

8.1 Follows the ethical standards of the education profession. (CO: 8.2)

The following ethical standards are to be considered in evaluating standard 8.1. These have been developed with consideration of documents from the National Education Association, the Council for Exceptional Children, and codes of ethics for teachers in numerous state codes:

1. Does not unreasonably restrain the student from independent action in the pursuit of learning, including: a. unreasonably denying the student's access to varying points of view; b. deliberately suppressing or distorting subject matter relevant to the student's progress.
2. Does make reasonable effort to protect the student from conditions harmful to learning or to health and safety.
3. Does not intentionally expose the student to embarrassment or disparagement.
4. Does not on the basis of race, color, creed, sex, national origin, marital status, political or religious beliefs, family, social or cultural background, or sexual orientation, unfairly-- a. exclude any student from participation in any program; b. deny benefits to any student; or c. grant any advantage to any student.
5. Does not use professional relationships with students for private advantage.
6. Does not disclose information about students, their families, or teachers obtained in the course of professional activities unless disclosure serves a professional purpose or is required by law.
7. Does not, in a professional application, deliberately make a false statement or fail to disclose a material fact related to competency and qualifications or misrepresent qualifications.
8. Does not disclose information about colleagues obtained in the course of professional service unless disclosure serves a compelling professional purpose or required by law
9. Does not knowingly make false or malicious statements about a colleague.
10. Does not accept any gratuity, gift, or favor that might impair or appear to influence professional decisions or action.
11. Does not misrepresent opinions of educators at school or school district and distinguishes their views from own personal attitudes and opinions.
12. Conforms to policies, statutes, and rules established by state and local agencies relating to judicious application of disciplinary methods and instructional procedures.
13. Does not falsify records or direct or coerce others to do so.
14. Maintains confidentiality of information except when information is released under conditions of written consent or other legal requirements.

PROGRAM POLICIES: Any of the following may be grounds for either dismissal from the program or, at the discretion of the faculty, based on the specific circumstances, grounds for intervention. If intervention occurs and unethical behavior continues, this persistence will result in dismissal from the program. In considering circumstances, faculty will review the pattern of the behavior, the intention of the behavior, and the significance of the effect on others. Please refer to the *Teacher Education Handbook* for additional information about the dismissal process.

1. Deliberately making false statements, failing to disclose information related to competency, and/or misrepresenting qualifications to university and/or K-12 educators and on admission to education/student teaching materials.
2. Placing K-12 students in positions of harm, in unsafe positions, or in conditions severely harmful to learning (e.g., exposing students to inappropriate, pornographic materials).
3. Purposefully disparaging or ridiculing K-12 students.
4. Excluding K-12 students from educational opportunities because of reasons listed in 4 (above).
5. Using relationships with K-12 students or teachers to own advantage.
6. Breaching confidentiality guidelines for K-12 students, their families, classroom teachers, and/or CSU-Pueblo colleagues.
7. Making false and/or malicious statements concerning colleagues in K-12 classrooms or peers at CSU-Pueblo.
8. Not conforming to school or classroom policies concerning instructional or disciplinary policies.
9. Misrepresenting school policies and or ideas of school personnel and not distinguishing from own.
10. Accepting favors, gifts, or gratuities to influence an educational action.
11. Deliberately denying student access to information to impede learning and achievement.
12. Cheating on quizzes or tests; falsifying records (e.g., own records such as field logs, records of students such as student data); plagiarism of requirements.

Guidelines for Rating Performance on the Standard:

	Basic (1.0 - 1.9)	Developing (2.0 - 2.9)	Proficient (3.0 - 3.9)	Advanced (4.0)
Observations	Examples of unethical behavior are documented with the following evidence: 1 or more recommendations rated this standard in the "1" range or the average of all evaluations was below "2" <u>OR</u> documentation of unethical behavior from items 1-12 above exists	Inconsistency in ethical behavior is documented with the following evidence: the average of all evaluations/ recommendations is in the "2" range; documentation of unethical behavior from items 1-12 above exists but is being addressed with a support plan	Consistent adherence to all ethical standards is documented with the following evidence: the average of all evaluations/recommendations is in the "3" range; no documentation exists of unethical behavior from items 1-12	To be rated "4," the student must meet all of the criteria for "proficient" AND document evidence of <u>consistency</u> in adhering to ethical standards over the time the student is in the program and during teaching
Understanding	No evidence is included in the eportfolio that describes the student's understanding of ethics for educators <u>OR</u> evidence is present but only mentions the importance of ethics and does not describe specific ethical standards or their effects	Evidence in the eportfolio addresses the ethical responsibilities of educators but does not include details beyond descriptions listed in the standards; may be superficial or include inconsistencies or errors in conceptual understanding that do not provide evidence that the student understands a range of ethical responsibilities	Describes a personal philosophy which articulates the role of ethics in the democratic ideal of education, including details beyond a description of ethical behavior listed in the standards; response demonstrates an understanding of meaning of a range of ethical responsibilities	Eportfolio evidence meets criteria for "proficiency" and describes a personal philosophy which articulates the role of ethics in the democratic ideal of education, including details which indicate a depth of understanding of how the philosophy is applied in teaching activities

Operationalization/Criteria:

Guidelines for Admission to Education:

1. Benchmark for admission is a rating of "proficient" on both dimensions: a) consistent adherence to ethical standards and b) a personal philosophy that demonstrates understanding of ethical standards.
2. To score "dimensions," review faculty and classroom teacher recommendations and any additional information made available from TEIMS and average the ratings. ANY rating of "basic" must be followed up with a recommendation of admission with reservations or denial.
3. To evaluate "understanding" review the student's reflection for Goal 8, the philosophy of education paper, and/or other evidence the student may have included.
4. The OVERALL rating should average the rating of the two dimensions.

Evidence to be Evaluated:

Faculty and field experience teacher evaluations, Goal 8 reflection, philosophy of education paper, notes included in student's file, intervention/support plans

Guidelines at Admission to Student Teaching:

Benchmark is a rating of "proficient" on both dimensions. This rating requires continued consistent adherence to ethical standards over the time the student is in the program.

Evidence to be Evaluated:

Faculty and field experience teacher evaluations, Goal 8 reflection, philosophy of education paper, notes included in student's file, intervention/support plans

Guidelines for Program Completion/Student Teaching:

Benchmark is a rating of "proficient" on both dimensions. This rating requires continued consistent adherence to ethical standards over the time the student is in the program, including teaching. The OVERALL rating should reflect an average of ratings of both dimensions. The Inventory narrative may cite consistency of information and/or quality of understanding, e.g., *Ratings of faculty and classroom teachers over a two year period of time are consistently proficient or advanced or reflection indicates complex understanding of the ethical responsibility of teachers in serving all children.*

Evidence to be Evaluated:

Faculty and field experience teacher evaluations, Goal 8 reflection, philosophy of education paper, notes included in student's file, intervention/support plans AND direct observation of teaching and feedback from cooperating teacher or other personnel who have observed teaching

Rationale:

Administrative codes of the following states: Texas ([http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=7&ch=247&rl=2](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=19&pt=7&ch=247&rl=2)), South Dakota (<http://www.departments.dsu.edu/EDUCATE/documents/policies/CodeofEthics.pdf>), Georgia (<http://www.gapsc.com/Ethics/NEthics.asp>), North Carolina (<http://www.ncptsc.org/Code%20of%20Ethics%20for%20NC%20Educators%20-%20PDF.pdf>), Arkansas (http://arkansased.org/rules/pdf/current/ade_291_ethics_060908_current.pdf), New York (<http://www.highered.nysed.gov/tcert/resteachers/codeofethics.htm>) and others.

Association of American Educators. (2003). *Code of Ethics*. Available at <http://www.aeteachers.org/code-ethics.shtml>.

Council for Exceptional Children. (1993). *CEC Code of Ethics for Educators of Persons with Exceptionalities*. Available at <http://www.cec.sped.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ProfessionalDevelopment/ProfessionalStandards/EthicsPracticeStandards/default.htm>.

Goodlad, J. I., Soder, R., & Sirotnik, K. (Eds.). (1990). *The moral dimensions of teaching*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC). (1992). *Model standards for beginning teachers' licensing, assessment, and development: A resource for state dialogue*. Available at www.ccsso.org/content/pdfs/corestrd.pdf.

Katz, M.S., Noddings, N., & Strike, K.A. (eds.). (1999). *Justice and caring: The search for common ground*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Koehn, D. (1994) *The ground of professional ethics*. New York: Routledge.

Nash, R. J. (1996). *Real world ethics: Frameworks for educators and human service professionals*. New York: Teachers College Press.

National Education Association. (1975). *Code of ethics for the education profession*. Available at www.nea.org/aboutnea/code.html.