

STATE OF FLORIDA  
DIVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE HEARINGS

RICHARD CORCORAN, AS COMMISSIONER  
OF EDUCATION,

Petitioner,

vs.

Case No. 20-0767PL

IVONNE ORTIZ,

Respondent.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

RECOMMENDED ORDER

Pursuant to notice, a final hearing was conducted in this case on October 30, 2020, via Zoom teleconference, before Lawrence P. Stevenson, a duly-designated Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”) of the Division of Administrative Hearings.

APPEARANCES

For Petitioner: Ron Weaver, Esquire  
Post Office Box 770088  
Ocala, Florida 34477-0088

For Respondent: Steve Rossi, Esquire  
Law Offices of Steve Rossi  
533 Northeast 3rd Avenue, Suite 2  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES

The issues in this proceeding are whether Respondent should be subject to discipline as a result of the violations of section 1012.795(1)(j), Florida Statutes and Florida Administrative Code Rule 6A-10.081(2)(c)1. and 8.,

alleged in the Administrative Complaint and, if so, what is the appropriate sanction for those violations.

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

On September 5, 2019, the Commissioner of Education issued a three-count Administrative Complaint against Respondent which alleged that:

On or about October 24, 2018, Respondent engaged in inappropriate and deceitful conduct when she gave a false statement indicating that a student had rammed into her to push out her [sic] of the way during the workday, which resulted in her school filing a worker's compensation claim.

On September 19, 2019, Respondent, through her attorney, timely filed an Election of Rights in which she requested a formal hearing. On or about February 12, 2020, Respondent filed a Revised Election of Rights. On February 13, 2020, the matter was referred to the Division of Administrative Hearings for a formal evidentiary hearing.

The case was scheduled for hearing on April 30, 2020. On March 19, 2020, Petitioner filed an unopposed motion to continue based on the Governor's declaration of a state of emergency and closure of the public schools due to the spread of Covid-19. The hearing was rescheduled for hearing via Zoom teleconference on September 30, 2020. On September 9, 2020, a joint motion to continue was filed based on Petitioner's recent discovery of an additional school surveillance video of the incident in question. The continuance was granted and the hearing was rescheduled for October 30, 2020, on which date it was convened and completed. Prior to the hearing, the parties submitted a Joint Pre-hearing Stipulation, which has been accepted and incorporated into the Findings of Fact in this Recommended Order.

At the hearing, Petitioner presented the testimony of Brittany Brooks, Assistant School Leader at KIPP Voice Academy (“KIPP Voice”) in Jacksonville; Leighton Roye, Jr., Campus Manager at KIPP Voice; Jessica Brown, Dean of School Operations at KIPP Voice; and Dr. Melissa Fullmore, Chief Schools Officer at KIPP Jacksonville Schools (“KIPP”). Petitioner’s Exhibits 3, 7, 10, 12, 18-A, and 18-B were accepted into evidence. Respondent testified on her own behalf and offered no exhibits.

The one-volume Transcript of the hearing was filed at the Division of Administrative Hearings on December 2, 2020. By Order dated December 14, 2020, Respondent’s unopposed motion to extend the time for filing proposed recommended orders was granted and the filing date was extended to December 28, 2020. The parties timely filed their Proposed Recommended Orders on December 28, 2020.

The events at issue in this proceeding occurred on October 24, 2018. This proceeding is governed by the law in effect at the time of the commission of the acts alleged to warrant discipline. *See McCloskey v. Dep’t of Fin. Servs.*, 115 So. 3d 441 (Fla. 5th DCA 2013). Accordingly, all statutory and regulatory references shall be to the 2018 versions, unless otherwise noted.

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

Based on the evidence adduced at hearing, and the record as a whole, the following Findings of Fact are made:

1. The Education Practices Commission is the state agency charged with the duty and responsibility to revoke or suspend, or take other appropriate action with regard to teaching certificates as provided in sections 1012.795 and 1012.796. § 1012.79(7), Fla. Stat.

2. Petitioner, as Commissioner of Education, is charged with the duty to file and prosecute administrative complaints against individuals who hold

Florida teaching certificates and who are alleged to have violated standards of teacher conduct. § 1012.796(6), Fla. Stat.

3. Respondent, Ivonne Ortiz, holds Florida Educator's Certificate 1258585, covering the areas of Pre-kindergarten/Primary Education, which is valid through June 30, 2022.

4. At the time of the allegations in the Administrative Complaint, Ms. Ortiz was employed as a third-grade teacher by KIPP, a charter school organization in Duval County. She was assigned to KIPP Voice, one of three academies operated by KIPP. Ms. Ortiz was employed at KIPP Voice from July 18, 2016, through November 8, 2018.

5. When a KIPP employee is injured on the job, the employee must notify his or her manager and complete an Employee Accident Report form. The form is an official KIPP document used to assist management and their insurance carrier in determining eligibility for workers' compensation benefits.

6. On October 24, 2018, Ms. Ortiz reported to Assistant School Leader Brittany Brooks that she was injured when a student "rammed" into her, and that she needed to see a doctor. Ms. Brooks asked Ms. Ortiz to complete an Employee Accident Report detailing the incident. The report would be forwarded to KIPP's Human Resources Department ("HR") for further consideration.

7. In the Employee Accident Report that she completed on October 24, 2018, Ms. Ortiz wrote that "[Student M.S.] was throwing a tantrum. He ran down the stairs and rammed into me to push me out of his way. He then took a snack from the bin and slammed it on the floor. I am in intense pain right now."

8. Ms. Ortiz told Ms. Brooks that she was in a lot of pain due to the interaction with the student and needed to see a doctor. After her discussion with Ms. Brooks, Ms. Ortiz left school for the day.

9. After receiving the written report from, and discussing the incident with Ms. Ortiz, Ms. Brooks informed Dean of School Operations Jessica Brown about the incident as reported by Ms. Ortiz. Ms. Brooks advised Ms. Brown that the student would have to be suspended for injuring a teacher.

10. Ms. Brown informed Ms. Brooks that she was a witness to the incident and that it did not happen as Ms. Ortiz reported.

11. On October 25, 2018, Ms. Brown submitted a written statement about the incident. In her statement, Ms. Brown wrote that Ms. Ortiz came down the stairs carrying a large black crate. M.S. came down the stairs behind her. M.S. was visibly upset. Ms. Brown took M.S. aside and learned that he was upset because Ms. Ortiz would not unlock the classroom to let him retrieve his backpack and homework. M.S. had been in in-school suspension all day and wanted to get his things so his mother would not be upset with him. Ms. Brown took M.S. upstairs to get his backpack.

12. Ms. Brown wrote, “I was shocked when Brooks came to me because Ortiz never made contact with the student [M.S.]. [M.S.] never hit her and never touch her [sic] he was just upset that Ortiz would not allow him to get his backpack so that he could do his homework.”

13. Due to the discrepancy in the accounts of Ms. Ortiz and Ms. Brown, Ms. Brooks asked Campus Manager Leighton Roye to pull video footage of the incident from the school surveillance camera. Due to the technical limitations of the school’s surveillance system, Mr. Roye was forced to record the footage with his cell phone and forward that recording to Ms. Brooks.

14. The silent video footage was entered into evidence in two parts. The first part was an eight second clip that shows Ms. Ortiz carrying a wheeled crate down the stairs near the building entrance. At the bottom of the stairs, she stopped and sat the crate on the ground. A table faced the stairs. On the table was a crate containing snacks. As students passed between the stairs and the table on their way out of the building, they could pick up a snack.

15. Ms. Brown stood at the table. She was directly facing the stairs. Two other teachers, Hannah Hughes and Madelaine Riley, were at, or near, the table but neither had the unobstructed, direct view of the stairs that Ms. Brown had.

16. The video shows that as Ms. Ortiz was placing her crate on the ground, M.S. came down the stairs behind her. As M.S. passed, Ms. Ortiz appeared to recoil slightly with her right arm, but it is unclear whether this movement was in response to a touch from M.S. or simply an adjustment of her arm after releasing the weight of the crate.

17. The angle of the video is to the side of the participants, making it impossible for the viewer to state definitely whether or not M.S. made contact with Ms. Ortiz. It is possible to state that any contact was minimal, no more than a brushing as M.S. went past. Ms. Brown, who was directly facing Ms. Ortiz and M.S., credibly testified that M.S. did not touch Ms. Ortiz.

18. The second part of the video was 81 seconds long. It began a second or two before the end of the first video and showed what occurred in the subsequent minute or so. M.S. picked up a snack and started to go outside. He dropped a portion of the snack, apparently without realizing it. An adult stepped in to pick up the dropped snack as M.S. proceeded to the door. M.S. stopped at the door and walked back into the building to an area out of camera range. Ms. Brown followed him. As this was happening, Ms. Ortiz remained standing at the bottom of the stairs with her crate at her feet. She turned her head to see where Ms. Brown was going.

19. A few seconds after Ms. Brown passed out of camera range, Ms. Ortiz began to roll her crate toward the building entrance, then stopped and turned around to hug another woman who walked into camera range. After the hug, Ms. Ortiz rolled her crate out of the building.

20. Roughly 45 seconds later, Ms. Brown and M.S. walked back into the frame. Ms. Brown had her arm around the child's shoulder as they walked

back up the stairs. The second video ended as they walked up and out of the frame.

21. Mr. Roye testified that he first recorded the eight second segment and sent that to Ms. Brooks. After viewing the video, Ms. Brooks asked Mr. Roye to go back and retrieve more footage to ensure that nothing was missed.<sup>1</sup> Mr. Roye was uncertain whether he provided the 81-second video to Ms. Brooks later the same day, but was certain that he provided it no later than the next day.

22. Ms. Brown's testimony was consistent with the videos. She was looking directly at both Ms. Ortiz and M.S. as they were coming down the stairs. Ms. Brown testified that M.S. did not touch Ms. Ortiz in any way when he came down the stairs. M.S. "absolutely" never touched Ms. Ortiz. He never came within six inches of her.

23. Ms. Brown noted Ms. Ortiz's recoiling gesture as M.S. passed. Ms. Brown believed that Ms. Ortiz gestured because she was "aggravated with him."

24. Ms. Ortiz alleged that M.S. reached the bottom of the stairs, turned to face her, and kicked the crate at her feet. Ms. Brown testified that this did not happen. Ms. Brown was positive about it because "I was standing right there."

25. The videos do not show M.S. turning back to face Ms. Ortiz at the bottom of the stairs.

26. The other adult witnesses to the incident, Ms. Hughes and Ms. Riley, provided written statements. Neither of these individuals was called as a witness at the hearing. Their hearsay written statements were not offered into evidence.

---

<sup>1</sup> The record is unclear whether Ms. Brooks directly asked Mr. Roye for the videos or whether Ms. Brown acted as an intermediary. The difference is irrelevant because the record is clear that Ms. Brooks was the initiator of the request.

27. Ms. Ortiz testified that the incident occurred as follows:

MS came down the stairs. I went to the bottom of the stairs. I never said that he pushed me. I never said that he hit me. He came down. He was very close to me. It was very quick. He came -- he took a snack, threw it on the floor. He stood in front of me. I felt the kick. It was like a ram kick. And that's how I explained it. No one ever asked me to explain what a ram kick was. But that's what I felt. He went and got a second snack and then went through the blue curtains where they receive -- the packages that come in are received. I gasped for air. I felt a little dizzy. I felt my body leaning towards the left. I was trying as best I could to deal with the pain because there were still students there and, as a teacher you don't want the students to see you weak. But I never said that he hit me. I felt a ram kick as if to push me.

\* \* \*

He turned and stood directly in front of me, kicked the crate that hit my foot, that sent the shock pain up my leg to my thigh, my waist. Caused me to feel dizzy. It caused me to feel I was losing my balance and feel my body shifting to the left side.

28. Ms. Ortiz conceded that the video did not corroborate her testimony that M.S. kicked her or the crate in front of her. She contended that the video only shows "clips," not the sequence of events as they actually occurred.

29. Ms. Brown testified that the videos showed the sequence of events exactly as they occurred. Mr. Roye testified that he had no ability to edit or alter the surveillance footage. After repeated viewings of the videos, the undersigned accepts the testimony of Ms. Brown and Mr. Roye on this point. While the videos do not include time stamps that would definitively establish their continuity, there is nothing about them that causes suspicion of alteration or editing.



30. Ms. Ortiz's testimony is not credible. M.S. did not kick her crate. On the video, Ms. Ortiz gives no outward indication that she is in pain. She hugs the other woman and appears to easily roll her crate out the building's entrance.

31. As noted above, Ms. Ortiz stated in her Employee Accident Report that "[M.S.] ran down the stairs and rammed into me to push me out of his way." Based on all the evidence presented, it is found that Ms. Ortiz made a false statement on the Employee Accident Report.

32. Dr. Melissa Peoples-Fullmore is the Chief of Schools at KIPP, functioning essentially as an assistant superintendent. After reviewing the videos, Dr. Peoples-Fullmore and Ms. Brianna Odom, KIPP's HR Associate, notified the worker's compensation carrier that they did not think Ms. Ortiz's accident claim was legitimate.

33. In consultation with KIPP attorneys and the workers' compensation carrier's attorney, Dr. Peoples-Fullmore made the decision to deny Ms. Ortiz's claim.

34. Dr. Peoples-Fullmore also made the decision to terminate Ms. Ortiz's employment because of the false statements in the Employee Accident Report. Dr. Peoples-Fullmore testified that while the false report was significant, it was not the most important factor in her termination decision. Dr. Peoples-Fullmore was more concerned that Ms. Ortiz was willing to allow her false report to cause M.S. to be wrongfully disciplined by the school. "Lying on a child" was the worst ethical infraction committed by Ms. Ortiz and a firing offense in the opinion of Dr. Peoples-Fullmore.

35. On November 7, 2018, Ms. Odom communicated with her HR superior regarding Ms. Ortiz's continued employment. On the same day, a Notice of Denial was issued on Ms. Ortiz's workers' compensation claim. On November 8, 2018, Ms. Ortiz's employment with KIPP was terminated.

36. At the hearing, Petitioner presented documentary evidence and testimony regarding past workers' compensation claims filed by Ms. Ortiz.

There was no assertion that any of Ms. Ortiz's prior claims were false or fraudulent. Mere evidence of past claims has no bearing on whether Ms. Ortiz's claim in this case was credible and has played no part in the findings of this Recommended Order.

37. Petitioner has demonstrated, by clear and convincing evidence, that Ms. Ortiz gave a false statement to her superiors, accusing a student of actions that could have had serious detrimental consequences for the student and resulting in the filing of a false workers' compensation claim.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

38. The Division of Administrative Hearings has jurisdiction of the subject matter of and the parties to this proceeding. §§ 120.569 and 120.57(1), Fla. Stat.

39. The Education Practices Commission is the state agency charged with the certification and regulation of Florida educators, pursuant to chapter 1012.

40. This is a proceeding in which Petitioner seeks to discipline Ms. Ortiz's educator certificate. Because disciplinary proceedings are considered to be penal in nature, Petitioner is required to prove the allegations in the Administrative Complaint by clear and convincing evidence. *Dep't of Banking & Fin. v. Osborne Stern & Co., Inc.*, 670 So. 2d 932 (Fla. 1996); *Ferris v. Turlington*, 510 So. 2d 292 (Fla. 1987).

41. Clear and convincing evidence "requires more proof than a 'preponderance of the evidence' but less than 'beyond and to the exclusion of a reasonable doubt.'" *In re Graziano*, 696 So. 2d 744, 753 (Fla. 1997). The Florida Supreme Court further enunciated the standard:

This intermediate level of proof entails both a qualitative and quantitative standard. The evidence must be credible; the memories of the witnesses must be clear and without confusion; and the sum total of the evidence must be of sufficient

weight to convince the trier of fact without hesitancy.

Clear and convincing evidence requires that the evidence must be found to be credible; the facts to which the witnesses testify must be distinctly remembered; the testimony must be precise and lacking in confusion as to the facts in issue. The evidence must be of such a weight that it produces in the mind of the trier of fact a firm belief or conviction, without hesitancy, as to the truth of the allegations sought to be established.

*In re Davey*, 645 So. 2d 398, 404 (Fla. 1994) (quoting *Slomowitz v. Walker*, 429 So. 2d 797, 800 (Fla. 4th DCA 1983)). “Although this standard of proof may be met where the evidence is in conflict, it seems to preclude evidence that is ambiguous.” *Westinghouse Elec. Corp. v. Shuler Bros.*, 590 So. 2d 989 (Fla. 1st DCA 1991).

42. Section 1012.795 and rule 6A-10.081 are penal in nature and must be strictly construed, with any ambiguity construed against Petitioner. Penal statutes must be construed in terms of their literal meaning, and words used by the Legislature may not be expanded to broaden the application of such statutes. *Beckett v. Dep’t of Fin. Servs.*, 982 So. 2d 94, 100 (Fla. 1st DCA 2008); *Latham v. Fla. Comm’n on Ethics*, 694 So. 2d 83 (Fla. 1st DCA 1997).

43. The allegations set forth in the Administrative Complaint are those upon which this proceeding is predicated. *Trevisani v. Dep’t of Health*, 908 So. 2d 1108, 1109 (Fla. 1st DCA 2005); *Cottrill v. Dep’t of Ins.*, 685 So. 2d 1371, 1372 (Fla. 1st DCA 1996). Due process prohibits Petitioner from taking disciplinary action against a licensee based on matters not specifically alleged in the charging instruments, unless those matters have been tried by consent. *See Shore Vill. Prop. Owner’s Ass’n v. Dep’t of Envtl. Prot.*, 824 So. 2d 208, 210 (Fla. 4th DCA 2002); *Delk v. Dep’t of Prof’l Reg.*, 595 So. 2d 966, 967 (Fla. 5th DCA 1992).

44. Count 1 of the Administrative Complaint seeks to discipline Ms. Ortiz on charges that she violated section 1012.795(1)(j), which states:

(1) The Education Practices Commission may suspend the educator certificate of any person as defined in s. 1012.01(2) or (3) for up to 5 years, thereby denying that person the right to teach or otherwise be employed by a district school board or public school in any capacity requiring direct contact with students for that period of time, after which the holder may return to teaching as provided in subsection (4); may revoke the educator certificate of any person, thereby denying that person the right to teach or otherwise be employed by a district school board or public school in any capacity requiring direct contact with students for up to 10 years, with reinstatement subject to the provisions of subsection (4); may revoke permanently the educator certificate of any person thereby denying that person the right to teach or otherwise be employed by a district school board or public school in any capacity requiring direct contact with students; may suspend the educator certificate, upon an order of the court or notice by the Department of Revenue relating to the payment of child support; or may impose any other penalty provided by law, if the person:

\* \* \*

(j) Has violated the Principles of Professional Conduct for the Education Profession prescribed by State Board of Education rules.

45. Count 1 cannot constitute an independent violation, but rather is dependent upon a corresponding violation of the Principles of Professional Conduct, codified at rule 6A-10.081.

46. Count 2 of the Administrative Complaint seeks to discipline Ms. Ortiz for violating rule 6A-10.081(2)(c)1. Count 3 of the Administrative Complaint seeks to discipline Ms. Ortiz for violating rule 6A-10.081(2)(c)8. The cited provisions of the Principles of Professional Conduct state as follows:

(2) Florida educators shall comply with the following disciplinary principles. Violation of any of these principles shall subject the individual to revocation or suspension of the individual educator's certificate, or the other penalties as provided by law.

\* \* \*

(c) Obligation to the profession of education requires that the individual:

1. Shall maintain honesty in all professional dealings.

\* \* \*

8. Shall not submit fraudulent information on any document in connection with professional activities.

47. Rule 6A-10.081(2)(c)1. does not define the term "honesty." If a term is not defined in rule or statute, its common ordinary meaning applies. *Cole Vision Corp. v. Dep't of Bus. & Prof'l Reg.*, 688 So. 2d 404, 410 (Fla. 1st DCA 1997). It is appropriate to refer to dictionary definitions when construing statutes in order to ascertain the plain and ordinary meaning of the words used therein. *Sch. Bd. of Palm Beach Cty. v. Survivors Charter Sch., Inc.*, 3 So. 3d 1220, 1233 (Fla. 2009). Merriam Webster's online dictionary defines "honesty" as "adherence to the facts; fairness and straightforwardness of conduct." It cites the following terms as synonyms: integrity, probity, truthfulness, veracity, and verity. See <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/honesty> (last visited January 9, 2021).

48. The evidence established that Ms. Ortiz submitted a false Employee Accident Report that wrongfully accused a student of actions that could have led to that student's suspension from school. Ms. Ortiz's false report also led to the submission of a false workers' compensation claim. It has been

established that Ms. Ortiz failed to maintain honesty in her professional dealings and therefore committed the violation alleged in Count 2.

49. Rule 6A-10.081(2)(c)8. does not define the term “fraudulent.” Merriam Webster’s online dictionary defines “fraudulent” as “done to trick someone for the purpose of getting something valuable.” See <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/fraudulent> (last visited January 9, 2021). Thus, “fraudulent information” would not simply be false or incorrect information; it must be information offered with the intent to mislead the recipient.

50. This definition is consistent with the elements of common law fraud. “The essential elements of a fraud claim are: (1) a false statement concerning a specific material fact; (2) the maker’s knowledge that the representation is false; (3) an intention that the representation induces another’s reliance; and (4) consequent injury by the other party acting in reliance on the interpretation.” *Ward v. Atlantic Sec. Bank*, 777 So. 2d 1144, 1146 (Fla. 3d DCA 2001).

51. Ms. Ortiz’s submission of a false report meets the definition of a fraudulent act. Her statements on the Employee Accident Report were dishonest and intended to deceive in order to obtain undeserved workers’ compensation benefits. School administrators relied on the information provided by Ms. Ortiz. The process to suspend the student was commenced and the workers’ compensation claim process was initiated. The school likely would have continued to act in reliance on Ms. Ortiz’s false claim if not for the coincidence that the main witness, Ms. Brown, also happened to be in the chain of command for processing the claim and in a position to stop the process before it went any farther.

52. It has been established that Ms. Ortiz submitted fraudulent information on a document in connection with her professional activities and therefore committed the violation alleged in Count 3.

53. By establishing the specific violations alleged in Counts 2 and 3, Petitioner has established the general violation of the Principles of Professional Conduct alleged in Count 1.

54. Florida Administrative Code Rule 6B-11.007(2) establishes the range of penalties for violations of section 1012.795(1)(j) and rule 6A-10.081(2)(a)1. The version of the rule in effect at the time of Ms. Ortiz's offenses provided as follows:<sup>2</sup>

(2) The following disciplinary guidelines shall apply to violations of the below listed statutory and rule violations and to the described actions which may be basis for determining violations of particular statutory or rule provisions. Each of the following disciplinary guidelines shall be interpreted to include "probation," "Recovery Network Program," "restrict scope of practice," "fine," and "administrative fees and/or costs" with applicable terms thereof as additional penalty provisions in each case in which neither a suspension or revocation is imposed, the penalty shall include a letter of reprimand. The terms "suspension" and "revocation" shall mean any length of suspension or revocation, including permanent revocation, permitted by statute, and shall include comparable denial of an application for an educator's certificate.

\* \* \*

(j) Violating the Principles of Professional Conduct in violation of Section 1012.795(1)(j), F.S., by:

\* \* \*

15. Failing to maintain honesty in all professional dealings. [subparagraph 6A-10.081(2)(c)1., F.A.C.] Reprimand -- Revocation.

\* \* \*

---

<sup>2</sup> The rule was amended to its current form on December 10, 2019, subsequent to the events at issue in this proceeding. The range of penalties for Ms. Ortiz's offenses did not change.

22. Submitting fraudulent information on any document in connection with professional activities. [subparagraph 6A-10.081(2)(c)8., F.A.C.] Suspension -- Revocation .

55. Petitioner recommends that Ms. Ortiz's educator's certificate be suspended for two years from the date of the final order; that she be placed on probation for a period of two years after her suspension, with conditions to be determined by the Education Practices Commission; that Ms. Ortiz be required to take a college level course in professional ethics for educators; and that she pay a \$750.00 fine.

56. The undersigned agrees with all aspects of the recommendation except for the fine, which the undersigned concludes would be needlessly punitive in light of the severity of the other penalties.

#### RECOMMENDATION

Based on the foregoing Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, the undersigned hereby RECOMMENDS that the Education Practices Commission enter a final order finding that: Respondent violated the statutes and rules listed above; Respondent's educator's certificate be suspended for a period of two years from the date of the final order; Respondent be placed on probation for a period of two years after her suspension, with conditions to be determined by the Education Practices Commission; and prior to the reinstatement of her educator's certificate, Respondent be required to take a college level course in professional ethics for educators.



DONE AND ENTERED this 19th day of January, 2021, in Tallahassee, Leon County, Florida.



---

LAWRENCE P. STEVENSON  
Administrative Law Judge  
Division of Administrative Hearings  
The DeSoto Building  
1230 Apalachee Parkway  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-3060  
(850) 488-9675  
Fax Filing (850) 921-6847  
[www.doah.state.fl.us](http://www.doah.state.fl.us)

Filed with the Clerk of the  
Division of Administrative Hearings  
this 19th day of January, 2021.

COPIES FURNISHED:

Steve Rossi, Esquire  
Law Offices of Steve Rossi  
Suite 2  
533 Northeast 3rd Avenue  
Fort Lauderdale, Florida 33301  
(eServed)

Ron Weaver, Esquire  
Post Office Box 770088  
Ocala, Florida 34477-0088  
(eServed)

Lisa M. Forbess, Interim Executive Director  
Education Practices Commission  
Department of Education  
Turlington Building, Suite 316  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400  
(eServed)

Matthew Mears, General Counsel  
Department of Education  
Turlington Building, Suite 1244  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400  
(eServed)

Randy Kosec, Jr., Chief  
Office of Professional Practices Services  
Department of Education  
Turlington Building, Suite 224-E  
325 West Gaines Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0400  
(eServed)

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO SUBMIT EXCEPTIONS

All parties have the right to submit written exceptions within 15 days from the date of this Recommended Order. Any exceptions to this Recommended Order should be filed with the agency that will issue the Final Order in this case.