

Reporting of Suspected Abuse of a Child

Any district employee who has reasonable cause to believe that any child with whom the employee has come in contact has suffered abuse or neglect, as defined in state law, be any adult or by a student with whom the employee is in contact has abused a child, will immediately notify the Washington County Department of Human Services, or the local law enforcement agency. The district employee shall also immediately inform his/her supervisor, building principal or superintendent or designee.

The abuse of a child by district employees or by students will not be tolerated. All district employees are subject to this policy and the accompanying administrative regulation. If a district employee is a suspected abuser, reporting requirements remain the same. The district will designate the superintendent or designee to receive reports of the abuse of a child by district employees and specify the procedures to be followed upon receipt of an abuse report. The district will post in each school building the name and contact information of the person designated to receive child abuse reports, as well as the procedures the superintendent or designee will follow upon receipt of a report. In the event that the designated person is the suspected abuser, the chief human resource officer shall receive the report. When the superintendent or designee takes action on the report, the person who initiated the report must be notified.

A substantiated report of abuse by an employee shall be documented in the employee's personnel file. A substantiated report of abuse by a student shall be documented in the student's education record.

Upon request, the district shall provide records of investigations of suspected abuse of a child by a district employee or former district employee to law enforcement, Oregon Department of Human Services or Teacher Standards and Practices Commission.

Any district employee participating in good faith in the making of a report, pursuant to this policy and Oregon law and who has reasonable grounds for the making thereof, shall have immunity from any liability, civil or criminal, that might otherwise be incurred or imposed with respect to the making or content of any such report. Further, the initiation of a report in good faith about suspected abuse of a child may not adversely affect any terms or conditions of employment or the work environment of the complainant. The superintendent or designee shall notify the person initiating the report about actions taken by the district based on the report.

If a student initiates a report of suspected abuse of a child by a district employee in good faith, the student will not be disciplined by any district employee. Intentionally making a false report of the abuse of a child is a Class A violation.

The superintendent or designee will establish rules, procedures, work instructions and/or forms to be used in the child abuse reporting process, and implement such regulations as are necessary to accomplish the intent of this policy and to comply with state law. Copies of this policy and applicable state laws will be given to all school employees.

The district shall establish written procedures to provide district staff training each school year in the prevention and identification of child abuse and on the obligations of school employees under Oregon Revised Statute (ORS) 419B.005 to 419B.050 and as directed by Board policy to report suspected the abuse of a child. In addition, an annual training for parents and legal guardians of students attending district schools shall be provided on the prevention, identification of abuse of a child and the obligation of school employees to report the suspected abuse of a child. Annual training designed to help prevent the abuse of a child will be made available to students attending district-operated schools.

END OF POLICY

Legal Reference(s):

[ORS 339.370 to -339.400](#)
[ORS 418.746 to -418.751](#)

[ORS 419B.005 to -419B.050](#)

[OAR 581-022-2205](#)

Greene v. Camreta, 588 F.3d 1011 (9th Cir. 2009), vacated in part by, remanded by Camreta v. Greene, 131 S. Ct. 2020 (U.S. 2011); vacated in part, remanded by Greene v. Camreta 661 F.3d 1201 (9th Cir. 2011).