


RECEIVED
DEC 18 2018
Secretary of State
Professional Regulation

SO ORDERED.

Vermont Board of Nursing

By: 
Ellen Watson, Chair
Vermont Board of Nursing

Date: 14 January 2018

OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL REGULATION

DATE OF ENTRY: 1.15.19

Appeal Rights

This is a final administrative determination by the Vermont Board of Nursing. A party aggrieved by a final decision of a board may appeal this decision by filing a written Notice of Appeal with the Director of the Office of Professional Regulation, Vermont Secretary of State, 89 Main St., Fl. 3, Montpelier, VT 05620-3402 within 30 days of the entry of this Order. If an appeal is filed, the Director of the Office of Professional Regulation shall assign the case to an appellate officer. The review shall be conducted on the basis of the record created before the board. In cases of alleged irregularities in procedure before the board, not shown in the record, proof on that issue may be taken by the appellate officer. 3 V.S.A. §§ 129(d) and 130a.

- (i) When Respondent is ready to petition for reinstatement, Respondent shall contact the Enforcement Unit Case Manager at the Office of Professional Regulation to set up the urine analysis process and receive instructions. Once registered with the pre-approved person or entity, Respondent will have 45 days to submit to a minimum of three (3) random urine analyses. The process by which Respondent learns whether the Respondent is selected to provide a sample on any given day will be governed by the policy of the pre-approved person or entity conducting the testing at that time;
- (ii) The urine analyses must be collected in an observed setting, administered by a pre-approved lab qualified to analyze samples for forensic purposes, the results of which shall be negative;
- (iii) Failure to appear for, refusal to provide, adulteration of, dilution of, or tampering with a sample for any urine analysis shall cause that screen to be presumed positive;
- (c) If recommended by an Independent Evaluator, enter into a treating professional agreement and substance abuse treatment plan with a pre-approved treating professional(s) and follow all recommendations.
- (d) If reinstated, Respondent's license **SHALL BE CONDITIONED** pursuant to whatever terms are reasonable at the time of Respondent's reinstatement request, taking into account the independent evaluation, urine analysis results, the facts contained in the Default Order, and any other relevant factors at that time.

The Hearing Officer reports the above facts, conclusions of law, and the finding of DEFAULT to the Board with the recommendation that the Board approve them and enter the Order as above.

Dated this 18th day of December, 2018.


George K. Belcher
Hearing Officer of the Vermont Board of Nursing

The Vermont Board of Nursing considered the report of findings of fact and conclusions of law at its meeting on 14 January 2019. After considering the report, the Board takes the following action:

- / / Rejects the report and schedules the matter for hearing.
- / / Schedules the matter for additional evidence.
- ☒ Accepts the report, adopts the findings of fact and conclusions of law, and orders the recommended discipline as set forth in the proposed order above.

Prosecution's presentation and taking notice of the OPR file, the Hearing Officer of the Board finds Respondent to be in Default. The allegations contained in the Specification of Charges are therefore treated as the facts on which the Board may issue an order of professional discipline. OPR Rule 3.4, 3 V.S.A. § 809(d), and 3 V.S.A. § 814(c).

6. It is specifically found that between October of 2017 and April of 2018 while working at the Gill Odd Fellows Home (nursing home) the Respondent diverted hundreds of Oxycodone tablets for unauthorized use and failed to properly document the missing medications.
7. It was the recommendation of the State of Vermont that the Respondent's license be indefinitely suspended with conditions should the Board later determine that the Respondent's license should be reinstated. Those recommended conditions follow in the proposed order below.

Conclusions of Law

Respondent has received adequate or constructive notice of the charges in this matter as indicated by the Board's file and the Prosecution's presentation. Because Respondent has failed to answer the charges, the factual allegations in the Specification of Charges are treated as if proved. O.P.R. Rule 3.4. Accordingly, the Board may find, based up the finding of Default from this Default Hearing held pursuant to 3 V.S.A. §809(d), that Respondent has engaged in the unprofessional conduct alleged in the Specification of Charges. The Respondent committed unprofessional conduct by violating 26 VSA Sec. 1582(a)(3) (Engaging in conduct of a character likely to deceive); 3 VSA Secs. 129a(a)(7) (Willfully making false reports); 3 VSA Sec. 129a(b)(1) (Failure to practice competently); 3 VSA Sec. 129a(a)(15) (Failure to exercise independent professional judgement); and 26 VSA Sec. 1582(a)(2) (Diverting drugs).

Proposed Order

In accordance with the above Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and consistent with the recommendation by the State, the Board does **ORDER** that the Respondent's license be **Indefinitely Suspended**. In the event that the Respondent seeks to regain her license, she must petition for reinstatement. Within forty-five (45) days of requesting reinstatement, Respondent must, at her own cost:

- (a) Obtain an independent substance abuse and mental health evaluation report by a pre-approved licensed professional specializing in drug and alcohol abuse ("Independent Evaluator") who has verified receipt of the Default Order. The results of the Independent Evaluation must indicate that Respondent does not present a risk to the safety, health or welfare of Respondent's potential patients, as well as any recommendations that would ensure Respondent is safe to practice. The evaluation must be submitted to the Enforcement Unit Case Manager.
- (b) Submit to the Enforcement Unit Case Manager the results of a minimum of three (3) random urine analyses:

**STATE OF VERMONT
SECRETARY OF STATE
OFFICE OF PROFESSIONAL REGULATION
VERMONT BOARD OF NURSING**

In re: COLLEEN MATTESON
License No. 026.0067563

}
}
}

Docket No. 2018-89

Appearances:

Prosecutor: Aaron J. Kisicki, Esq.

Respondent: Did not appear

Hearing Officer: George K. Belcher

DEFAULT ORDER

The Hearing Officer of the Vermont Board of Nursing held a hearing pursuant to 3 VSA Sec. 129(f) in the above matter on December 17, 2018 at the Office of Professional Regulation in Montpelier, Vermont. Respondent did not attend and was not represented by counsel.

Findings of Fact

1. Respondent is a Licensed Registered Nurse and is therefore subject to the regulatory authority of this Board. 3 V.S.A. §§ 129, 129a, 26 V.S.A. Chapter 28, and the Administrative Rules of the Board of Nursing, and the Rules of the Office of Professional Regulation.
2. Charges were filed in this matter on August 27, 2018. The Respondent was sent a Notice of Charges in this matter by certified mail and first class mail to the address of the Respondent which was on file with the Office of Professional Regulation on August 27, 2018. The certified mail notice of charges was returned unclaimed and unable to forward. A copy of the Specification of Charges is attached to this Default Order.
3. OPR Rule 3.3 requires that an Answer be filed within 20 days of the date on which the notice of charges was mailed by the Director.
4. On December 4, 2018 a notice was sent to the Respondent advising of the hearing before the Board to find a default and advising that, "If you wish to contest the charges you must contact the office immediately at (802) 828-2367 and show good cause for failing to answer the charges against you." This notice was mailed by certified mail. The certified mail notice was not returned as of the date of the hearing. The State Prosecutor likewise sent a copy of the Motion for Default to the Respondent on November 29, 2018 to which no answer was made.
5. Respondent has not filed an answer to the charges, nor any communication concerning good cause for failure to answer. The Respondent did not appear at the hearing on default. No contact was made by the Respondent to the attorney for the State indicating that the Respondent intended to contest the charges. Upon consideration of the