

	EPSB Committee Meeting Agenda			
	Committee Name: Code of Ethics Review Committee			
	Date: 11/30/2017			
	Time: 9:30 a.m. - 1:12 p.m.			
	Location: EPSB Conference Room A			
Meeting Purpose:	To review Kentucky's current Code of Ethics and the Model Code of Ethics for Educators, and make a recommendation on next steps.			
Meeting Called by:	Committee			
Materials:	Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky School Certified Personnel, Model Code of Ethics for Educators, Memo on Other States' Use of the MCEE, Crosswalk (Code of Ethics & MCEE), Reverse Crosswalk (Code of Ethics & MCEE)			
Committee Members ("x" indicates attendance)				
Rob Akers	X			
Sarah Burnett	X			
Tolya Ellis	X			
David Graham	X			
Donna Hedgepath	X			
Dusty Phelps				

Time	Agenda Topics	Person Responsible
9:38 a.m.	Introduction	Cassie Trueblood
9:42 a.m.	Presentation from NASDTEC	Dr. Phil Rogers
10:19 a.m.	Review of current Code of Ethics	Cassie Trueblood
10:45 a.m.	Review of MCEE	Cassie Trueblood
11:40 a.m.	Comparison of Code of Ethics & MCEE	Chelsea Young
12:16 p.m.	Review of Use of MCEE by Other States	Cassie Trueblood
12:27 p.m.	Discussion of Next Steps	Committee Members
1:08 p.m.	Recommendation of Committee	Committee Members

Meeting Minutes

Introduction: Cassie Trueblood began the meeting by providing an overview of how the committee was created, and what their task was. Ms. Trueblood then introduced Dr. Rogers, the Executive Director of the National Association of State Directors of Teacher Education and Certification (NASDTEC).

Presentation from NASDTEC: Dr. Rogers presented on NASDTEC and the Model Code of Ethics for Educators (MCEE). Dr. Rogers' presentation included an overview of NASDTEC as an organization, what resources it provides for its members, how the MCEE came about, and why NASDTEC was chosen

to create it. Dr. Rogers described the process for creating the MCEE, which included a taskforce of key stakeholders from around the country and an extensive public comment period that led the taskforce to completely revise the MCEE. He explained the MCEE is not a list of “shall nots,” but it is meant to provide a shared language for educators to help them talk about all the little decisions they make every day that have ethical implications. Dr. Rogers explained that the intention was for states to be able to adopt the MCEE, adapt it, endorse it, or use it in any other way they see fit. He explained it has been used in some states by their EPPs and in local school districts. He stated the MCEE is not meant to be a code of conduct or charging document. He used the analogy that a code of conduct is like a stop sign and a code of ethics, like the MCEE, is a yellow caution sign. A code of ethics is a list of standards to assist practitioners in choosing the best course of action. He then provided a brief breakdown of the MCEE (5 key principles, with subtopics and 89 indicators). He concluded by explaining what NASDTEC is hoping to do next with the MCEE.

Review of Code of Ethics: Ms. Trueblood briefly reviewed KRS 161.120, which is the statute that gives the Board authority to discipline educators for misconduct. KRS 161.120(1)(m) gives the Board the authority to discipline educators for violations of the Code of Ethics. Ms. Trueblood stated the Code of Ethics was promulgated in 1995 and has not been amended since, other than to change the location of the regulation in KAR. Ms. Trueblood explained the Code sets out three sets of duties. Ms. Trueblood then reviewed each section- section (a) duties to students, section (b) duties to parents, and section (c) duties to the education profession. Ms. Trueblood explained that the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky School Certified Personnel is in statute, and we currently charge educators for violations of the code of ethics.

There was then a discussion about changing the nomenclature of the Professional Code of Ethics for Kentucky Certified School Personnel. Ms. Trueblood and Ms. Graves explained the regulatory process and the legislative process. Mr. Adams explained that it would be possible to amend the statute, but that could open up the possibility of other changes. It was discussed that 16 KAR 1:020, the Code of Ethics does need to be reviewed by June of 2019 because of the sunset provision.

Mr. Akers asked what would be helpful for staff.

There was discussion around how the MCEE is really about prevention. It was discussed that if educators were aware of the MCEE and started to really think about their decisions that it could actually decrease workload. Mr. Akers stated that as there was more awareness about these issues that it could initially lead to more educators being reported to the Board, but the goal would be a decrease in the long run.

Ms. Ellis stated that she viewed the MCEE as a proactive measure, and that it was something that needs to be available to educators.

Review of MCEE: Ms. Trueblood then went through the entire MCEE, and noted where there were specifically defined words.

Mr. Graham drew a comparison in that educators are trained on their duty to report abuse and neglect, but the MCEE says educators also have a duty to each other to point out and discuss potential ethical violations.

The MCEE specifically defined “student” and Ms. Trueblood noted that the Board currently does not have a definition of student. It was briefly discussed that there have been instances where an inappropriate relationship is alleged to have occurred the day after a student graduates. Ms. Ellis stated that she thought it was important to look at defining a student.

Ms. Hedgepath asked if the MCEE defines the word “respect” which was mentioned in one of the indicators. She brought up the definition of boundaries in the MCEE and stated she thought that was something the board needs to look at too.

It was discussed that districts could take the MCEE and train educators themselves, and that they might be more comfortable doing that if the Board endorsed it.

The committee took a break at 11:30 a.m.

Comparison of Code of Ethics & MCEE: Ms. Young presented a cross walk and reverse crosswalk to show how the current Code of Ethics and MCEE interact. Ms. Young pointed out that it is not a perfect fit, but there is a lot of overlap between our Code of Ethics and the MCEE.

Mr. Akers noted that the MCEE seems to fill in the gaps in our Code of Ethics. There was some discussion that technology was missing from the current Code of Ethics.

Mr. Graham brought up the term multiple relationship, which was defined in the MCEE and stated that he thought that was important because those exist, but educators do not talk about it.

The committee then discussed opening up the statute to change the name of the code of ethics, and the potential issues with this.

The committee took a break to have lunch at 11:55 a.m.

Review of Use of MCEE by Other States: Ms. Trueblood stated that staff had reached out to several states to see if they had any updates on their use of the MCEE. The committee reviewed updates from several states including: Alaska, Georgia, Hawaii, Indiana, Ohio and Wyoming.

Discussion of next steps: Ms. Trueblood stated that staff will summarize the meeting for Mr. Akers to give an update at the December board meeting, and prepare a full report to be presented at the February board meeting.

The committee then continued discussion on next steps.

Ms. Ellis reiterated that Kentucky needs the MCEE to be readily available for those already in education or even thinking about education. She asked what the cost would be to post it online or buy brochures.

The committee agreed that they wanted to endorse the MCEE.

Ms. Trueblood asked whom they wanted to endorse it to. There was some discussion on what would be the best way to publicize the MCEE (talking to different organizations, presenting at conferences,

including in EPSB Update Memos, making districts aware of it, giving in house presentations, getting word out to EPPs, online webinars, etc.). There was a brief discussion on if it could be utilized in KTIP in any way.

The committee discussed different options for trainings on the MCEE and the Code of Ethics including ProEthica. The potential of making the training mandatory was also discussed.

Ms. Hedgepath stated that she likes Hawaii's approach.

There was discussion that the committee would like feedback.

There was some discussion on changing the title of the MCEE in a way that made it clear that it is from NASDTEC and being used nationwide, but also something Kentucky wants to use, such as Kentucky's Guide to Ethical Decision Making. It was suggested that the Board could bundle the current Code of Ethics and MCEE as a guide, but there would still be issues with the wording.

Ms. Burnett stated she thinks the Board should endorse the MCEE as an instructional tool for use by EPP's and in-service teachers. She stated that she thinks it will encourage self-reflection.

Mr. Graham agreed. He stated it is preventative and informative.

Ms. Hedgepath stated she could see online training, at admission/exit of a program, and that it could even lead to more scenario driven instruction, which could change the culture in higher education in a good way.

The next steps are a full report to the Board by February, and to start publicizing and getting feedback on the MCEE. The committee would need to start making decisions in February/April 2019 since the deadline to review the regulation is June 2019. Ms. Graves stated we could file that we are working on it, and get an extension if the timing became an issue.

It was discussed that the committee want to allow districts and EPPs to use how they see fit initially, and by Fall 2018 to start gathering feedback from stakeholders. The committee wants to publicize the MCEE by any means necessary.

The committee's recommendation is to endorse the MCEE to school districts and EPPs, and to start looking into how it could be incorporated into KTIP.