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Abstract
In this paper, I share findings from a historical investigation into how the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation’s (STF) Code of Ethics has evolved as a direct result of changing legislation. This study was based on the idea that codes of ethics are not stand-alone documents created by professional organizations to guide ethical behaviour, but policies that are a direct reflection of the relationship the profession has with the government in power. I demonstrate that the initial creation and all subsequent revisions of the STF Code of Ethics have never been independent of legislative changes. Rather, changes to the ethical code have been reactionary to political activity and dependent on the legislated changes made by the government in power.
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1. Introduction
In order to better understand the evolution of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation’s (STF) Code of Ethics, it is imperative to understand that the STF is a professional organization that identifies itself as a political body. It is further important to acknowledge that as the STF evolved through time, its two-pronged nature of being both a professional organization and a political body has highly impacted relations between the STF and the government in power through history. Because the STF bargains with the government and the Ministry of Education mandates much of teachers’ professional work, the intersections between government, legislated policy, and ethics has become entangled. History demonstrates that each time the government enacted, proposed, or changed educational legislation, the role and powers of the STF subsequently altered in response. In a domino effect, any changes to the STF’s role and powers consequently resulted in changes to its Code of Ethics.

1.1 Aim
This paper seeks to address the evolution of the STF Code of Ethics in relation to changing government legislation. It also seeks to demonstrate that the type of relationship struck between the STF and the political party in power, directly impacted when and why changes were made to legislation, and consequently, the STF’s ethical code over time. Further, this paper proves through a historic lens, that revisions to the STF Code of Ethics have never independent of legislative changes. Rather, changes to the ethical code have been reactionary to political activity and dependent on the ideology of the government in power.

To demonstrate that the first STF code of ethics and subsequent editions have been the result of legislative amendments further influenced by the relationship struck by the profession and government, I address the following questions in this article:

- What circumstances brought about the very first code of ethics for the STF?
- What legislation was proposed, enacted, or tabled through time which subsequently changed the code of ethics?
- Does the Code of Ethics serve a greater goal than simply being a natural consequence of discipline-based legislation?
- Has the STF Code of Ethics ever been a singular professional priority, or has it ended up a secondary consequence of legislation that changed the STF’s disciplinary functions?
1.2 Social Significance

There is noteworthy social significance to this research as teachers are not the only professionals who are bound by a professional code that is influenced by government policy. Understanding the legislative pieces that contribute to the creation and revisions of ethical codes is essential for also understanding how government and professions are inextricably linked together. Professionals of every realm should begin to see their ethical code as not just a professional expectation, but as binding legislation. Further, when ethical policy intersects with regulatory bodies - which concern themselves with competence and conduct - professional behaviour can be enforced in ways that codes of ethics themselves do not as aggressively impose. Should a professional behave in ways that are deemed unethical, punitive enforcement of policy can negatively impact one’s professional career trajectory. Having comprehensive knowledge of the historical evolution of ethics, policy, and legislation can help to enhance professionals’ understanding of their ethical code and advance ethical awareness of professionals across career types.

1.3 Relevant Scholarship

In this literature review, light is shed on research that specifically connects codes of ethics to government policy and legislation. Although the literature review includes a brief discussion on the definition and purpose of ethics and speaks to how ethics relate to the field of education in particular, the main focus of this literature review is on research that has attempted to connect ethics to governmental policy. Little research has been completed that specifically target the historical connections between the idea of codes of ethics and their historical connections to other ideas (Lovejoy, 1955; Woods, 1994) such as legislation and government policy. In particular, historical research in specific regards to teacher ethical codes, how ethics intersect with legislation, and impact to ethical codes due to the relationship struck between the teaching profession and the government in power is seemingly underdeveloped.

Codes of Ethics

The establishment of a code of ethics has, historically, been taken to be a significant mark of professions (Coady & Bloch, 1996). To understand codes of ethics, one must first know from where they came and how they are defined. Historically, the word ‘code’ came from *codex* or *caudex*, a Latin word etymology, meaning “a special kind of book, namely a systemic written collection of laws or rules” (Siggins, 1996, p. 56). In relating ethics to the concept of profession, “The word ‘profession’ in its Latin form meant a public declaration or vow” (Iacovino, 2002, p. 63). Today, ethical codes can be clearly understood as modern-day vows made by professionals to which define and document what professions should do (Strike & Soltis, 1998) and “enunciate what…their responsibilities and obligations are” (Campbell, 2000, p. 211). Because ethical codes are “formal and public proclaiming [of] core values, which are the source of professional responsibilities, laid down in principles and duties…” (Monteiro, 2015, p. 70), they then function as commitments on the part of a profession to itself and to the public.

Traditionally, codes of ethics had strong implications of oath-taking – the ritual of declaring oneself set apart to fulfill an extraordinary commitment or assume an exalted and authoritative calling (Siggins, 1996, p. 56). Jonsen and Butler (1975) paraphrasing Bourke (1968), wrote “…thus from the time of the first Greek philosophers, ethics had but one meaning… It is the reflective study of what is good or bad in that part of human conduct for which man has some personal responsibility” (p. 22). To emphasize the relationship between ethics and responsibility, Siggins (1996) highlighted how and why professions such as medicine and law were set apart from the rest of society. Members of those professions bestowed with elite status (generally divinity, law, and medicine) took oaths to prove their virtuous character, their avowed duty to others, and their prudence of etiquette for their craft (Siggins, 1996, p. 58). Historically, ethical codes were the method through which religious and political stakeholders – those with the right to “supervise and regulate morality, family life, education, and even commerce and warfare” (Siggins, 1996, p. 64) – assured the public that professions were fulfilling their “dut[ies] to society, law, and truth” (p. 62). In this way adherence to ethics was tantamount to public trust. If we fast-forward to present day, “Ethics and the notion of ethical behavior and value systems in the organizational setting have become an organizational precedence in the 21st century (Grigoropoulos, 2019, p. 169). In this manner, codes of ethics still function for the purpose they always have, and that is that is to promote procedures and practices aiming towards common good and benefit (Eryaman, 2008; Child, 2015; Trevino, Weaver, & Reynolds, 2006), as well as reflecting a concern for society as a whole (Brimmer, 2007).

In both the past and the present, the argument over why professions need a code of ethics remains fairly standard. Professions possess and use a particular knowledge and expertise to help people who are in need of their services. The public, utilizing the services of those employed in professions, need to be able to trust that the profession demonstrates sufficient expertise and will not abuse the user of their services (Banks, 1998). In general, most people do not possess all of the knowledge they need to tap into (for example medical, legal, and educational knowledge) without utilizing the supplier of services expressly educated to fulfill such needs (Fullinwider, 1996). According to Larson (1979, 2014), professions are occupations with special autonomy and prestige, so codes of ethics serve as an essential part of protecting
the public’s potential exploitation of vulnerability (Fullinwider, 1996). In this light, Codes of Ethics can be defined as documented declarations of what professions should do (Strike & Soltis, 1998) and “enunciate what…their responsibilities and obligations are” (Campbell, 2000, p. 211). Codified ethics “describe duties professionals must perform, conduct they must forgo and situations they must avoid” (Fullinwider, 1996, p. 72). Codes of ethics are the tangible portrayal of quality practice.

Beyond a definition of ethics, Banks (1995, 1998, 2003) identified four distinct purposes of ethical codes which can be applied across professions. First, because an ethical code is a key feature of professions, “the adoption of a code of ethics is…about establishing the professional status of an occupational group” (Banks, 1998, p. 218). Secondly, it plays a role in the creation and maintenance of professional identity. “It affirms the fact that members of an occupational group belong to a community of people who share and are publicly committed to the same values” (Banks, 1998, p. 218). Thirdly, ethical codes provide guidance to professionals about how to act and lastly, these codes serve as protection of users from malpractice or abuse (Banks, 1998). Not only can codes of ethics be defined as a framework that formally and publicly states professional responsibilities, principles, and overall values, codes of ethics also have clear purpose and function.

Teachers and Ethics

Currently, teachers practice according to a code of ethics. It is this code, that indicates teachers’ corresponding obligation to the public to act in an ethical manner, which sets teachers apart as professionals. In fact, “Every professional occupation, both humble and proud, holds an ethical dimension insofar as it implies some trustworthy relationship between persons and some kind of responsibility over what it does” (Monteiro, 2015, p. 69). Monteiro (2015) argued that the ethical dimension for a profession grows infinitely more complex “in proportion to the extent to which the profession deals most directly and essentially with the human person…and broader its public exposure” (p. 69). For teachers, the ethical dimension existing between them and the public is immense. The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation (STF) (2008) stated, “The public trusts professional teachers because they have the qualifications, including specialized knowledge, skills, and judgement, to serve students’ educational needs” (para. 5). Correspondingly, teachers have a responsibility to “act at all times in a manner that is worthy of this public trust and consistent with the teaching profession’s expectations” (para. 5).

As Monteiro (2015) pointed out, the ethical dimension for teachers is more demanding than other professions because teachers constantly deal with the public (p. 69). Monteiro (2015) compares teaching to being like a “goldfish bowl” (p. 74) where teachers are constantly exposed to public scrutiny. This scrutiny is a result of being in day-to-day contact with students who echo the behaviour of their teachers back to families and society. Teachers cannot afford to make decisions based on “moral subjectivity and relativity” because if their “competence and conduct are not professionally acceptable, the profession’s public image is significantly and negatively affected…” (p. 74).

In truth, teachers’ ethical codes not only bolster public trust, but these codes function as a symbolic statement about the profession itself (Fischer & Zinke, 1989) encapsulating teachers’ ethical activities, motives, and responsibilities to the larger society, stakeholders of education, and even to themselves. In fact, Hostetler (1997) described teaching as a fundamentally ethical activity because “…teachers are continually searching for, and being responsible to, what is ethically right and good” (p.195-196). It is within teachers’ quests to demonstrate the highest degree of ethical conduct so that teaching can be considered an ethical profession.

Teachers in Saskatchewan have several codes which contribute to the understanding that teaching is an ethical activity. STF codes include three: Code of Ethics, Standards of Practice, and Code of Collective Interests. Teachers are bound to these codes in order to be considered acting in a professional manner (STF, 2016). Campbell (2000) reiterated the necessity for ethics to be at the forefront of education. Not only should ethical codes be established and enforced so that teachers can self-regulate and be accountable, but codes of ethics should also “act as a guide and resource to help [teachers] cope with the ethical complexities and dilemmas” (Campbell, 2000, p. 218) inherent to education. If teachers are considered to be members of a profession who conduct themselves professionally, then all educators must live their ethical codes on a consistent basis. After all, teachers’ ethical codes are their expression of how they behave, the values they hold and their commitment to the profession’s wider public interest responsibilities.

It is because of the teacher/public relationship that educators are obligated to uphold the codes, standards, and processes of accountability that reinforce both public confidence and support of the teaching profession. The concept of public trust includes the belief that professions – teachers included - should hold the interests of society above their own. All professions must have a system of accountability to govern them, in turn “protecting the profession’s client – the public – from incompetent and dishonest practitioners” (Grimmett & Young, 2012, p. 2). One of the ways that teachers have tried to “foster a reputation of integrity, competence, and commitment to the public interest” is through their legislated code of ethics (STF, 2013, p. 2). In short, teachers procure increased public trust by upholding their professional code of ethics. Since 1935, Saskatchewan teachers have practiced in accordance with their official code of ethics. It is this code, that indicates teachers’ corresponding obligation to the public to act in an ethical manner, which sets teachers apart as
professionals. To further understanding of ethical codes, it is also important to know in which ways they connect to legislation.

Relating Ethics to Policy

Bourke (1968), who traced the history of ethics from Greco-Roman times to the modern era, wrote about the relationships that exist between law, society, and ethics and pointed out that philosophers and social theorists first began to study ethics as a way “to provide a foundation for their theories of society and law” (p. 221). Leys (1952) declared, “The connections between ethics and policy decisions is not very clearly understood…you will find some people who entertain quite clear and straightforward ideas about ethical duties and they may have definite notions about policies, but they can seldom tell you how to get from ethics to policy or vice versa.” (p. 3). However, if we consider ethics to be, in part, legislated policy - we must first understand what policies are and apply this knowledge to what we know regarding ethics and professions.

Dye (1994) described policy as “anything a government chooses to do or not to do” (p. 4) and Easton (1965) stated that public policy consists “of decision rules adopted by authorities as a guide to behavior” (p. 358). Extrapolating from this, it could be interpreted that anything that the government chooses to do in terms of directing behaviour is ethical policy. In this way, codes of ethics can easily be seen as policies adopted by professions by way of legislation. Not only do ethics relate to policy, but professions relate to both in that “…the characteristics of a profession are increasingly determined to a significant extent by the state, which is now a major stakeholder in defining professionalism in modern societies. Most professionals are employed, or at least regulated, by governments” (Whitty & Wisby, 2006, p. 44). The type of bargain that a profession and the government strike influences the professions’ mandate (Witty & Wisby, 2006). One integral piece of a professions’ mandate is that of ethical codes. The relationships between ethics, policy, and legislation are inherent and this complex relationship can most certainly be applied to the teaching profession.

Relating legislation to the teaching profession

Walker and Bergmann (2013) analyzed teacher education policy in Canada and wrote, “very few articles or studies on Canadian teacher educational policy exist” (p. 68). Even fewer are articles regarding ethics as educational policy or professions as legislation. As such, it is difficult to fully substantiate the teaching profession and its codes of ethics as policy inside of existing literature. That said, one is able to make connections between the teaching profession, ethics, and legislated policy through the fragmented resources that touch on this topic.

Education can be viewed in part as a political act. Robertson and Dale (2013) reinforced this notion, stating that “education is governed through policies, politics, and practices” (p. 433). In fact, research shows that teachers are “primarily understood as implementers of policy decisions made by their organizational superiors” (Bascia & Rottmann, 2011, p. 789). In this vein, ethics can be seen as legislative policy decisions which teachers implement. Furthering this thinking, ethical codes are one major characteristic of professions and thus, a critical component in professionalism. Hoyle, (as cited in Sockett, 1996), described how professionalism relates to professions arguing that, “Professionalism describes the quality of practice. It describes the manner of conduct within an occupation, how members integrate their obligations with their knowledge and skill in a context of collegiality and of contractual and ethical relations with the client… (p. 9). We can infer from this definition that codes of ethics are a form of professionalism. We can further infer from what we know about policies overall, that policy can be viewed as a governmental tool used to regulate professions. Thus, ethics could reasonably be considered to be legislated policy regulating the behaviour of teachers.

Ozga (1995) maintained that “Professionalism is best understood in context, and particularly in policy context” (p. 22). Codes of ethics then, can be viewed as Ozga (1995, p. 35) believed, a form of occupational control. This concept of ethics as control is upheld in the STF (2013) document titled, Teacher Professionalism in Saskatchewan, which states that in the current context of education, “The development of codes of ethics...are closely intertwined with the process of professionalization… [and that ethics are] one of the legislated purposes of the Saskatchewan Teacher’s Federation” (p. 2). Recent legislation passed by the government of Saskatchewan stands as an example of regulatory measures being enacted by the government to control teacher behaviour. The Registered Teachers Act (2015) of Saskatchewan established the Saskatchewan Professional Teachers Regulatory Board (SPTRB), “a single, independent authority responsible for regulating teachers. Though the SPTRB assumes all responsibility for teacher certification and registration, it also receives, investigates, and hears complaints regarding conduct and competence” (SPTRB, video 2015). Hence, Saskatchewan teachers occupy a unique position in that they are responsible to distinctive and separate sets of expectations, policies, and procedures as employees and as members of the teaching profession. To explain the relationship between legislation, teaching profession, and public accountability, one can reference the Manitoba Law Reform Commission (1994) from the SPTRB website:

In exchange for the benefits of professional status, the regulatory body of a profession is expected to develop, implement, and enforce various rules. These rules are designed to protect the public by ensuring that services from members of the profession are provided in a competent and ethical manner. This legal authority often
includes: the right to set standards for who may enter the profession; the right to set standards of practice for those working in the profession; and the right to create rules for when and how members may be removed from the profession. (Manitoba Law Reform Commission, 1994, in Randall, 2005, para. 4)

It may seem incongruous to compare government legislation concerning teacher regulation in Saskatchewan to both the evolution of professions and ethics. However, these topics intersect in several ways. First, both the STF Code of Ethics and SPTRB codes and standards are tied to teacher conduct and competence and serve as an essential component of ensuring public trust in the profession (Fullinwider, 1966). Second, as Monteiro (2015) pointed out, there is a logical connection between the teaching profession and government. “…Most teachers are public servants governed by Boards, Departments, and Ministries of Education” (p. 72). As such, the government has a considerable hand in controlling policies for teachers.

The government “is a partner associated with other actors in order to bring about an action, for which they all share responsibility, authority, risks and an investment of resources” (Lessard & Brassard, 2006, p. 3). Part of being a profession includes working in symbiotic partnership, as Witty and Wisby (2006) pointed out, and, for teachers, this involves cooperation with the government and other educational stakeholders. Findings by Harris (1994) substantiate this need for government/educational partnership positing that, if teachers are considered to be members of a profession, then they should be “centrally involved in the determination and development of educational policy” (p. viii). In a recent publication, the STF stated that the mechanics of the teaching profession are “founded on the historically positive relationships between the partners in education and the shared responsibility of the government, school divisions and the Federation” (STF, 2013, p. 2). These relationships build teacher mandates and cannot be overlooked when examining the connection between professions, ethics, and legislation. The type of relationships the government and teaching profession strike, directly influences the policies created to guide it and the legislation enacted to govern it. After all, the evolution of teachers’ practice and professionalism has seemingly always occurred through a negotiation of shared interests between demands of the state, society, and the teaching profession (Lawn, 1987). It is in the bargains these entities strike that influences education overall, but more specifically, teachers’ professional responsibilities - including their code of ethics.

2. Methodology

The perspective of time is essential when attempting to conduct historical research. “In all spheres of life, from personal relationships to political judgements, we constantly interpret our experience in time perspective, whether we are conscious of it or not” (Tosh, 1991, p. 1). It is impossible to grasp the full picture of an event and represent the past “without some perception of where it fits into a continuing process” (Tosh, 1991, p. 1). Historical methodology relies on the interpretation of the past, drawing on available sources, and it is the historian, as researcher, who does the interpretation. As Rousmaniere (2004) proclaims, “there is not one true historical story out there waiting to be told if only the correct facts are pulled together” (p. 33).

Instead, historians rely heavily on primary sources as written evidence. It is the work of the historian to examine this written evidence, make sense of it, and tell a story based on the reconstruction of their findings. This reconstruction of the past through source documents is known as historiography. Reconstruction of past events can be difficult for the historian as there is an immense amount of diversity within the sources found to reconstruct the past, available evidence can be limited or vast, and historians can only analyze those sources that are able to be obtained. In short, a historian’s “main methodological concerns [has] to do with sources, or the different types of historical data available to them, and the way in which they might interpret them” (Rousmaniere, 2004, p. 45). In trying to understand and reconstruct the past, a historian must have some process for locating and evaluating the particular sources that are most relevant to the research.

2.1 What Sources Were Utilized?

To uncover the understandings about conduct as stipulated in the evolving STF Codes of Ethics over time, this study made use of both primary and secondary sources. Secondary sources include books and articles, usually based on primary sources, that are written by historians and other scholars, after the fact – that is, put together later than the time period under study. Primary sources include written document and/or artifacts “generated at the time of the event or by the subject in question” (Rousmaniere, 2004, p. 46). Hence, primary sources can include letters, speeches, contemporary newspaper articles, photographs, meeting minutes, academic journals written, and surveys recorded during the time period(s) under study.

In this particular case, the primary sources employed as ‘data’ for this study included meeting minutes of the STF executive, the STF Bulletin, pamphlets, other newsletters and news articles, legislative acts issued or enacted over the time periods we studied, and the STF codes themselves. Academic journals and books, providing context and background, made up the bulk of secondary sources consulted.
2.2 Analytical Approach

Fact checking and analysis of sources as Tosh (1991) explained, is an important regular routine employed by historians. This involves corroboration of details revealed in one source with details reported in other sources. This is similar to the approach used when witness statements are corroborated in a court of law. It is the fact checking of subjective sources that helps historians create a story based on evidence that matches as closely as possible with what actually happened in the past.

In particular, the historical document analysis that was performed in this study was alignment with Denzin and Lincoln’s (2005) interpretation and suggestions of this method of analysis wherein the researcher/historian behaves like a “quilter [who] stitches, edits, and puts slices of reality together” to represent complex situations (p. 5 – 7). Relevant sources of historical information were specifically located in archives, digital and special collections, and libraries, with primary sources sought based upon their relevance to legislation and the Saskatchewan teachers’ codes of ethics changing at similar times. Data from these sources were summarized and evaluated using a document analysis approach, which included skimming, thorough reading, interrogating, interpolating, assessing, interpreting, and selecting of excerpts and quotations that addressed our research questions and represent any potential emerging themes (Bowen, 2009; Collingwood, 1946/1993). As Peräkylä and Ruusuvuori (2005) note:

Qualitative researchers who use written texts as their materials do not try to follow any predefined protocol in executing their analysis. By reading and rereading their empirical materials, they try to pin down their key themes and, thereby, to draw a picture of the presuppositions and meanings that constitute the cultural world of which the textual material is a specimen. (p. 870)

However, the document analysis approach employed by historians does rely on primary source authenticity, which can be both external and internal (Tosh, 1991). External criticism of sources asks questions about a source’s veracity. Author, place, and date of writing should be corroborated. Sources must be able to be traced back to people and places that produced it. The content of the sources must be fact checked. That is, the source must substantiate facts found in other unimpeachable documents from the time. The corroboration between sources creates authenticity. Internal criticism examines interpretation of sources. Once a source has passed the external criticism test, it is important to question overall meaning and reliability.

Constant analysis of sources does not begin after sources are located. Rather, source analysis transpires simultaneously and continuously (Pole & Morrison, 2003). Miles and Huberman (1994) described this consistent analysis of sources as ‘anticipatory data reduction.’ “Even before the [sources] are actually collected, anticipatory data reduction is occurring as the researcher decides (often without full awareness) which conceptual framework, which research questions, and which data collection approaches to choose” (p. 10). Once an appropriate body of sources is found and analyzed, the historian can display their findings and draw conclusions. Because historiography often begins from a particular conceptual framework or an idea that is then refined through conducting research, finding sources and redefining the research question, it is possible to argue that the historian never stops analyzing sources through the entire research process.

3. Findings

3.1 Liberal Rule

Prior to the STF being formally recognized as a profession, times were difficult for Saskatchewan residents, teachers included. In 1932 reports submitted to the Department of Education, inspectors of schools noted that teachers’ salaries and school operating expenses were reduced, sometimes so much that rather than teachers receiving a pay cheque, they were given “farm products such as butter, eggs, meat, vegetables, coal, etc., …in exchange for their services” (Province of Saskatchewan, 1933, p. 42 and 43).

Realizing the need for one strong, unified body to give the profession “some hope of liberating itself from an economic plight that was becoming untenable” (Tyre, 1968, p. 15), the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation (STF) was unofficially formed (McDowell, 1965).

On January 5, 1935 the Executive met with the newly elected Premier Gardiner. “When the Liberals assumed office… they kept their word by passing the Teachers’ Federation Act in 1935…virtually as the STF had written it” (Gallen, 2006, p. 166). The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act:

…was modeled on the Acts which established the legal and medical professions in the province. The Executive justified the Bill on the grounds that it would benefit the cause of education in Saskatchewan, that it would enable the Federation to promote progressive education policies, and that increased solidarity in the profession would promote increased efficiency (The Saskatchewan Bulletin, 1935 as cited in McDowell, 1935, p. 54).

The process went quickly. Bill 72 was introduced to the legislature and received first reading on February 6, 1935. By
February 21 of the same year, the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act had reached Royal Assent. This Act officially recognized Saskatchewan Teachers as members of a profession.

In Sterling McDowell’s (1965) doctoral thesis describing the dynamics of the STF, he chronicled his personal interview with Woodrow Lloyd, a Saskatchewan teacher, STF President (1940-1944), Minister of Education (1944-1960), and Premier (1961-1964). Lloyd revealed to McDowell that when the Saskatchewan government passed the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act into law on February 21, 1935, it made clear that the STF would not be granted the disciplinary functions the Federation had initially requested in the proposal to government until the organization developed and adopted a code of ethics (McDowell, 1965). Affirming this notion, in his speech to Council in December of 1935, STF President J.R MacKay acknowledged that the section of the Act dealing with discipline had been rejected because “the government, perhaps rightly, claimed that we did not have a sufficiently clear cut code of professional ethics yet…” (STF, 1935a, p. 2). Given this, the STF (2013) “took steps to demonstrate its capacity and commitment to the public interest” (p. 3) by formulating and adopting a code of ethics to “encourage high standards among teachers in Saskatchewan” (p. 3) and guide their professional behaviour. In order to comply with government wishes as well as to fulfill the obligations of their new professional status, a motion was made at the January 1935 Executive Meeting that “A committee of one, Mr. J.H. Sturdy, be appointed to formulate a code of ethics” (STF, 1935b, p. 1). Indeed, Sturdy’s report on ethics, entitled Canons of Teaching Ethics was published in the June 1935 edition of The Bulletin. The Canon of 1935 remained in effect until 1947.

During the 1935-1944 period, not only did the government request that the STF create a code of ethics, but also at this time the Department of Education had full and comprehensive control over nearly everything to do with education and the professional lives of teachers. Centralization of power during the early, formative period in Saskatchewan educational history was prominent (Foght, 1918) in that teachers’ work was totally controlled by politicians presiding over educational portfolios. For example: The Minister of Education was in charge of such things including, but not limited to, classification and inspection of schools; construction, furnishing, care of schools and premises; examination, licensing, and certification of teachers; teachers institutes and conventions (Foght, 1918). The level of control the Department had over teachers was significant and the values they considered both politically, economically, and socially important influenced how they exerted that control.

Not only were politicians in control of educational directives and policy, but the STF during this time period defined itself as a “body corporate and politic” (McDowell, 1965, p. 54). There is little doubt that the STF initially began organizing for better standards and wages as a result of Depression circumstances. However, as the STF evolved, its two-pronged nature of being both a professional organization and a political body has highly impacted relations between themselves and the government proving that the interrelationship between government and teachers is a major contributing factor to their code of ethics.

3.2 CCF Rule

By the time the Canon changed its name and was revised into a Code of Ethics in 1947, much had happened in the province politically, economically, and socially. Farmers, facing the loss of their farms to creditors, saw that initiatives such as government ownership of utilities and natural resources, a national bank, and a public health system as the only way out of the mess they found themselves in” (Waiser, 2005, p. 312). Cooperative and social reform movements had rapidly gained popularity in the 1930s. It was during this time that parties such as the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF) began to crop up, becoming a strong rival to the Liberals for power who had, up until this point, enjoyed relatively few political adversaries in Saskatchewan. The Great Depression, the second world war, further industrialization, and migration of mostly rural populations to urban living provided impetus for such rivalry and set the stage for “one of the most ideologically charged campaigns in Saskatchewan history” (p. 123).

Similar to the changes that were taking place on a provincial scale, changes to the STF Canon were also afoot. In December 1946, a member of the STF Executive, Wray Wylie, was asked to draw up a new Code of Ethics and submit it to the Executive for consideration” (STF, 1946, p. 2). By April 1947, Wylie was ready to present his new Code to members of the STF Executive, as minutes of their meeting held on that date stated that it was “discussed clause by clause and Mr. Wylie agreed, in light of the suggestions offered, to rewrite the Code for the next Executive meeting” (STF, 1947a, p. 1). Unfortunately, the original code that Wylie authored and the Executive’s suggestions for change, were not included with meeting documentation, so the record is silent with regard to details about Wylie’s revised code. However, it seems that Wylie’s code caused some controversy as revealed in the records of subsequent STF Executive meeting minutes. In June of 1947, the Minutes of the Executive meeting exposed that a discussion was held on the tentative new Code of Ethics and that, “… after considerable discussion it was decided to leave the completion of the discussion until the afternoon…” (STF, 1947b, p. 1). Dialogue in the afternoon appeared to be rife as “considerable discussion and amendments” resulted in a new draft of a code (p. 2). Again, details about this Code were not included with the June meeting documentation and
no further details were recorded until another Executive meeting held on September 6, 1947. The September Minutes of the Executive Meeting show that a motion to “adopt the National Code of Ethics as prepared and approved by the Canadian Teachers’ Federation” (CTF) (STF, 1947c, p. 58) was carried.

Regrettably, there was no information included in the Executive Minutes as to why Wylie’s code, that was so deeply discussed and drafted in June 1947, was scrapped. As with what seems to be common in all STF decisions regarding its Code of Ethics, no information on Wylie’s code or the adapted CTF Code appeared for public consumption in conventional media such as the newspapers and little information was disseminated to STF members. Instead, on September 23, 1947 the newly adopted Canadian Teachers’ Federation’s Code of Ethics as approved by the STF Executive, was distributed to STF councilors at fall convention and published in December’s issue of the Bulletin (STF, 1947d, p. 53). Although little information can be found which documents the details or rationale for abandonment of Wylie’s STF draft code in June, 1947 and the adoption of the CTF’s Code of Ethics in September, 1947, it seems safe to assume that the STF could have surmised that changes were coming their way. After all, the Liberal government had been replaced by the CCF in the June 1944 election. Perhaps the STF Executive felt it more prudent to spend time and energy on government lobbying rather than on garnering membership approval for a newly written Code. This is a logical assumption as government negotiations between the STF and CCF are corroborated in a Historical Background article where the STF proclaimed, “It was in the continual lobbying by the STF... that the CCF government of Tommy Douglas amended The Teachers’ Federation Act in 1948 to give the STF a significant measure of responsibility for the professional conduct of its members” (STF, 1999, p. 1). Indeed, Section 33 of the amended Teachers’ Federation Act, 1948 gave the STF authority to form a Discipline Committee with statutory powers to hear complaints of unprofessional conduct. Sections 34 to 45 of the Act were devoted to enunciating the new disciplinary measures afforded the STF by the CCF government (Government of Saskatchewan, 1948, p. 1-4). To give a clear understanding of the purpose of the new Discipline Committee, Section 36 succinctly stated that:

36 – (1) The discipline committee shall make every investigation ordered by the council or the executive, in any case in which complaint has been made that a member of the federation has been guilty of a professional misconduct or conduct not becoming to a teacher, and may of its own motion investigate the facts in any such case.

These events support the claim that the STF did not follow through with Wylie’s Code because they were aware of upcoming changes to the Act and realized that changes to their disciplinary responsibilities would require a Code of Ethics responsive to Act’s amendments.

It is interesting to note that under the CCF government, teachers were first given increased disciplinary responsibilities as well as the legislated right to bargain collectively in 1949. In its infancy, collective bargaining allowed teachers the ability to negotiate salaries, but over time, the scope of bargaining widened to include other items such as, medical and dental plans, grievance procedures, and teacher classification. Although collective bargaining relates to labor legislation more than it does to ethics legislation, it is safe to say that the combined rights of the teaching profession were a reflection of a changing economy and shifting socio-political ways of thinking.

After amendments were made to the Teachers’ Federation Act, 1948 and the CTF’s Code was distributed for use by Saskatchewan teachers, the minutes of the STF Executive record a passed motion stating the “Discipline Committee be asked to form a Committee to study the Code of Ethics and to make recommendations in regard to same” (STF, 1954a, p. 1). The main task of the committee was to finalize a new Code of Ethics (STF, 1956, p. 1). The committee accomplished this task by holding ethics workshops across the province for three years and working with teachers “to define the ethical issues [they faced] and articulate the profession’s standards for ethical conduct” (STF, 1999, p. 1). The proposed code was reviewed and discussed by the Executive and council and on April 26, 1957, Council endorsed the new code and voted in favour “that it replace the present [CTF] code” (STF, 1957b, p. 58). The grass-roots STF Code of 1957 was utilized until March 1973.

During the 1935-1957 time period, it was by way of Liberal and CCF legislation that the STF was afforded a “framework of rights and protections... provid[ing] a minimum salary for teachers, economically viable units of school administration, teacher tenure, structures and processes for collective bargaining, and input into teacher classification” (STF, 1999, p.1). Woodrow Lloyd, Minister of Education in the CCF government from 1944-1960, had been a CTF Executive Member and was past President of the STF - With Lloyd as the Education Minister, the CCF raised teachers’ salaries, “reorganized 5, 000 school districts into sixty larger school boards to standardize and equalize the quality of schooling”, (McGrane, 2014, p. 127) and provided free text books to all students (Warnock, 2004). Although most of these changes can be categorized as unionistic in nature, the STF’s efforts in matters primarily related to wages and benefits rather than on Code activities reveal the direction in which the STF was evolving as an organization and suggest that their ethical code may not have been a matter of high importance. In short, it was during a period of CCF rule that the government offered increased
disciplinary powers to the STF which resulting compelled the need for an updated Code.

3.3 Back to Liberal Rule

The CCF found that their platform too closely represented that of the opposing Liberals and in order to differentiate themselves to the electorate before elections time, the CCF in 1961 was “replaced by the New Democratic Party (NDP), in an attempt to make political inroads…moderating its platform and forming a broader power base” (Bélanger, 2000, para. 1). However, the provincial election of 1964, saw the reelection of a Liberal government in Saskatchewan. The Liberals tried to enact “…legislation intended to create more equity among teachers by shifting from local to area bargaining” (STF, 2016, p. 1). Parliamentary debate transcripts corroborates the proposed legislative changes. Liberal Minister of Education, Mr. McIsaac stated that proposed legislation would “ensure that all rights presently enjoyed by teachers are guaranteed, rights… which are not presently guaranteed in law” (Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, 1968, p. 166). Opposition New Democratic Party Member of Parliament (MLA) Mr. Kwasnica responded saying that the proposed salary legislation was “hastily drawn-up… constructed without the co-operative consent of all parties concerned” (Legislative Assembly of Saskatchewan, 1968, p. 175). Indeed, teachers were opposed. The proposed legislation concerning the structure of bargaining was short lived (STF, 2016), partly due to teacher resistance, which was happening not only in Saskatchewan, but across the country. “In the late 1960s and early 1970s, teachers became militant, engaging in illegal strikes to fight for the right to collective bargaining” (Heron 2012, in Hanson, 2014, para. 4). In Saskatchewan, salary parity was realized by way of the first provincial collective agreement which guaranteed equal compensation for equal qualifications in 1973 (STF, 2016). The collective agreement was brought about through negotiation with a re-elected NDP government, a party that the STF had experienced prior success with when negotiating for increased rights.

Though these government/STF interactions do not directly relate to teacher ethics, they do demonstrate the STF’s position of being first and foremost a union politically inclined. It is important to note that no changes were made to the STF Code of Ethics during this period of Liberal rule, because no increased privileges, professional or unionistic, were afforded to them during the Liberal government’s eight year reign over two provincial elections.

3.4 NDP Rule

On November 7, 1970 the STF Executive voted in favor of “investigate[ing] the possibility of setting up a committee… to undertake a study of the code of ethics” (STF, 1970, p. 10). Apparently this motion became a reality as the Minutes of the Executive show that by September 1971 “the proposed Code [was] forwarded to the members of the Discipline Committee and Administrative Staff for any comments or observations” (STF, 1971, p. 5).

A revised Code of Ethics this was necessary in light of new legislation amending sections 34-45 of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Act, 1970 in which the CCF government gave the STF increased disciplinary powers:

(2) The professional competency committee shall… inquire into and determine any matter of complaint against a member of the federation where it is in substance alleged, or the committee has reasonable grounds for believing that the member has been guilty of carrying out the duties and responsibilities of a teacher an inefficient or incompetent manner (p. 1, 2).

The CCF government had first amended the Act in 1948 giving the STF power to form a Discipline Committee to hear complaints (STF, 1999, p. 1). The 1970 revision provided further amendments with legislation offering the STF the opportunity to form a Professional Competence Committee. The Professional Competence Committee, working parallel to that of the Discipline Committee, would be tasked with investigating charges of professional misconduct or conduct not becoming of a teacher (STF, 1972). The STF maintained that the Code needed to be re-written in order to reflect new ideas and standards about what constituted misconduct (STF, 1999, p. 1). There is no doubt this was so, but we can also surmise that the re-written Code was also a direct reflection of changing government policy. Minor changes to the 1973 Code occurred in the years 1977, 1979 and 1996, however, the 1973 Code of Ethics remained virtually unchanged for twenty-seven years.

1970 saw the NDP give increased disciplinary rights to teachers which in turn, required amendments to their Code of Ethics. It was during this time that collective bargaining also underwent major changes. The STF and the provincial government created conditions for the bi-level bargaining structure – still in use today - that “introduced teacher representation and influence at both the provincial and local levels and established a formal process for the settlement of disputes” (STF, 2016, p. 1). This is important to note, as once again, the STF placed its political efforts on union activities rather than those directly related to ethics and that changes to ethics were resultant of legislative updates.

3.5 Progressive Conservative Rule

The 1980s brought new political parties and political ideologies to the forefront. Leeson (2001) stated that Saskatchewan people who were, “Already socially conservative… became economically conservative” (p. 7), identified less and less
with the political worldviews of the past, and became more willing to accept political alternatives vastly different than those of their grandparents’ and parents’ generations. The Progressive Conservatives, recognized a changing shift in the electorate and tailored their messaging to reflect new values. The 1982 election was won by the Progressive Conservatives under Premier Grant Devine who shockingly took over the ten-year reign of the NDP in an avalanche victory.

Though the STF did not make any changes to the Code of Ethics during the 1980s, they seemed to have prepared themselves for possible Progressive Conservative legislation that may have consequently altered their Code. In 1989, Progressive Conservative “draft legislation proposed setting up a Professional and Occupations Board that would recommend to the government an appropriate level of regulation for each occupation, ranging from self-regulation to complete government regulation (STF, 1999, p. 2). If the Progressive Conservatives had enacted their proposed regulation of professions legislation, “it might well have resulted in a concrete separation, perhaps with two separate bodies – the union activities particularly associated with collective bargaining, and the profession’s regulatory functions such as professional conduct and competency” (Dahlem & Crozier-Smith, 2009). In other words, the STF may well have been stripped of the disciplinary powers given to them by the CCF government in 1948 and again in 1970.

It is important to mention that at the same time that Grant Devine came to power, other rulers such as Margaret Thatcher in England and Ronald Reagan in the United States of America, came onto the political scene, transforming world politics with what became known as neoliberal policies. Neoliberalism accentuates efficiency in resource allocation, commitment to free trade, and minimal government intervention in economic and social affairs (Smith, 2018). The concept of neoliberalist policy is important because for the first time in Saskatchewan’s history, the government was neither centrist (Liberal) or leftist (NDP). Though the archives are silent in terms of documented interactions between the STF and Devine government, it can be assumed that a positive relationship and cordial negotiations may not have been achieved. What is known is that the Progressive Conservative government tried to enact legislation that would have significantly impacted the function of the STF as a professional organization and that no changes were made to educational legislation, and consequently, the Code of Ethics. The failed attempt of the government in the late 1980s to develop legislation that would test “whether the leadership of the group [had] the ability to distinguish between the public interest and the self-interest of the association” and whether it could resolve matters “on the side of protecting public interest” (Government of Saskatchewan, 1990 in STF, 1999, p. 2) would fascinatingly resurface again some twenty-five years later. It is a logical assumption that during the Conservative leadership throughout most of the 1980s, the STF laid low, hoping that in so doing, they would escape any policy changes that could negatively disrupt the structure of their organization.

3.6 Back to NDP Rule

The 1990s began with a return to NDP rule in 1991 with Roy Romanow as Premier. The NDP remained in power from 1991-2007. During these 16 years, the STF’s Code of Ethics underwent further changes.

Council voted in April 1996 to “…revise the Code of Ethics to contain inclusive language” (STF, 1996, p. 54). At that time, background information on each resolution was given to Councilors to inform their voting. It stated, “The possibility of revisions to the Code was raised at Council 1995… However, no clear consensus about the need for change emerged from these meetings. An internal review… is in progress, but is being undertaken slowly in the context of continuing discussions with the Minister of Education about the Federation’s entire discipline structure” (STF, 1996, p. 54). Though it appears that a motion was made and passed to revise the Code to include inclusive language, regrettably there was no archived material describing what those language changes would be. Though 1996 signifies a year in which a new Code of Ethics was issued to teachers, there were no discernible changes in it as compared to the previous version. It seems logical that 1996 resolutions never materialized into actionable items before legislation changed, resulting in the need for a new Code.

After undergoing “months of intense lobbying of government officials” (STF, 1999, p. 3) the STF again saw changes to The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Act. The 1997 Teachers’ Act legislation resulted in the STF remaining a unitary organization, but one that split its disciplinary processes internally into three newly mandated committees: Professional Ethics, Professional Competency, and Collective Interests (STF, 1999). The Professional Ethics committee, first legislated in 1978, would now replace the Discipline Committee, first legislated in 1948, and work alongside the newly legislated Competency Committee. The 1997 Act stated that “Where a complaint has been referred to mediation and the mediation is not successful, the executive may order an inquiry by the professional ethics committee or the professional competency committee” (Government of Saskatchewan, 1997, p. 5). The Act also stated that “Engaging in conduct contrary to the collective interests of teachers is a question of fact” (Government of Saskatchewan, 1997, p. 7). With this, the Executive, upon receiving a complaint that a member was guilty of conduct contrary to the collective interest, could make preliminary inquiries and establish a committee to further investigate (Government of Saskatchewan, 1997). In a paper entitled “Teacher Professionalism in Saskatchewan: Strengthening Regulation,” the STF acknowledged that the 1997 changes to the Act were precipitated by a Saskatchewan Court of Appeal Decision that ruled against the STF (STF, 2013).
The discipline committee found T.M. guilty of professional misconduct and recommended that the provincial executive suspend his teacher’s certificate... T.M. appealed the ruling on the basis that the process was unfair... The Court of Appeal upheld T.M.’s appeal on the grounds that the Federation had not acted fairly. (STF, 2013, p. 6)

Thomas Munro was charged with sexual touching of a student. He pled guilty and was sentenced to a period of incarceration. The matter was referred to the Discipline Committee where they recommended his teaching certificate be suspended for five years. “The provincial Executive substituted a recommendation that his teaching certificate be cancelled” (Dahlem & Crozier-Smith, 2009, p. 44). Munro appealed this decision, not because he was innocent of charges, but because of what he felt was an unfair professional disciplinary process.

The Court of Appeal ruled in Thomas Munro’s favor because “Munro was not given a copy of the report of the committee to the provincial Executive, he was not notified of the meeting of the provincial Executive at which a decision would be made, and he was not invited to make representation. The provincial Executive did not examine any of the proceedings of the committee hearing nor the exhibits, relying solely on the report of the discipline committee…” (Dahlem & Crozier-Smith, 2009, p. 44)

Whether the STF acted fairly or not in the disciplinary process is not the focus here. However, it must be noted that the Court of Appeal decision caused the STF to lobby the NDP government for additional disciplinary powers which resulted in changes to the Act which then required revising the Code of Ethics. This chain of events proves, once again, that Code revisions are the direct result of legislated policy brought about by STF/government negotiations. Banda (1999) supported this notion stating that “STF history has illustrated that the primary reason behind establishing a Code of Ethics, and subsequently revising it, was political” (p. 8). In review of the STF Codes of Ethics, political motivation seemed to be a central and recurring theme in its evolution.

In response to the legislative changes, a committee was struck at the December 1997 Executive Meeting (STF, 1997). This committee was asked to “examine the professional ethics of teachers, review the Code of Ethics, examine teacher competency and standards of practice, and consider the structure of the teachers’ professional organization” (STF, 2013, p. 9). Meeting minutes in January, 1999 show that “the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Professionalism [was] received” (STF, 1999, p. 10). By September of the next year, meeting minutes document a motion made to discuss the proposed Code of Ethics with councilors at fall convention and, as an Executive, submit a motion to adopt the proposed code (STF, 2000, p. 4). Documents detailing Council decisions in October, 2000 validate that robust discussion over the proposed ethical code indeed occurred. Several amendments were made to wording before it was finally “… resolved that the proposed Code of Ethics be adopted as a Bylaw of the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation” (STF, 2000, p. 4). Teachers began using the revised code in 2000.

In 2006, the NDP government once again amended The Teachers’ Federation Act, 2006. New changes “included the many amendments that had been incorporated since the previous Act in 1978” (Dahlman & Crozier-Smith, 2009, p. 51). Revisions to the Act that directly concerned ethics, included the replacement of the Discipline Committee with the Professional Ethics Committee. The Teachers’ Federation Act, 2006 clearly set out the purposes of these committees:

34(1) The professional ethics committee shall, on a written order of the executive, or on its own motion, conduct a hearing to inquire into and determine any matter of complaint against a member of the federation where it is in substance alleged, or the committee has reasonable grounds for believing that the member has been guilty of professional misconduct or conduct not becoming to a teacher. (Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act, 2006, p. 14)

The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act, 2006 legislation provided procedures for the review, investigation, hearing, and disposition of complaints on matters of misconduct and incompetence. The Act (2006) also made amendments giving Council the authority to make bylaws. Section 20 of the Act, 2006 outlined bylaw procedures and for what purposes bylaws could be made (p. 9). Mentioning bylaws in relation to ethics is important because, section 15(p) of the Act stated that bylaws could be made for multiple purposes including “providing for a code of ethics for teachers” (Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act, 2014, p. 13). Other than its place in the Governance Handbook, the 2000 Code of Ethics did not change until 2015, when further legislative changes under new government once again impacted the STF’s disciplinary responsibilities and thus its ethical code.

3.7 Saskatchewan Party Rule

The Saskatchewan Party, one that leaned to the right of the political spectrum, became an adversary to the NDP and took power under the leadership of Brad Wall in 2007. Formerly a province that esteemed universality and communal values, a radical consumer culture and had overtaken with a marked focus on self (Wishlow, 2001). Thus, the Saskatchewan Party’s neoliberal policies appealed to the changing electorate. Canadian values related to “the role of government, the balance between collective action and individual responsibility, and support for universal social programs,” (Vail, 2000,
para. 2) were changing. Whereas Canadians used to value the role of government in their lives (Lipset, 1989) there was now a decline in trust and confidence in government... [and an] overall decline in trust... towards authority and all forms of institutions” (Vail, 2000, p. 3). These institutions included the education system.

Newspaper articles such as *When teachers fail: Investigation reveals cases of misconduct* reverberated around the province. Reporter Janet French took a look at Saskatchewan educators “...who had lost their jobs because of behavioral reasons and found that several teachers who had lost their jobs still had valid teacher certificates” (Canadian Television Network, 2013). *The Star Phoenix* investigation called into question whether or not the current teacher disciplinary system was flawed (French, 2013). Before and after French’s article was published, other newspapers, blogs, and television reports sustained the trend of questioning whether teachers who behaved inappropriately and violated their Code of Ethics, were properly disciplined. For example, titles such as “Teacher discipline: Who interests are served by hiding the ‘bad apples’” (Bennett, 2016), “Teacher misconduct: Marketplace finds disciplinary action often kept hidden from public” (Griffith-Greene, 2016), and “Allowing union to handle teacher discipline has negative effect on professional standards: report” (Gerson, 2014) flooded the newsstands and became a stimulus for government intervention.

On the heels of French’s (2013) investigative report, The Ministry of Education commissioned Dr. Dennis Kendel to study the issue of teacher regulation across Canada and offer recommendations on future options for teacher regulation in Saskatchewan. His report, entitled *For the Sake of Students* recommended that the STF no longer remain a unitary structure in charge of both union activities and teacher discipline. Kendel’s (2013) recommendations led the government to pursue regulatory changes that would further impact the Code of Ethics.

As a result of *The Teachers’ Federation Act, 2006* defining misconduct and providing some details about incompetence, the STF decided that a formal statement of competence standards was necessary to avoid the possibility of an outside regulatory body assuming responsibility over teacher discipline; “an outcome the Federation was hoping to avoid” (STF, 2013, p. 10). Though the archives are silent on exactly why this was feared, it is logical to assume that negative media coverage regarding teacher discipline and Kendel’s (2013) report may have been mitigating factors. It is also likely that the STF assumed regulation changes would be a likely happenstance should the Saskatchewan Party win the next election, given that their platform was comparable to that of the Progressive Conservative government who had threatened the STF’s unitary structure in the 1980s.

Conjectures aside, the STF did draft *The Code of Professional Competence* “which referred to teachers’ professional knowledge, skills, and judgement with respect to curriculum, instruction, assessment and evaluation, professional relationships, and student learning” (STF, 2013, p. 10). This code was to serve several purposes including: guiding teaching practices, guiding the Executive to assess complaints about professional competency, and it served as a compliment to the pre-existing Code of Ethics and Code of Collective Interests. All Codes, their preambles and proceedings sections are presently contained in the STF Governance Handbook under Bylaws 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 7.1, 7.2, 7.3 and 7.4. While additional codes were created in 2013, interestingly enough, no changes were made to the Code of Ethics. French’s investigative report and Kendel’s recommendations foreshadowed that this would soon change.

In December 2014, soon after Kendel’s (2013) report was made public, the Government of Saskatchewan introduced the Saskatchewan Professional Teachers Regulatory Board (SPTRB). Though the STF maintained “there [was] little justification for the unilateral imposition of an alternative model of professional regulation (STF, 2013, p. 12), new legislation provided for just that. *The Registered Teachers Act, 2015* proclaimed on July 1, 2015, enabled the SPTRB—a single, independent authority responsible for regulating teachers - to begin operations including teacher certification and registration, as well as the receiving, investigation and hearing of complaints regarding teacher conduct and competence (SPTRB, 2015). *The Registered Teachers Act, 2015* effectively rescinded the STF’s power to discipline its own members accused of professional incompetence and professional misconduct. Though the government stated that the SPTRB served the public interest and was the “result of a two-year consultation process with educators and members of other professions” (Davis, 2015, para. 4), the STF did not seem to concur.

In December 2015, the STF publication *The Bulletin*, interviewed then STF Director Dueck who referred to the previous year as a “horrible” one where the STF became “involved in an external environment that [they] could not have predicted would happen” (STF Bulletin, 2015, p. 1). While it may have been surprising, the inability to predict the mandating of the SPTRB is debatable as the STF itself, documented time and again, repeated threats to the organization’s unitary structure (STF, 1997, 1999, 2013). The STF believed that “public confusion and skepticism about the teaching profession was minimal, making it difficult to accept the notion that major legislative intervention was necessary” and argued that separating the collective bargaining function from disciplinary and licensing functions “was unacceptable” (STF, 2013, p. 6).

The STF’s view of the SPTRB was in direct contrast with that of the government who believed that public trust in the teaching profession had eroded to such an extent that separation of STF advocacy and disciplinary functions were...
necessary. Naylor (2108) suggested that in provinces like Saskatchewan, where regulatory measures were introduced after highly publicized cases of misconduct surfaced in the news, that:

… informed public discussions have not occurred. Rather than engage in public discourse, governments often appoint an individual to investigate options for action. Some governments use commissioned reviews, then legislate in ways that selectively accept some aspects of a report, but go well beyond the actual recommendations made (p.17).

Indeed, as Naylor (2018) suggested, the Saskatchewan Party utilized media reports and Kendall’s recommendations as justification for significant regulation changes which dramatically changed the government’s relationship with the STF. Since inception, the STF had enjoyed a mostly collaborative relationship with the government. However, it must be mentioned that history suggests this collaborative relationship was nearly exclusively with left leaning CCF/NDP socialist governments. The Liberals in the 1960s and the Progressive Conservatives in the 1980s tried to enact legislation contrary to STF desires. The imposed regulatory changes of 2015 under Saskatchewan Party governance highlight a termination of the seemingly historic cooperative relationship between the STF and government. Writing about their history, the STF stated that “teachers in Saskatchewan are proud of their history of working together with other partners in education and believe that a successful education sector is renewed and revitalized by respectful dialogue and common understandings” (STF, 2016, p. 6). Perhaps what made the creation of the SPTRB so initially unpalatable to the STF was that they viewed it as a breach of the historic collaboration they had once enjoyed.

The creation of the SPTRB, whether perceived as positive or negative, demonstrates that history matters when looking at educational policy. All previous events brings us to the now. It also demonstrates that legislative changes create ripple effects in STF professional functions. Though the formation of the SPTRB may not be directly tied to ethics, it is, as Andersen (2007) suggested, an educational initiative embedded in reform policy. The government mandating the creation of the SPTRB in a time of conservative politics and public distrust points to education being inexorably tied to social ideologies, politics, and economics. Grimmert and Young (2012) reinforced this notion saying that “public policy and legislation are the product of the dynamic interchange occurring in socio-political-cultural negotiations of power, wherein players use the currency of their economic, social and cultural capital to frame and construct events and understandings” (p.170). The SPTRB was a change “brought about in the process of adaptation between new policy and pre-existing institutions” (Andersen, 2007, p. 52). “Political initiatives and the development of new policies are shaped within institutional frames, whether these are formal rules, policy structures or norms… In this way, institutions steer individual choices in certain directions and thus both restrict and make certain action possible” (Andersen, 2007, p. 42). The fact that the SPTRB came into existence through a struggle between the government and the STF is significant because it proves the inherent interconnectedness of ideas that this paper has tried to highlight. The economic conditions and social ideologies that are present in any given time period influences the actions of government. In turn, what the government does effects education. The relationships between all of these facets is what creates history.

As a result of new regulatory measures, the STF Executive established the Teacher Success and Professionalism Working Committee in August 2015 to review changes to teacher regulation in Saskatchewan as well as to review current STF codes and standards. The Committee’s work, among other items, resulted in proposed revisions to the Code of Ethics, now contained in STF Bylaw 6 (STF, 2016). The majority of the proposed revisions concerned “minor changes in wording… to update the language used, especially where a more positive framing of a statement [was] possible” (STF, 2016, p. 18). The revised Code of Ethics is the STF’s current code and carries a date of 2017.

4. Conclusion

Ethical codes are responsive to changing ideologies and code evolution is inherently embedded with changing contexts. Codes spawn predominantly from policies which are themselves influenced by social ideology, economy, and in the case of this paper, government policy. Ethical codes are political because the affiliation of government policy and educational matters is interchangeable and inseparable. As both legislation and the relationship between government and the STF changed, so too did STF ethical codes. The connection between changing legislation leading to revised codes is dependent on the ideology of the government in power.

Education is in part, a political act. Ozga (1995) maintained that “Professionalism is best understood in context, and particularly in policy context” (p. 22). Robertson and Dale (2013) reinforced this notion, stating that “education is governed through policies, politics, and practices” (p. 433). Furthering the notions that education is governed through politics and that teachers are implementors of legislation (Bascai & Rottmann, 2011), history substantiates time and again that the type of interaction between the STF and the governing party has always translated into legislation that directly impacting teachers. When interactions were positive, the STF were typically successful in bargaining with and lobbying the government for gains in unionistic items (such as wage and benefits) and/or professional responsibilities (such as disciplinary functions). When interactions were negative, the STF typically did not lobby the government and nearly
always saw setbacks to unionistic and/or professional responsibilities. Changes to the STF Code of Ethics have always been brought about by the “…dynamic interchange occurring in socio-political-cultural negotiations of power, wherein players use the currency of their economic, social and cultural capital to frame and construct events and understandings” (Grimmett & Young, 2012, p.170).

As has been pointed out, STF negotiations with the Liberal government in 1935 resulted in the Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act, 1935. In accordance with new legislation formally recognizing teachers as a profession, the government required that the STF create a Code of Ethics. In 1948 and again in 1970, the STF lobbied the CCF government for increased disciplinary powers which resulted in changes to The Saskatchewan Teachers Act. Changes to the Act resulted in revisions to the Code of Ethics. While the Liberals (1964-1971) were in power, they tried to enact legislation intended to create more equity among teachers by shifting from local to area bargaining” (STF, 2016, p. 1). Under Progressive Conservatives rule, the government tried to enact legislation that would have divided the STF into two separate bodies – one to perform union activities and the other to discipline its members (Dahlem & Crozier-Smith, 2009). Though the Liberal and Progressive Conservative’s proposed policies never materialized in legislation, at these times, neither were there changes to the Code of Ethics. After undergoing “months of intense lobbying of government officials” (STF, 1999, p. 3) the STF saw changes to The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Act, 1997 under an NDP government. Changes to the Act resulted in the STF remaining a unitary organization, but one that split its disciplinary processes internally into three newly mandated committees: Professional Ethics, Professional Competency, and Collective Interests (STF, 1999). Legislative changes and disciplinary function increases resulted once again in revisions to the Code of Ethics. Under Saskatchewan Party rule (2007-Present), the government legislated The Registered Teachers Act, 2015 which effectively rescinded the STF’s power to discipline its own members accused of professional incompetence and professional misconduct. Disciplinary duties were handed over to the SPTRB. Changes to legislation and mandating of the SPTRB once again resulted in changes to the Code of Ethics.

The affiliation of government policy and educational matters is interchangeable and inseparable. As the STF evolved through time, its two-pronged nature of being both a professional organization and a political body has highly impacted STF/Government relations and thus its ethical codes. As Banda (1999) observed, the STF only gave attention to and revised the Code of Ethics as a means “to suit amendments to The Saskatchewan Teachers’ Federation Act” (p. 8). As such, changes to the STF Code of Ethics have never been simultaneous with changing legislation, nor have Code revisions ever preceded or been independent of legislative changes. As evidenced, the Code of Ethics seems to have always been reactionary to political activity and influenced by the relationship struck between the STF and the government in power.
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