

1 boundaries. Additionally, Mitchell violated the district's sexual conduct policy and could be
2 in violation of the Commission's professional standards.

3 3. Multiple students reported that during the 2015-2016 school year and the beginning of the
4 2016 school year through April of 2017, Mitchell engaged in inappropriate conduct with
5 students. The reported conduct included inappropriate touching, shaming remarks,
6 inappropriate comments regarding drugs and sex, and failing to maintain appropriate
7 teacher-student boundaries. Investigation determined the following:

- 8 • Several female students reported that Mitchell touched them inappropriately while
9 demonstrating choreography, by touching student's hips, buttocks, torsos, and
10 breasts.
- 11 • Students reported Mitchell shamed some students by referring to their weight and
12 body type; indicating they should lose weight if they wanted to try out for drama roles
13 that were not just parts for "Big girls". Mitchell also referred to a student with acne as
14 "Pizza face" on several occasions and in the presence of other students.
- 15 • Mitchell inappropriately discussed sex with students. Mitchell commented on a
16 student who identified as bi-sexual, stating that if she hadn't experienced sex yet,
17 then how did she know she was bi-sexual. Mitchell commented to students how
18 confused Mitchell was that so many students had made up their minds about their
19 sexual orientation in high school and about how many LGBTQ students there were in
20 Eugene. Mitchell shared a story with his class about two students Mitchell had caught
21 backstage. Mitchell jokingly inferred they may have been kissing or engaged in oral
22 sex. This upset the involved female student who requested Mitchell stop, to which
23 Mitchell replied that she was overly sensitive. Upset, this student withdrew from
24 Mitchell's theatre class. During a discussion about breaking into show business,
25 Mitchell half-jokingly told students he had been involved with pornographic videos
26 and that an actor needed to do what they had to in order to get by on the East Coast.
- 27 • Mitchell discussed with students his use of marijuana, both recreationally and as a
28 sleep aid.
- 29 • Mitchell provided gifts to students, including a smart watch, clothing and footwear.
30 Mitchell "motivated" students by threatening them with the loss of their assigned
31 roles or threatened to leave the program himself if students failed to perform, practice
32 or rehearse as Mitchell expected.

33 4. On June 26, 2017 and again on October 15, 2018, a Commission investigator sent Mitchell a
34 first class letter and a certified letter to his known address(s), officially requesting an

1 interview. The investigator advised Mitchell that by Oregon Administrative Rules, he was
2 required to cooperate with the investigation, including participating in an interview, or be
3 subject to discipline for not participating. The certified mail return receipts were signed and
4 returned to the Commission as delivered on both occasions. In addition, the investigator also
5 emailed Mitchell the same request. Despite multiple official requests for an interview,
6 Mitchell refused to contact the investigator as directed and failed to cooperate in the
7 investigation as required by rule.
8

9 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

10 Mitchell's conduct described in sections two (2) and three (3) above, constitutes gross neglect
11 of duty in violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-
12 020-0010(1) (*Recognize the worth and dignity of all persons and respect for each individual*), OAR
13 584-020-0010(5) (*Use professional judgment*), OAR 584-020-0025(2)(e) (*Using district lawful
14 and reasonable rules and regulations*), OAR 584-020-0030(2)(b) (*Skill in communicating with
15 administrators, students, staff, parents, and other patrons*); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(o) as it
16 incorporates OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(A) (*Not demonstrating or expressing professionally
17 inappropriate interest in a student's personal life*), and OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(D) (*Honoring
18 appropriate adult boundaries with students in conduct and conversations at all times*).

19 Mitchell's conduct described in section four (4) above, constitutes gross neglect of duty in
20 violation of OAR 584-020-0040(4)(p) (*Subject to the exercise of any legal right or privilege, failure
21 or refusal by an educator under investigation to respond to requests for information, to furnish
22 documents or to participate in interviews with a Commission representative relating to a
23 Commission investigation*).

24
25 The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS 342.175.
26

27 **FINAL ORDER**

28
29 The Commission hereby suspends Lanny F. Mitchell's right to apply for an Oregon educator
30 license for a period of six (6) months, to begin upon the date this order is signed and in effect.


31 In addition, the Commission places Mitchell on probation for a period of two years to
32 commence upon Mitchell's reinstatement from suspension. This probation period is subject to the
33 following terms and conditions:
34

- 1 1. Mitchell shall comply with the Standards for Competent and Ethical Performance of
2 Oregon Educators under Oregon Administrative Rules Chapter 584, Division 020.
3
4 2. Mitchell shall successfully complete a Commission approved training on Boundaries
5 within the first year of probation.
6

7 Violation of any term or condition of probation shall constitute an independent basis for
8 the Commission to revoke Bradford's teaching license or otherwise impose discipline,
9 after first providing Bradford with notice and opportunity for hearing.
10

11
12
13
14 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 5th day of June, 2019.

15 TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

16 By: 
17 Dr. Anthony Rosilez, Executive Director
18
19
20
21
22

23 NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS
24

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