1 2 3	BEFORE THE TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF OREGON	
5 6 7	In the Matter of the ) DEFAU Teaching License of ) REVOC KRISTIN LARAE SHIMEK ) TO API	ILT ORDER OF CATION OF RIGHT PLY
8		nd Practices Commission
9	(Commission) issued a Notice of Opportunity for Hearing to Kristin LaRae Shimek	
10	(Shimek) in which the Commission charged her with Gross Neglect of Duty pursuant to	
11	OAR 584-050-0006(3)(a), OAR 584-020-0040 (4)(c), and OAR 584-050-0006(3)(d).	
12	The Notice was sent via U.S. First Class Mail and U.S. Certified Mail Receipt 7010 0290	
13	0001 6831 4503 to the address on file with the Commission. The Certified Mail was	
14	returned to the Commission as unclaimed. The regular mail was not returned to the	
15	Commission. The Notice of Opportunity of Hearing, dated October 12, 2010, and	
16	signed by Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director, stated:	
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	PERIOD, YOUR RIGHT TO A HEARING SHALL BE CONSIDERED WAIVED UNLESS YOUR FAILURE TO REQUEST A HEARING WAS BEYOND YOUR REASONABLE CONTROL. IF YOU DO NOT REQUEST A HEARING OR IF YOU FAIL TO APPEAR AT A HEARING, THE COMMISSION WILL ADOPT AN ORDER OF DEFAULT WHICH MAY INCLUDE THE REVOCATION OR SUSPENSION OF YOUR LICENSE OR OTHER DISCIPLINE."	
24 25		nerefore, finds Shimek to be in
26	default and enters the following findings of fact, conclusions	sions of law and order, based on
27	the files and records of the Commission concerning this	s matter.
28	FINDINGS OF FACT	
29	1. On August 18, 2008, and May 7, 2009, Kristin L	aRae Shimek submitted a PA-1
30	Application for Student Teaching or Practicum for	orm. On each form Shimek
31	accurately answered "yes" to the following ques	tions regarding her previous
32	discipline by a licensing agency;	

- a. 4. Have you ever had a professional certificate, credential or license (of any kind) revoked or suspended or have you been placed on probationary status
   for any alleged misconduct or alleged violation of professional standards of conduct?
  - b. 7. Have you ever been disciplined by any public agency responsible for licensure of any kind, including but not limited to educational licensure?

5

6

7

8

9

24

25

26

- c. Shimek's "yes" answers relate to discipline she received by the Oregon Board of Physical Therapists. Shimek did not begin a student teaching program following her August 2008 submission.
- 10 2. With Shimek's August 18, 2008, PA-1 form she submitted an explanation for her 11 "yes" answers to questions 4 and 7 above. In this letter Shimek explained that 12 her Physical Therapy license had been suspended due to the misfeasance of two 13 of her former employees who engaged in credit card theft, fraud, and identity 14 theft, against one of her patients. Shimek also wrote that these former employees made threats against her and retaliated against her by filing 15 16 complaints with various state agencies. This information was false. The former employees Shimek wrote of did not engage in the crimes listed, nor were there 17 18 complainants to the Physical Therapy Board. The Physical Therapy took action 19 against Shimek's licensure for unrelated actions.
- 20 3. The Physical Therapy Board issued several actions against Shimek as follows;
- a. Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action, issued December 6, 2005: Shimek allowed an untrained employee to act as a physical therapist aide by placing electrodes on two patients. Shimek was fined \$500.00.
  - b. Order for Physical, Mental and Chemical Addiction Evaluation, issued August 17, 2006: Allegations by confidential complainants that Shimek appeared intoxicated at work. Shimek was directed to undergo an evaluation for addiction.

c. Interim Stipulated Agreement issued November 7, 2006: In lieu of suspension of license, Shimek agreed not to practice physical therapy during formal investigation by the Physical Therapy Board.

- d. Amendment to Interim Stipulated Order, issued November 9, 2006: The Physical Therapy Board modified the earlier agreement to state that Shimek could terminate the Interim Stipulated Agreement by first providing a 30 day notice.
- e. Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action, issued February 9, 2007: Physical Therapy Board to take action against Shimek for failing to complete a board-ordered evaluation; sexual conduct involving a patient and failure to maintain an appropriate patient-therapist relationship; failure to maintain appropriate patient-therapist relationships and engaging in inappropriate conversations with patients; addiction or dependency on controlled substances and/or psychological condition negatively affecting practice of physical therapy; practices behind the scope of physical therapy; obtaining a fee by misrepresentation/failure to adequately bill for services provided/moral turpitude; providing substandard care as a physical therapist by failing to be available for treatment; inappropriate use of aides and failure to properly train aides; failure to properly document aide training; failure to complete and perform required re-assessments; inadequate treatment records; interference with another person's cooperation with the Physical Therapy Board; failure to cooperate with the Physical Therapy Board.
- f. Stipulated Agreement and Final Order, issued August 6, 2007, Shimek admitted to some of the complaints in the previous notice and thereafter lost her license to practice for one year, requiring that she complete a psychological/chemical addiction evaluation and course of treatment, have a plan of action for patient treatment at your clinic while she was unable to practice, submit quarterly written progress reports, keep the Board informed of all personnel changes at clinic, refrain from performing any activity

- 1 requiring a license, pay a fine of \$5,000, cooperate with the Board, cannot 2 contest alleged violations in the notice, and must comply with all sanctions in 3 a timely manner. 4 g. Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action, issued August 5, 2008: Shimek failed 5 to secure outpatient treatment in a timely manner, did not obtain individual 6 psychotherapy as recommended by the Mayo Clinic, and failed to provide the 7 Board with quarterly written progress reports. Due to this, Shimek was 8 notified that the Board intended to revoke her license. 9 h. Emergency Suspension Order and Notice of Rights, issued August 5, 2008: 10 Shimek failed to comply with the terms of the Interim Stipulated Agreement 11 and her license was suspended. 12 i. Stipulated Agreement and Final Order, issued March 17, 2009: Shimek failed 13 to comply with all conditions of the Stipulated Agreement, although she did 14 partially comply, and her license was suspended for two years, until March 15 17, 2011. 16 4. As part of the Stipulated Agreements with the Physical Therapy Board Shimek 17 was required to undergo several evaluations for substance addiction and mental 18 fitness. A March 17, 2008, doctors evaluation recommended: 19 a. "An outpatient addiction program...often individuals like Ms. Shimek do not 20 benefit as greatly from a program dealing primarily with alcohol or illicit 21 substance dependence. I recommend a program which includes both group 22 psychotherapy as well as individual sessions." 23 b. "...recommend aftercare which is ongoing once weekly individual or group 24 sessions for monitoring of recovery through urine screens and contact with
- c. "I believe ongoing urine screening for resumption of substance use, as 27 mandated by most state boards, would be a reasonable component..."

professionals."

25

- In the fall of 2008 Shimek was treated for chemical dependency at Addiction
  Recovery Center in Medford Oregon. Shimek previously completed a threeweek pain treatment program at the Mayo Clinic where she was treated for opioid
  and benzodiazepine use problems, as well as boundary concerns.
- On September 10, 2009, Shimek left a voice message for a Commission staff
  person in which she slurred her words and sounded as though she was under
  the influence of some substance. Shimek made numerous contacts with
  Commission staff as information regarding her application was gathered in which
  she was emotional and moody to the point of crying.

## 10 CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Kristin LaRae Shimek's explanation of her "yes" answers on your 2008 PA-1 Form provides grounds for denial of her license application under OAR 584-050-0006(3)(a), which provides that a license application may be denied if the applicant submits a falsified application.

Shimek's explanation of her "yes" answers on your 2008 PA-1 Form violated OAR 584-020-0040(4)(c), which provides as follows "Knowing falsification of any documents or knowing misrepresentation directly related to licensure, employment, or professional duties," constitutes gross neglect of duty and is a basis for denial of licensure, as it is incorporated in ORS 342.143, "good moral character."

Shimek's false statements relating to the reason for the Physical Therapy taking action against her license provide the Executive Director basis to deny her application for educator license pursuant to OAR 584-050-0006(3)(a)) (Notice of denial and right to a hearing may be issued by the Executive Director when any of the following conditions exist: The applicant submits a falsified application.)

The conduct that became the subject of the Oregon Physical Therapy Board's actions against Shimek's license provides the Executive Director of evidence of her lack of fitness to serve as an educator pursuant to ORS 342.143(2); OAR 584-050-0006(3)(d) (The Executive Director has evidence that the applicant may lack fitness to serve as an educator)

30 ///

1	The Commission's authority to impose discipline in this matter is based upon	
2	ORS 342.175.	
3	FINAL ORDER	
4	The Commission hereby revokes Kristin LaRae Shimek's Right to Apply for an	
5	Oregon Teaching License.	
6	IT IS SO ORDERED THIS /// day of February, 2011.	
7		
8	TEACHER STANDARDS AND PRACTICES COMMISSION	
9 10 11 12 13 14	By: Mandedain Victoria Chamberlain, Executive Director	
16 17 18	NOTICE OF APPEAL OR RIGHTS	
19 20 21 22 23	YOU ARE ENTITLED TO JUDICIAL REVIEW OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW MAY BE OBTAINED BY FILING A PETITION FOR REVIEW WITHIN 60 DAYS FROM THE SERVICE OF THIS ORDER. JUDICIAL REVIEW IS PURSUANT TO THE PROVISIONS OF ORS 183.482 TO THE OREGON COURT OF APPEALS.	