

**BEFORE THE  
COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING  
STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**In the Matter of the Accusation Against:**

**BRANDON ANTHONY JONES,**

**Clear Single Subject Teaching Credential, Preliminary  
Administrative Services Credential, Administrative Services  
Credential, Certificate of Eligibility,**

**Respondent.**

**Case No. 2-24026402**

**OAH No. 2021060014**

**PROPOSED DECISION**

Regina Brown, Presiding Administrative Law Judge, State of California, Office of Administrative Hearings, heard this matter remotely on November 2, 2021, and January 4, 2022.

Aspasia A. Papavassiliou, Deputy Attorney General, represented complainant Mary Vixie Sandy, Ed.D., Executive Director, California Commission on Teacher Credentialing.

Respondent Brandon Anthony Jones represented himself at hearing.

The matter was submitted for decision on January 4, 2022.

## **FACTUAL FINDINGS**

1. Respondent Brandon Anthony Jones holds or held three certification documents issued by the California Commission on Teacher Credentialing (Commission). A Clear Single Subject Teaching Credential with an authorization in Science/Social Science was issued on June 3, 2013, and reissued on July 1, 2018. An Administrative Services Credential, Certificate of Eligibility, was issued on June 1, 2013. A Preliminary Administrative Services Credential was issued on July 26, 2018. All of these credentials were in full force and effect at all times relevant to this proceeding.

2. Respondent previously held a Preliminary Single Subject Teaching Credential issued on March 8, 2006, which expired on April 1, 2014. Respondent also previously held an Emergency Crosscultural Language and Academic Development Permit issued on February 20, 2007, which expired and was reissued twice, and finally expired on April 1, 2013.

3. At its August 13-14, 2020 meeting, the Commission's Committee of Credentials found probable cause to recommend the suspension of respondent's Preliminary Administrative Services Credential for a period of 90 days. The Committee of Credentials found that respondent, an administrator, was subject to discipline because he resigned with allegations pending against him, in particular, that he failed to report students' complaints that a teacher grabbed them and he obtained students' incident statements but did not notify his immediate supervisor, the Department of Children Services, parents or the police. Also, it was alleged that he falsified documents

in an attempt to demonstrate that he had followed up on the students' complaints when he had not. Respondent requested an administrative hearing.

4. Complainant Mary Vixie Sandy, Ed.D., filed the accusation in her official capacity as the Executive Director of the Commission on April 2, 2021. The accusation charged that respondent's alleged misconduct constituted unprofessional conduct, immoral conduct, and moral turpitude.

5. Respondent filed a notice of defense. This hearing followed.

6. At hearing, complainant amended the accusation at page A6, paragraph 17, lines 19-21 and changed the initials "CH"<sup>1</sup> to "WH," and deleted the phrase, "in an incident prior to the scratching incident."

## **Unprofessional Conduct**

7. In July 2018, respondent was hired as the Dean of Students at Monroe Middle School in the Campbell Union School District (District). This was his first position as an administrator. Respondent is a mandated reporter. Pursuant to Penal Code sections 11166, subdivision (a), and 11167, subdivision (a)(1), a mandated reporter must report to an agency (immediately or as soon as is practicably possible) whenever the mandated reporter, in the mandated reporter's professional capacity or within the scope of the mandated reporter's employment, has knowledge of or observes a child whom the mandated reporter knows or reasonably suspects has been the victim of child abuse or neglect.

---

<sup>1</sup> The students are identified by their initials to maintain their privacy.

8. Jennifer Snavelly was an eighth grade Core and English Language Development (ELD) teacher during the 2018-2019 school year. Snavelly was in a beginning teacher induction program. It was known that she suffered from a medical condition ( ), and she was periodically out on medical leave.

9. According to respondent, Monroe Middle School had merged with another school and the student population had increased from approximately 700 students to 1100 students. Snavelly was transferred from a special assignment to the classroom setting as a result of the merger. Starting in September 2018, respondent noticed an escalation of classroom management issues in Snavelly's classroom. Respondent spoke to Snavelly about the classroom management issues and informed the principal and vice-principal of his concerns. The principal Gilbert Rodriguez and vice-principal Veronica Flores told him that they would "handle the teacher."

10. In an email dated November 9, 2018, Snavelly reported to respondent that on a daily basis, she was having problems controlling her class and she needed assistance. Respondent spoke to the students about classroom expectations. Again, respondent reported the classroom management issues to Rodriguez and the vice-principal. As a result, they also began to conduct classroom observations of Snavelly. Respondent would check in with the principal and vice-principal about the classroom management issues, especially after they conducted classroom observations of Snavelly. The principal told respondent that the superintendent had placed Snavelly at the site and was aware that Snavelly was an issue and they were working on how to handle her. In December, when respondent again reported classroom management issues, Rodriguez told respondent that they did not have any substitutes to take Snavelly's place. Respondent felt that he was receiving no support or mentoring from the principal.

11. On December 3, 2018, Snively wrote an email to respondent indicating that she was suspending student JC because he was an ongoing problem and she was meeting with his father the next morning. Respondent met with JC and discussed the recent incident which involved "silly string," and the expectation that JC needed to change his behavior.

12. On January 16, 2019, Snively emailed respondent that she was suspending two students, CH and EA, because they were constantly "destroying" her class and she was going to call their parents. That same day, respondent had CH and EA submit incident statements after hearing "chatter" about their classroom experiences. In the incident statements, the students indicated that Snively would get angry and "lose it" and engage in a tug-of-war with students and their backpacks. Respondent met with Snively to discuss the suspension, her contact with the parents, and what was going on in the classroom.

13. On January 24, 2019, CH submitted an incident statement to respondent stating that Snively had sent him out of the classroom. When he went to retrieve his backpack, Snively would not let CH have it and pulled it away from him. Another student retrieved CH's backpack from Snively. Respondent did not contact CH's parents or meet with CH and the teacher.

14. In January 2019, respondent compiled the incident statements of CH and EA and other documents regarding Snively's classroom management issues into an orange file folder. Respondent conveyed his concerns to Rodriguez. Rodriguez said that he would "take care of it." According to respondent, Rodriguez questioned the students' credibility because of their reputations as "rabblers." Respondent left the orange file folder on Rodriguez's desk. The file remained on Rodriguez's desk until February, when respondent found the file in his mailbox. Respondent saw that there

was no indication in Powerschool, the computerized database, that Rodriguez had taken an action. Respondent took the orange file folder to his office.

15. In January 2019, student WH had a cast on his broken arm. WH got out of his chair to attempt to plug in a Chromebook. Snively ripped the charger out of his hand hurting his arm with the cast on it. WH testified at hearing that he did not tell anyone about the incident until two months later in March.

16. On February 14, 2019, Snively sent an email to respondent stating that student BH was dressed inappropriately and asked that someone remove her from the classroom. Respondent removed the student from the classroom. In an incident statement, which was partly illegible, BH wrote that when students did something that Snively did not like, she would pull on their sweaters, grip their arms tightly, and engage in a tug-of-war with their backpacks. The evidence did not establish that respondent contacted BH's parents or met with BH and Snively.

17. Also on February 14, 2019, student JP submitted an incident statement to respondent. JP wrote that she and her friend AG were sitting on "the tall chairs" which Snively said that they were not allowed to sit on. When they asked why, Snively pulled the chairs effectively pushing them off the chairs and said, "I am sick and tired of this." Snively told them to leave the classroom. While they were exiting the classroom, JP's hand was on the door, and Snively closed the door on her hand and said to JP, "Want it to hurt more?" JP also reported to respondent that on one occasion Snively grabbed both of her arms hard, but did not cause bruising. Respondent did not call JP's parents and never met with JP and Snively. Respondent did not notify the Department of Children Services or the police.

18. On March 5, 2019, CH submitted an incident statement to respondent stating that while he was taking a test, Snavelly attempted to retrieve the test before he could finish it. He refused to relinquish the test. Snavelly grabbed hard and pinched him with her nails scratching his arm causing pain. Respondent also took the statement of a student who witnessed the incident. Respondent did not call CH's parents or meet with CH and Snavelly. Respondent did not notify the Department of Children Services or the police. According to respondent, he did not call the parents because they spoke Spanish and he does not speak Spanish.

19. On March 6, 2019, CH notified the principal of the incident. The principal saw visible marks on his arm and took photographs. When respondent was called, he brought the orange file folder to the office. Rodriguez acted as if he had never seen the orange file folder before. He called the superintendent and the human resources department.

20. The district superintendent Shelly Viramontez and assistant superintendent Lena Bundtzen arrived at the school to investigate the incident that occurred on March 5, 2019. In a meeting with Viramontez, Bundtzen, Rodriguez, and Flores, respondent said that he had a "file of past incidents" involving Snavelly. He went to his office to retrieve the file.

21. Because respondent was gone for over 10 minutes, Viramontez and Bundtzen went to respondent's office. They observed respondent writing on an email he had printed out. In total, he had printed four emails sent from Snavelly to him dated November 9, 2018, December 3, 2018, January 16, 2019, and February 14, 2019, which involved the classroom management issues described in Factual Findings 10, 11, 12, and 16 above. At the bottom of the emails, respondent had handwritten notes of the actions he took in response to the emails.

22. Respondent was placed on administrative leave for allegedly falsifying documents (the emails with his handwritten notes) in an attempt to demonstrate that he had followed up on issues regarding Snavelly when in fact he had failed to take any action. According to respondent, he was making the notes to make sure that he could vindicate himself because he felt that the District would "saddle" him with whatever had happened.

23. That same day, Bundtzen interviewed several students. She contacted the police and the Department of Children Services. The principal contacted their parents. Snavelly was placed on paid administrative leave. Snavelly passed away six months later.

24. After speaking with his union representative, on March 7, 2019, respondent resigned from the Campbell Union School District, effective April 16, 2019. He rejected Viramontez's offer to be reassigned to the District office to work until April 30, 2019.

25. On March 12, 2019, Bundtzen notified the Commission of respondent's resignation with the pending allegations.

26. Bundtzen testified at hearing. She has been the assistant superintendent for human resources since 2017. Bundtzen stated that respondent, as a mandated reporter, had a duty to contact the Department of Children Services if he believed that a student had been harmed. Although respondent told Bundtzen that he met with students and took their incident statements, he did not document in Powerschool that he met with students or called their parents, which was important to establish a pattern of behavior by Snavelly, especially since there were allegations against Snavelly from different students. According to Bundtzen, respondent's excuse that he was dealing with a teacher suffering from a [REDACTED] did not change his reporting



requirements. Bundtzen considered respondent's attempts to document the actions that he took on the emails, after the investigation was initiated, as insufficient.

27. Viramontez testified at hearing. She has been the superintendent since 2017, and prior to that she was the associate superintendent for nine years. Viramontez was concerned about the students' safety and the lack of awareness by the principal and vice-principal of Snaveley's misconduct. Viramontez found respondent's organizational system to be questionable as it consisted primarily of stacks of papers in a box.

28. Flores testified at hearing. She has been the assistant principal at Monroe Middle School since July 2018, before that she was the dean of students for one year, and from 2015 to 2017, she was the equity coach. According to Flores, she was not aware of any incidents where Snaveley was physical with students.

29. Rodriguez was the principal for one year from 2018 to 2019, and before that, he was the assistant principal for two years at Monroe Middle School. Currently, he is the principal at a charter school. According to Rodriguez, who testified at hearing, respondent never informed him about the incidents involving Snaveley. Rodriguez stated that he was aware that there may have been classroom management concerns because Snaveley was returning after an extended leave of absence, but he denied knowledge of anything else. Rodriguez's testimony that he was first provided the orange file folder on March 6, 2019, was not credible. It is, however, entirely plausible that Rodriguez was not aware of the contents of the orange file folder because he never looked at the contents when respondent gave it to him in January 2019. This supports respondent's testimony that Rodriguez did not want to be involved and "kept his head in the sand." According to respondent, Rodriguez was

demoted from the position of principal before he left the middle school at the end of the 2018-2019 school year.

## **Respondent's Additional Evidence**

30. Respondent received a bachelor's degree from Alcorn State University in 2006. He has taught in public schools since 2006. He received a master's degree in Educational Leadership from Santa Clara University in 2010. He taught social studies for seven years with the Eastside Union School District, and from 2014 to 2018, he was also the assistant to the associate vice principal.

31. In a letter to the Commission, dated December 2, 2019, respondent wrote that his employment with the District "never seem[ed] to be right" from the outset with his interactions with the principal and vice-principal. For example, a teacher filed a grievance against respondent, an African American male, for allegedly racially threatening the teacher. Respondent was found not to be in violation of any regulations. That same teacher, in a meeting with the eighth grade faculty, openly cursed respondent, the principal and vice-principal, and received a disciplinary action. However, the principal mediated with the teacher and directed respondent not to have any interactions with the teacher. Thereafter, respondent felt that he was a "target" and did not have the support of the principal and vice-principal. In October 2018, respondent spoke to the director of student services Rosanno Polamano about his concerns. Respondent met with Polamano and Rodriguez and shared that he did not feel supported and that he felt uncomfortable; however, according to respondent, things did not change.

32. In his letter to the Commission, respondent also wrote that from December 2018 to March 2019, he handled Snively's classroom management issues

and student discipline and met with parents, students and Snavelly. Respondent described one occasion where Snavelly grabbed a student, and respondent questioned the student and the teacher and met with the student's parents. When respondent asked the principal to sit in on the meeting, Rodriguez declined. Respondent also stated that when additional allegations arose against the teacher, he informed Rodriguez that he was conducting an investigation.

33. Respondent acknowledged that he failed to fulfill his duty as a mandated reporter. He stated that he did not report the incidents because he was "the only one trying to figure out how to get it done." Respondent stated that he did not know how to handle the situation as an administrator, but when he sought guidance from Rodriguez, it was not forthcoming. Respondent stated that he was "not strong enough" to report the incidents to the police or Department of Children Services. He believes that he is "a scapegoat" for the administration's failure to deal with Snavelly.

34. After his resignation, respondent took time off from teaching after serving as an educator for 15 years. He had expected to return as a substitute teacher in the Berryessa Unified School District. However, since the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, respondent has been homeschooling his 10-year-old son.

35. Respondent testified at hearing in an open, forthright, and credible manner, consistent with one who was telling the truth. Respondent's explanation regarding the four emails was convincing. Respondent was not attempting to deceive the superintendent, but was trying to document the actions that he had taken in dealing with Snavelly's classroom management issues.

Respondent testified that he had several email exchanges with the principal to support his contentions that he had informed the principal of Snavelly's misconduct.

On November 12, 2021, complainant confirmed that all email communications between respondent and Rodriguez were deleted one year after they left employment pursuant to District policy.

36. Jennifer Phillips, a teacher at Monroe Middle School, wrote a letter of support, dated December 1, 2019. Phillips described respondent as professional, kind, genuine, and passionate about his experience teaching high school history. She described respondent's expressed desire to help students become their personal best and noted that he had inspirational art on the wall of his office. According to Phillips, at the start of the school year, respondent established himself as the administrator that dealt with disciplinary issues and as a person who actually liked kids. She described respondent as visible, being outside during passing of classes, and relating to students and teachers who felt comfortable with him. He was known as "someone who could get things done." Respondent would locate a student who had not shown up to class. He would remove a student from class, counsel the student, and return the student to class with an improved attitude which, according to Phillips, "alone is worth its weight in gold to a teacher." She was shocked when she heard that respondent would not be returning. She concluded her letter with, "This man gave his heart and soul to [Monroe Middle School], and was there many nights, past dark, working at his computer, perfecting his craft. Throughout the course of a day, he was the most visible administrator, always moving a mile a minute, and always with a smile."

37. On November 19, 2019, respondent completed a Mandated Reporter: Child Abuse and Neglect training program.

## **Ultimate Factual Findings**

38. The evidence established that respondent failed to notify the parents, the Department of Children Services and/or the police of the inappropriate conduct by Snavelly, including grabbing, pulling on, and/or injuring several students. Respondent failed to perform his duty as a mandated reporter.

39. The evidence did not establish that respondent falsified documents in an attempt to demonstrate that he had followed up on issues involving the teacher. In closing argument, complainant conceded that that the evidence did not establish, as alleged in the accusation on page 7, lines 3-4, that "[r]espondent had made handwritten notes of the actions he purportedly took, but which in fact did not take place. . . ." The notes that respondent made related to the classroom management issues.

40. The evidence failed to establish that respondent had never shared information about the teacher's conduct with the principal. It appears that the incident statement involving CH on January 24, 2019, and incidents before that date were included in the orange file folder placed on Rodriguez's desk, which Rodriguez should have reviewed and taken action upon. However, the incident statement involving JP and JS on February 14, 2019, and the incidents that occurred thereafter, were likely not placed in the orange file folder for Rodriguez's review. Given that the emails between respondent and the principal were destroyed by the District, there is no evidence to contradict respondent's testimony that he informed the principal of incidents that occurred after January 2019. Therefore, the evidence failed to establish that respondent did not report all of the incidents of misconduct by Snavelly to the principal. In closing argument, complainant acknowledged that the principal and assistant principal were aware of Snavelly's classroom management issues.

## LEGAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The Commission is responsible for the credentialing of certificated personnel, including issuing credentials and taking adverse action against credential holders. (Ed. Code, § 44000 et seq.; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 80001 et seq.) Adverse action includes the suspension or revocation of a credential. (Ed. Code, § 44000.5.)

2. The burden of proof is on complainant to show cause for discipline by clear and convincing evidence. (*Ettinger v. Board of Medical Quality Assurance* (1982) 135 Cal.App.3d 853; Evid. Code, § 500.) Clear and convincing evidence requires proof that is so clear as to leave no substantial doubt and that is sufficiently strong to command the unhesitating assent of every reasonable mind. (*In re Marriage of Brooks* (2008) 169 Cal.App.4th 176, 190.)

3. Expiration of a credential does not deprive the Commission of its authority to impose discipline. (Ed. Code, § 44440, subd. (b).)

4. Administrative proceedings regarding the discipline of professional licenses are intended not to punish the applicant or licensee, but to protect the public. (*Hughes v. Board of Architectural Examiners* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 763, 785-786.)

### Causes for Discipline

5. Education Code section 44421 authorizes the Commission to privately admonish, publicly reprove, suspend, or revoke the credential of a credential holder who has engaged in "immoral or unprofessional conduct," demonstrated "evident unfitness for service," or for any cause that would warrant the denial of an application for a credential. Complainant alleges three causes for discipline against respondent's credentials including unprofessional conduct, immoral conduct, and acts of moral

turpitude. Complainant seeks revocation of respondent's credentials. Respondent seeks to have the action dismissed.

6. Unprofessional conduct is conduct that "violates the rules or ethical code of a profession or such conduct which is unbecoming a member of a profession in good standing." (*Board of Education v. Swan* (1953) 41 Cal.2d 546, 553 [citation omitted], overruled, in part, on another ground in *Bekiaris v. Board of Education* (1972) 6 Cal.3d 575, 588, fn. 7.)

Respondent's failure to perform his duty as a mandated reporter in his position as an administrator constituted unprofessional conduct, and cause for discipline exists under Education Code section 44421, as set forth in Factual Findings 7-24 and 38.

7. "The term 'immoral' has been defined generally as that which is hostile to the welfare of the general public and contrary to good morals." (*Board of Education v. Weiland* (1960) 179 Cal.App.2d 808, 811 [citation omitted].) Immorality has not been confined to sexual matters, but includes conduct inconsistent with rectitude, or indicative of corruption, indecency, depravity, dissoluteness; or as willful, flagrant, or shameless conduct showing moral indifference to the opinions of respectable members of the community, and as an inconsiderate attitude toward good order and the public welfare." (*Id.*, at p. 972.)

Based upon the matters set forth in Factual Findings 7-24, 39 and 40, it is found that respondent's conduct, while unprofessional, did not amount to immoral conduct. There was no evidence that respondent was dishonest or engaged in corruption, indecency, or showed moral indifference to community opinions. Accordingly, cause for adverse action does not exist under Education Code section 44421 based on immoral conduct.

8. Education Code section 44345, subdivision (e), provides that the Commission may deny an application for a credential or for the renewal of a credential by any person who has "committed any act involving moral turpitude." "Moral turpitude" has been defined as an act that is contrary to honesty and good morals. (*In re Scott* (1991) 52 Cal.3d 968, 978; *Board of Education v. Weiland*, *supra*, 179 Cal.App.2d at p. 811 [citation omitted].) Courts have defined "moral turpitude" to be "any crime or misconduct committed without excuse, or any 'dishonest or immoral' act not necessarily a crime." (*Golde v. Fox* (1979) 98 Cal.App.3d 167, 181.) Moral turpitude has also been defined as conduct involving acts of "baseness, vileness or depravity in the private and social duties which a man owes to his fellow men, or to society in general, contrary to accepted and customary rule of right and duty between man and man." (*Yakov v. Board of Med. Exam'rs* (1968) 68 Cal.2d 67, 73.)

Based upon the matters set forth in Factual Findings 7-24, 39 and 40, it is found that respondent's conduct, while unprofessional, did not amount to moral turpitude. The evidence did not establish that respondent was dishonest or engaged in conduct involving acts of vileness or depravity. Accordingly, cause for adverse action for moral turpitude does not exist under Education Code section 44421 and 44345, subdivision (e).

### **Relationship of Misconduct to Fitness for Credentials**

9. In accordance with *Morrison v. State Board of Education* (1969) 1 Cal.3d 214 and California Code of Regulations, title 5, section 80302, an examination must be made to determine the relationship between the misconduct and the credential holder's fitness, competence, or ability to perform the duties authorized by the credential. Factors to be considered include, but are not limited to, the following:

(1) likelihood that the conduct may have adversely affected students, fellow teachers,



or the educational community, and the degree of such adversity anticipated;

(2) proximity or remoteness in time of the conduct; (3) type of credential held;

(4) extenuating or aggravating circumstances surrounding the conduct;

(5) praiseworthiness or blameworthiness of the motives resulting in the conduct;

(6) likelihood of recurrence of the conduct; (7) the extent to which disciplinary action may inflict an adverse impact or chilling effect upon the constitutional rights of the person involved or other certified persons; and (8) the publicity or notoriety given to the conduct.

10. Only the most pertinent *Morrison* factors need be considered in a particular case. (*West Valley-Mission Community College Dist. v. Concepcion* (1993) 16 Cal.App.4th 1766, 1777.) The factors may be applied to the charges in the aggregate, considering the totality of the teacher's offensive conduct. (*Woodland Joint Unified School Dist. v. Commission on Professional Competence* (1992) 2 Cal.App.4th 1429, 1444.)

11. Upon a consideration of the pertinent *Morrison* factors, it is determined that respondent's misconduct was related to his fitness, competence, and ability to discharge the duties authorized by his credentials and cause for adverse action exists under Education Code section 44421. Respondent engaged in unprofessional conduct when he failed to fulfill his duties as a mandated reporter when he knew that students had been physically assaulted by the teacher. However, respondent credibly testified that his misconduct stemmed from his lack of support and inexperience at being an administrator. It was not established on this record that respondent possessed additional motivations of an improper nature or that his conduct involved dishonesty. Respondent has taken a course on mandated reporting to ensure this type of conduct does not reoccur in the future. It is also noted that respondent has worked for

approximately 15 years as an educator in high schools without complaints of inappropriate conduct.

It is likely that knowing that an administrator had failed in his duty as a mandated reporter would adversely affect both students and teachers. Respondent's misconduct occurred while he was the dean of students at a middle school, serving as an ultimate role model for both students and teachers. He failed to do so.

It is an aggravating factor that respondent's misconduct was surrounded by his violation of the law requiring mandatory reporting. It is also an aggravating factor that respondent's unprofessional conduct likely allowed additional harm to come to students and thereby harmed the public or the educational system.

"Mitigating factors" are circumstances demonstrating that the public, schoolchildren, and the profession would be adequately protected by a more lenient degree of adverse action. (Cal. Code Regs., tit. 5, § 80300, subd. (m).) Respondent has shown a number of mitigating factors. He has no prior record of adverse action over many years of service as an educator. Respondent provided a strong character reference from a teacher who worked at the middle school. Most importantly, respondent accepted responsibility for his actions and completed a Mandated Reporter: Child Abuse and Neglect training program.

## **Determination of Discipline**

12. As determined above, cause for discipline exists; the question remains as to what adverse action is appropriate. Revocation which might result in ending respondent's career as an educator and administrator is too extreme based upon the evidence presented and would be punitive. However, dismissal of the action is also not warranted. Respondent's conduct did not involve dishonest or immoral conduct. He

accepted responsibility for his failure to act upon his duty as a mandated reporter and has taken a course in mandated reporting. It appears that his inexperience as an administrator and mistakes in judgment were the catalyst for his failings because he should have reported the incidents instead of amassing a file of incident statements. Under the circumstances, the public interest will be sufficiently protected by suspending respondent's credentials for a period of 90 days. This discipline is consistent with the recommendation of the Committee of Credentials and will impress upon respondent the seriousness of his misconduct and the need to handle similar situations differently in the future.

## **ORDER**

All credentials, certificates and authorizations issued to respondent Brandon Anthony Jones are suspended for a period of 90 days.

DATE: 02/01/2022

*Regina Brown*

REGINA BROWN

Presiding Administrative Law Judge

Office of Administrative Hearings