

1 policies. Investigation determined that two female coworkers, Rodriguez and Tina, had
2 complained to PPSD and law enforcement that during the 2015-2016 school year, Cantwell
3 had engaged in personal text messages that made them feel uncomfortable. Rodriguez and
4 Tina reported that the communication had continued after they had requested Cantwell to
5 stop. On September 18, 2016, PPSD issued Cantwell a letter of expectation regarding
6 professional boundaries and PPSD policy on harassment.

- 7 3. On July 20, 2017, Cantwell appeared at TSPC for a scheduled investigative interview.
8 Cantwell determined at this interview that he was not prepared to participate in the interview
9 and wished to seek legal counsel. No interview was conducted. On September 29, 2017, the
10 Commission was informed that Cantwell was represented by an attorney. An interview was
11 scheduled for March 1, 2018. Cantwell's attorney was present for the interview, but Cantwell
12 failed to show up at the agreed upon time and location. Another date and time (May 1, 2018)
13 for the required interview was agreed upon. On May 1, 2018, the Commission received an
14 email from Cantwell's attorney advising that Cantwell was declining the Commission's formal
15 request for an interview, with the understanding that failure to participate may constitute a
16 violation of Commission rules and standards.

17 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

18
19 Cantwell's conduct described in sections two (2) above, constitutes gross neglect of duty in
20 violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0010(5)
21 (*Use professional judgment*), OAR 584-020-0025(2)(e) (*Using district lawful and reasonable rules*
22 *and regulations*), OAR 584-020-0030(2)(b) (*Skill in communicating with administrators,*
23 *students, staff, parents, and other patrons*); and OAR 584-020-0040(4)(l) (*Sexual harassment*).

24 Cantwell's conduct described in sections three (3) above, constitutes gross neglect of duty in
25 violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(p) (*Subject to the exercise of any legal right*
26 *or privilege, failure or refusal by an educator under investigation to respond to requests for*
27 *information, to furnish documents or to participate in interviews with a Commission*
28 *representative relating to a Commission investigation*).

29
30 The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS 342.175.

31 ////

32 ////

33 ////

1 **FINAL ORDER**

2
3 The Commission hereby suspends Anthony Cantwell's right to apply for an Oregon educator
4 license for a period of sixty (60) days, to begin upon the date this order is signed and in effect.

5
6 Furthermore, the Commission imposes a two (2) year period of probation upon Cantwell to
7 commence upon reinstatement of his Oregon educator license and subject to the following
8 terms and conditions of probation:

- 9
10 1. Cantwell shall comply with the Standards for Competent and Ethical Performance of
11 Oregon Educators under Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 584, Division 020.

12
13 Violation of any term or condition of probation shall constitute an independent basis for the
14 Commission to revoke Cantwell's Oregon educator license or otherwise impose discipline, after first
15 providing Cantwell with notice and opportunity for hearing.

16
17 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 17th day of October, 2019.

18 TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

19 By: Anthony J. Rosilez

20 Dr. Anthony Rosilez, Executive Director

21
22
23
24 **NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS**

25
26 YOU ARE ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW MAY BE
27 OBTAINED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM THE SERVICE OF
28 THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW IS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF ORS 183.482 TO
29 THE OREGON COURT OF APPEALS.