

1 During all relevant times, Woodford was employed by the Springfield School
2 District.

- 3
- 4 2. On February 6, 2017, the Commission became aware that Woodford had been
5 arrested on February 4, 2017, for multiple charges of child sex abuse. The
6 Commission opened an investigation. On February 9, 2017, the Commission received
7 a report from the Springfield School District indicating Woodford was the subject of
8 an investigation related to the earlier reported criminal activity, including sexual
9 conduct with a student.

10 Subsequent school district, law enforcement, and Commission investigations
11 determined that on February 2, 2017, a student witnessed Woodford and a minor
12 aged, female student kissing in Woodford's classroom. Law enforcement
13 investigation located evidence that Woodford and the student had participated in
14 "Sexting" by exchanging explicit sexual texting. Your sexting activities included
15 Woodford and the student exchanging nude digital images and video of each other
16 by cell phone. The student reported kissing Woodford on multiple occasions and that
17 Woodford had fondled her breasts and buttocks, both inside and outside her
18 clothing.

- 19
- 20
- 21 3. On February 15, 2017, Woodford was charged by the Lane County Grand Jury with
22 one felony count of Online Sexual Corruption of a Child in the First Degree (ORS
23 163.433), five felony counts of Using a Child in Display of Sexually Explicit Conduct
24 (ORS 163.670), five felony counts of Luring a Minor (ORS 167.057) and three
25 misdemeanor counts of Sexual Abuse in the Second Degree (ORS 163.425). On July
26 6, 2017, as part of a plea agreement, Woodford was convicted on one count of Using
27 a Child in Display of Sexually Explicit Conduct (ORS 163.670), and one count of
28 Luring a Minor (ORS 167.057). Woodford was sentenced in part, to a total of
29 approximately 70 months in prison, 36 months of post-prison supervision, and
30 required to register as a sex offender.

1 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

2 Matthew Woodford’s criminal convictions constitute gross neglect of duty in
3 violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-
4 020-0010(5) (*Use professional judgment*); and OAR 584-020-0040(1) (*The*
5 *Commission will deny, revoke or deny the right to apply for a license or charter school*
6 *registration to any applicant or educator who, has been convicted of any of the crimes*
7 *listed in ORS 342.143, or the substantial equivalent of any of those crimes if convicted*
8 *in another jurisdiction*), including ORS 163.670 – *Using a Child in a Display of*
9 *Sexually Explicit Conduct*, and ORS 167.057 – *Luring a Minor*. This conduct also
10 constitutes gross unfitness in violation of ORS 342.175(1)(c); OAR 584-020-0040(5)(c)
11 (*Conviction of violating any federal, state, or local law. A conviction includes any final*
12 *judgment of conviction by a court whether as the result of guilty plea, no contest plea*
13 *or any other means*); OAR 584-020-0040(5)(d) (*Commission of an act listed in OAR*
14 *584-020-0040(1)*); and OAR 584-020-0040(5)(e) (*Admission of or engaging in acts*
15 *constituting criminal conduct, even in the absence of a conviction*).
16

17 Pursuant to ORS 342.175(3) and OAR 584-020-0040(1) the Teacher Standards
18 and Practices Commission must revoke Woodford’s license and Woodford’s right to
19 apply for a license based on conviction of any of the crimes listed in ORS 342.143(3)(a),
20 or the substantial equivalent of any of those crimes.
21

22 Furthermore, the conduct underlying Woodford’s convictions constitutes gross
23 neglect of duty in violation of ORS 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it
24 incorporates OAR 584-020-0010(5) (*Use professional judgment*); OAR 584-020-
25 0040(4)(k) (*Violation of any rule or order of the Commission*); OAR 584-020-
26 0040(4)(f) (*Any sexual conduct with a student*) as defined by OAR 584-020-0005(5);
27 OAR 584-020-0040(4)(o) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-0035(1)(c)(D) (*Honoring*
28 *appropriate adult boundaries with students in conduct and conversations at all times*);
29 and OAR 584-020-0035(3)(a) (*Maintain the dignity of the profession by respecting and*
30 *obeying the law, exemplifying personal integrity and honesty*). Additionally,
31 Woodford’s criminal convictions and conduct related to his convictions constitute “gross
32 unfitness” in violation of ORS 342.175(1)(c); OAR 584-020-0040(3)(c) and (d) as

1 defined by OAR 584-020-0040 (5) (*Gross unfitness is any conduct which renders an*
2 *educator unqualified to perform his or her professional responsibilities*).


3
4 The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon
5 ORS 342.175.

6
7 **FINAL ORDER**

8 The Commission hereby denies Matthew M. Woodford's application for an
9 Oregon educator license and revokes his right to apply for an Oregon educator license.

10 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 23rd day of March, 2018.

11 TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION

12
13 By: 
14 Dr. Anthony Rosilez, Executive Director

15
16
17
18 **NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS**

19
20 YOU ARE ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW MAY
21 BE OBTAINED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM THE
22 SERVICE OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW IS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF
23 ORS 183.482 TO THE OREGON COURT OF APPEALS.