

**BEFORE THE PROFESSIONAL STANDARDS COMMISSION
OF THE STATE OF IDAHO**

In the matter of the certificates of:

Ryan Campbell,

Respondent.

Case No. 22314

**FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS
OF LAW AND FINAL ORDER**

On April 30, 2024, this matter came before a hearing panel of the Professional Standards Commission of the State of Idaho (“Hearing Panel”) for an administrative hearing. The hearing was conducted to consider the allegations outlined in the Administrative Complaint filed against Ryan Campbell (“Respondent”) by Cina Lackey, Chief Certification Officer for the State of Idaho, Department of Education (“Complainant”).

Based upon the findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth herein, this Hearing Panel enters its Final Order granting Complainant’s request for the revocation of Respondent’s certification.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

1. On January 4, 2024, Complainant filed and served an Administrative Complaint against Respondent seeking Respondent’s certification be revoked.

2. On February 2, 2024, Respondent disputed the allegations detailed in the Administrative Complaint and requested a hearing.

3. On April 30, 2024, an administrative hearing in this matter was conducted before the Hearing Panel at Fremont County School District Office – Board Room, 945 W. 1st N., St. Anthony, Idaho. During the hearing, Deputy Attorney General Kyle Grigsby represented the Complainant and Respondent represented himself. Dana Johnson served as Chair for the Hearing

Panel. Eileen Holden and Joseph Reed served as the other members of the Hearing Panel. Karen Sheehan, Deputy Attorney General, served as legal counsel for the Hearing Panel.

4. The Hearing Panel excluded minors from the hearing. The Hearing Panel excluded all witnesses until after they had testified.

5. The Hearing Panel granted Complainant's counsel's request that minors only be identified by their initials throughout the hearing.

6. During the hearing, Complainant offered documentary evidence in the form of Exhibits 1 through 27. Respondent offered documentary evidence in the form of Exhibits A through U and X through EE (Respondent's exhibits did not include an Exhibit V). The Hearing Panel overruled Complainant's objection to the admission of Respondent's Exhibit DD. The Hearing Panel admitted all of the parties' exhibits into evidence.

7. The Hearing Panel also received verbal testimony from the following witnesses:

- Complainant's witnesses:
 - Alvin Winegar, Jr.;
 - Drex Hathaway; and
 - Brooke Bailey.
- Respondent's witnesses:
 - V.L.;
 - Sage Lyon;
 - Hunter Jacobsen;
 - Matt Lyon;
 - Michael Rupp;
 - Janelle Anderson; and

- Respondent.

8. The Hearing Panel deliberated after all exhibits and testimony was completed.

FINDINGS OF FACT

9. Respondent was employed by the Fremont School District (“District”) as a teacher and cross country/track coach during the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years.

10. Based on a complaint from a female athlete at South Fremont High School, the Fremont Count Joint School District #125 conducted a Title IX investigation, and a Title IX Investigative Report was completed, dated November 1, 2022; *See* Complainant Ex. 2.

11. A supplemented Title IX Investigative Report which included follow-up interviews, was completed, dated January 17, 2023; *See* Complainant Ex. 3.

12. A Title IX Outcome Determination Letter Report, was completed, dated February 7, 2023; *See* Complainant Ex. 4. Pursuant to the Report, based on the evidence, “it is highly and substantially more likely to be true than untrue” that:

- Respondent engaged in belittling behavior.
- Respondent engaged in name-calling.
- Respondent engaged in manipulative and emotional abuse.
- Respondent engaged in harassment/stalking of M.W.
- Respondent engaged in unwanted touching and inappropriate coaching/training techniques.
- Respondent engaged in inappropriate comments about female athletes’ bodies.
- Respondent engaged in singling out female athletes.
- Respondent focused admittedly on those he felt had high potential which were female runners such as M.W.

13. Respondent appealed and a Title IX Appeals Final Decision upheld the decision referenced above, dated February 27, 2023. *See* Complainant Ex. 5.

14. Based on the Title IX Appeals Final Decision, on January 4, 2024, Complainant filed the Administrative Complaint in this matter against Respondent. *See* Complainant Ex. 17.

15. Respondent submitted an answer to the Administrative Complaint on February 2, 2024, and requested a hearing before a panel.

16. A hearing was set and heard on April 30, 2024.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

17. This Hearing Panel has authority under Idaho Code §33-1209 to hear this contested case initiated by Complainant against Respondent.

18. The Hearing Panel has authority under Idaho Code §33-1209 to revoke, suspend, issue a letter of reprimand, or place reasonable conditions on any certificate for violations of the statutes and rules governing Idaho professional educators.

19. In accordance with Idaho Code § 33-1209(6), the Hearing Panel grants Complainant's request for the revocation of certification against Respondent for violating the laws and rules governing his certification in the State of Idaho, including the Code of Ethics for Idaho Professional Educators. Specifically, Respondent's violation of the following provisions of Idaho Code and the Code of Ethics for Idaho Professional Educators:

- Idaho Code § 33-1208(1) ("Willful violation of any professional code or standard of ethics or conduct, adopted by the state board of education.").
- Code of Ethics Principle I Idaho Admin Code r. 08.02.02.076.02 ("A professional educator abides by all federal. State, and location education laws and statutes.")

- Idaho Code § 33-1208(1)("Willful violation of any professional code or standard of ethics or conduct, adopted by the state board of education.").
- Code of Ethics Principle II Idaho Admin Code r. 08.02.02.076.03 ("A professional educator maintains a professional relationship with all students both inside and outside the physical and virtual classroom.").

HEARING PANEL ANALYSIS

In consideration of the factors set out above, during deliberations at the end of the hearing, the Hearing Panel revoked Respondent's certificate on the basis that from fall of 2020 through summer of 2022, Respondent did not maintain appropriate teacher/student and/or coach/athlete boundaries with one or more female student athletes and did not maintain a professional relationship with students inside and outside of the classroom. More specifically, the Hearing Panel stated during its deliberations that it was making its decision based on the following:

- Evidence Respondent Did Not Maintain Professional Conduct: Based on the evidence, there was inappropriate conduct between Respondent and athletes (students) inside and outside of the classroom:
 - i. Respondent text messaged students at unusual hours.
 - ii. Respondent communicating with athletes through social media to send personal messages, not related to school or athletic events, to female athletes only.
 - iii. Respondent routinely discussing iron levels, menstrual cycles, and female bodies with individual female athletes outside of a group setting. A counselor or female coach was never asked to assist with these conversations nor was the athlete directed by Respondent to do so.

- iv. Respondent had no sense of professional boundaries or clear understanding of standard professional boundaries.
 - v. Respondent undermined the meaning of professional relationships according to the Code of Ethics Principle II.
 - vi. Respondent had too much contact with female athletes; he singled out female athletes from the male athletes. He coached female and male athletes differently.
 - vii. Respondent conducted Saturday practices with female athletes, not at school, but at his home.
 - viii. Respondent invited individual female athletes to lunch which was inappropriate.
- Title IX Investigation and Reports: The Hearing Panel found the Title IX reports showed a thorough investigation was conducted into the incidents. This was not a situation where there was a single incident; there were many incidents, with testimony from several witnesses along with written witness statements. The Hearing Panel further found that the investigation was not biased, a lot of questions were asked, an outside source reviewed the report, and that the reports appeared objective.

FINAL ORDER

IT IS THE FINAL ORDER of this Hearing Panel, based upon the findings of facts and conclusions of law set forth herein, that Complainant's request for Respondent's certification to be revoked is GRANTED.

Dated this 31 day of May 2024.

Dana Johnson

DANA JOHNSON
Hearing Panel Chair

REVIEW OF FINAL ORDER

THIS IS A FINAL ORDER OF THE HEARING PANEL. Any party may file a Petition for Reconsideration of this Final Order within fourteen (14) days of its service date. The Hearing Panel is required by law to dispose of a Petition for Reconsideration within twenty-one (21) days of its filing or the Petition for Reconsideration will be considered to be denied by operation of law. *See Idaho Code § 67-5243(3).*

Petitions for Reconsideration of this Final Order may be filed by mail addressed to the Professional Standards Commission, Department of Education, Statehouse, Boise, ID 83720-0027, or may be delivered to the Department of Education, Len B. Jordan Building, Room 200, 650 West State Street, Boise, Idaho, and must be received within fourteen (14) days of the service date of this Final Order.

Judicial Review

Pursuant to Idaho Code §§ 33-1209(8), 67-5270, and 67-5272, any party aggrieved by this Final Order or by another Order previously entered in this Contested Case may obtain Judicial Review of this Final Order and of all previously issued Orders in this Contested Case by filing a Petition for Judicial Review in the District Court as provided by those sections.

A Petition for Judicial Review must be filed within twenty-eight (28) days of the service date of this Final Order, or, if a Petition for Reconsideration is timely filed, within twenty-eight (28) days of the service date of a final order on the Petition for Reconsideration or denial of the Petition for Reconsideration by operation of law. *See Idaho Code §§ 67-5246 and 67-5273.*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on June 4, 2024, I caused to be served a true and correct copy of the foregoing by the following method to:

Respondent
Ryan Campbell

- U.S. Mail
- Hand Delivery
- Certified Mail, Return Receipt Requested
- Overnight Mail
- Email: providentfa@gmail.com

Attorney for the
Chief Certification Officer
KYLE GRIGSBY
Deputy Attorney General
P.O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0010

- U.S. Mail
- Hand Delivery
- Overnight Mail
- Facsimile:
- Email: kyle.grigsby@ag.idaho.gov
laura.kauffmann@ag.idaho.gov

Idaho State Department of Education
Professional Standards Commission
Attn: Annette Schwab
P. O. Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0027

- U.S. Mail
- Hand Delivery
- Overnight Mail
- Facsimile:
- Email: aschwab@sde.idaho.gov

/s/ Karen Sheehan

KAREN SHEEHAN
Presiding Officer