoing notice of final order, certified by me as such, by mailing U.S. First Class Mail and U.S. Certified Mail—Return Receipt Requested, addressed to:

Thomas John Spoelhof  
1126 SW 12<sup>th</sup> Ave Apt 409  
Portland, OR 97205

Dated this 30<sup>th</sup> day of September, 2016.

By: Patty Sheldon  
Patty Sheldon  
Investigative Assistant