

1 2. On October 18, 2015, the Commission became aware through a news media article that a law
2 suit had been filed against Corley. The law suit alleged misconduct on Corley’s part as related
3 to his conduct and involvement in a surprise active shooter drill. Additionally, on March 7,
4 2016, the Commission received a complaint from a patron of the Pine Eagle School District
5 advising that Corley had been involved in the planning and approval of an active shooter drill
6 that was reckless, dangerous, and resulted in traumatized educators and a federal law suit
7 filed against the district. The patron alleged that Corley’s conduct could be considered gross
8 neglect of duty and/or gross unfitness.

9
10 3. On April 26, 2013, with Corley’s knowledge and approval, the Pine Eagle Charter School
11 experienced an unannounced “Active Shooter” drill during a teacher in-service day. The
12 “Active Shooter” drill included, but was not limited to, the following:
13 a. Two men dressed in disguises and wearing masks, entered the school posing as
14 shooters. They ignited firecrackers to simulate gunshots or explosions and each
15 carried .22 caliber starter pistols loaded with blanks. The shooters split up and walked
16 the hallways engaging teachers who were working on “Run, Hide, Fight” safety
17 projects in their rooms or common areas.
18 b. One shooter entered a classroom, pointed his pistol at the teacher inside, fired the
19 weapon at them and stated “You’re dead”. Another teacher who was attempting to flee
20 the building fell to the ground and urinated herself. A third teacher injured their knee
21 when they collided with another teacher trying to exit the area. .
22 c. None of the involved educators were aware the event was a drill prior to the incident.
23 After the event, a group debriefing was conducted where red dots were handed out to
24 staff indicating they had been shot and / or killed during the scenario. The educator
25 who was “shot” in her classroom was traumatized to the point that she filed a federal
26 law suit and has never returned to work.
27 d. No one involved in the planning or execution of the event had experience or training
28 on how to stage an active shooter drill. There was no safety team established, no law
29 enforcement involvement and no way to predict or account for the possibility that
30 staff or a passerby might deploy a weapon or actively engage to the point of a serious
31 injury or death.

32 ///
33 ///
34 ///

1 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

2 Corley’s conduct described above, constitutes gross neglect of duty in violation of ORS
3 342.175(1)(b); OAR 584-020-0040(4); OAR 584-020-0040(4)(n) as it incorporates OAR 584-020-
4 0010(1) (*Recognize the worth and dignity of all persons and respect for each individual*), OAR 584-
5 020-0010(5) (*Use professional judgment*), OAR 584-020-0025(3)(b) (*Skills in planning and staff*
6 *assignment*), and OAR 584-020-0030(2)(b) (*Skill in communicating with administrators,*
7 *students, staff, parents, and other patrons*).


8
9 The Commission’s authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon ORS 342.175.

10
11 **FINAL ORDER**

12
13 The Commission hereby suspends Michael R. Corley’s right to apply for an Oregon educator
14 license for a period of ninety (90) days, to begin upon the date this order is signed and in effect.

15
16 IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 5th day of June, 2019.

17 **TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION**

18
19 By: 
20 Dr. Anthony Rosilez, Executive Director

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

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