

Office of General Counsel  
Walter J. Harvey, General Counsel

**SUBJECT: MIAMI-DADE COUNTY SCHOOL BOARD v. OLIVE D. ANDERSON**  
**DOAH Case No. 22-2867TTS**

On September 7, 2022, the School Board took action to suspend Respondent without pay and initiate dismissal proceedings against Respondent for just cause, including but not limited to Misconduct in Office and gross insubordination and violation of School Board Policies 3210, *Standards of Ethical Conduct*, 3210.01, *Code of Ethics*, and 3213, *Student Supervision and Welfare*, in accordance with §§ 1001.32(2), 1012.22(1)(f), 1012.32, 1012.67, 447.209, Florida Statutes, and State Board Rules 6A-5.056 and 6A-10.081, F.A.C. Respondent timely requested an administrative hearing, which was held on January 31, 2023, before Administrative Law Judge (“ALJ”), Brittany O. Finkbeiner, of the Division of Administrative Hearings (“DOAH”). The basis for the recommended disciplinary action resulted from Respondent swiping items off the desk of a student as a form of discipline along with repeated incidents where Respondent improperly disciplined students in spite of prior directives to refrain from such conduct.

The ALJ issued her Recommended Order on April 24, 2023. In her Recommended Order, the ALJ recommended that the School Board enter a Final Order dismissing Respondent from further employment with the school district.

The Board’s General Counsel recommends that the School Board accept the Recommended Order as the School Board’s Final Order. Administration is in agreement with this recommendation. A copy of the Recommended Order is being furnished to the Board under separate cover with a copy of the proposed Final Order for the Board’s consideration.

**RECOMMENDED:** That The School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida adopt the Recommended Order of the Administrative Law Judge in its entirety as its Final Order in the case of The School Board of Miami-Dade County, Florida v. Olive D. Anderson, DOAH Case No. 22-2867TTS, dismissing Respondent from further employment with the school district, sustaining Respondent’s suspension, and denying any and all claims for back-pay.