

Running Head: CROSSING THE LINE

Crossing the Line: Bringing Shame to the Profession

Tim J. McConnell

University of Utah

### Abstract

**This case reports the efforts of a third year public school superintendent to create a culture of accountability for questionable or inappropriate behavior on the part of employees. As the case illustrates, this type of accountability lies in contradiction with long standing employee and public perceptions that Alexandra School District chooses to sweep inappropriate employee behavior under the proverbial rug. A recent state level report has identified Alexandra as the only school district in the entire state that has not had a single referral for inappropriate or unprofessional behavior of a certificated employee to the state professional practices advisory council in the past 22 years. Concerns at the district/county level include criticism by the public for failure to address poor performing teachers, nepotism with certain employee hires and a specific concern over protecting veteran teachers whose behaviors have become a concern over the past several years. In an effort to stem the undercurrent of discontent, the superintendent has hired a district principal as the new personnel director. The new director has a reputation of being a clear, concise, firm and fair administrator with his middle school staff. The personnel director has had a concern brought forward that seemed somewhat innocuous at first, but as the investigation continues, could turn out to be a test case in solidifying the superintendent's commitment to address the district's reputation.**

*Gabris (2004) uses a technique of developing stories based on actual cases in public administration to inform graduate and undergraduate students in understanding how to put theory into practice. In particular is his interest in providing students an opportunity to have a vicarious experience of a real situation to develop a sense of what it is like, without actually being there. Yin (2005) provides examples of drawing from multiple cases in compiling a story that may be illustrative and informative for readers in summary of issues that are relevant to current practice in education. This case is a compilation of a review of job actions recorded over a 15 year period from a state level professional practices committee and draws on personal experience as a human resources director for a mid-size public school district.*

### Leadership, District Dynamics and a Computer Glitch

The Director of Personnel, Jon Robertson, sat in Superintendent Teri Chambers' office at the end of the day on Friday as was common over the course of Jon's three month tenure as personnel director and the newest member of the district office administrative staff. The conversations served multiple purposes. The meetings, though informal, were part of becoming acculturated to the central office. They were also an opportunity to discuss personnel issues and district politics. Perhaps most importantly, it was a chance for Dr. Chambers to provide mentoring for a director that had been hired without previous human resources experience, which was somewhat of a gamble. In fact, it was a decision that the school board was skeptical would work. Finally, the Friday afternoon discussions were an opportunity to debrief and talk about the process of changing both the culture and practice of how the district would hold employees accountable when instances of inappropriate behavior arose.

The conversation on this particular Friday in mid-September was focused on the upcoming Monday meeting with the principals, assistant principals and classified employee supervisors to address two issues. First, the superintendent would discuss a state level report on job actions by the state professional practices commission over the past 22 years. The report had been released publicly two weeks earlier and had revealed that Alexandra school district was the only district in the state that had not had a single referral to the state level commission on professional practices despite numerous concerns over the years from patrons and district administrators about problem teachers. The state report was an opportunistic segue to the second part of Monday's

administration meeting. There would be a presentation on a process for addressing inappropriate employee behavior that the superintendent and Jon had been working on over the summer and had finalized over the past month in anticipation of the state report.

After spending most of her first two years focused on improving instructional practices at the classroom level, the superintendent's top agenda item for the upcoming school year was to raise school building and program supervisors' awareness of and focus on accountability for employee behavior. The information in the state report while damaging, was also timely. As Dr. Chambers said to Jon two weeks earlier, "The question of a high profile personnel case occurring isn't a matter of if, but when. Employees will walk through your door and present you with information that will have to be investigated. At some point, the stakes of the outcome of the investigation will be high, possibly leading to terminating someone's contract and perhaps resulting in criminal prosecution. You and the administrator have to be prepared and understand how to work together to ensure a thorough investigation and a fair outcome".

The impetus for the state level report was an article in the Fairview Herald-Tribune on local and national reports about educator sexual misconduct. In the last three months of the previous school year, there had been three disturbing reports of sexual misconduct on the part of school teachers from three different school districts around the state's largest metropolitan area. Most disturbing was that two of the three cases involved alleged sexual misconduct with elementary age students; one by a male teacher with female students and one by a female teacher with a male student. Included in the article was also a review on three of the more notorious cases of educator misconduct

involving Mary Kay Letourneau, Pamela Rogers Turner and Debra Lafave, all of whom became “romantically” involved with school-age students.

From the perspective of some members of the Alexandra community (and three of the seven school board members), the information in the state report was not only laudable, but a tribute to the quality of the employees that had worked in the school district over the past two decades. They reasoned that no disciplinary referrals made to the state commission must have meant that none had been necessary.

Conversely, other members of the board, district employees, as well as a growing segment of the public viewed the report from a different perspective. The report was justification for increased frustration over the previous administration’s unwillingness to take on the “old guard” and to use “discount and defend” as their strategy for inappropriate employee conduct and poor teaching practices.

The fuel for their frustration centered on teachers who had not kept up with current best practice with no apparent consequences and a small but powerful contingent of teachers and coaches whose verbal tirades during classes or team practices were downplayed and rarely resulted in anything beyond a verbal warning. In addition to these two issues there was an alleged incident with a teacher from this same contingency, shoving a student into a set of lockers during an argument. Because no one witnessed the altercation, the matter was not pursued. A final frustration was the practice of hiring relatives and friends of district employees over, at times, more qualified applicants, especially in classified positions such as secretaries, teaching assistants, maintenance workers and custodians. From the perspective of dissatisfied patrons, employees and

board members, the information from the state report was a catalyst for critical review of district practices and action that was long overdue.

### *A Divided District*

Alexandra School District is located 90 minutes south of the state's major metropolitan area and state capital. Alexandra and Fairview are the two primary population areas, with each town supporting a public high school. After twenty years of steady growth, the student population in Alexandra School District has held steady for three years at just over 9,000 students. Alexandra High enrollment is typically around 1,400 students, Fairview enrollment around 1,300. Each high school has a feeder system of two middle schools and four elementary schools.

The split in opinions about the information in the state report on the part of the school board and patrons was reflective of the longstanding divisiveness between constituent groups on the east and west side of Alexandra County. Alexandra School District is divided geographically by a freeway running north and south. Politically it is divided because the town of Alexandra is the county seat. For the west side residents in and around Fairview, this was viewed as an advantage for Alexandra because such things as community improvement projects, road construction and repair and zoning ordinances seemed to occur either first or to the advantage of Alexandra.

Accusations of favoritism toward the east side schools, including Alexandra High School were also a common occurrence anytime a school board decision was made that was perceived inequitable toward Fairview and its schools. Due to the size of the

precincts in Alexandria County, four of the school board members represented the east side of the school district.

When a new east side elementary school and major reconstruction project for Alexandria High School was approved by a split vote of the school board four years earlier, the Fairview residents protested vehemently that Fairview High School was in greater need for an upgrade and that their elementary schools were equally as crowded as the east side elementary schools. When the district could not financially support two distance learning sites, Alexandria High School was where the studio was built for students to participate in the state education network classes. The result of that decision was that Fairview high school students had to drive to Alexandria to take classes not offered in the district such as aviation science, criminal justice, Chinese and anatomy and physiology.

Because the schools were similar in size based on student enrollment, they also competed in the same region of the state for academic and athletic competitions. Invariably Fairview was a close second to Alexandria in activities including debate, academic decathlon and “mathletes”. In athletics, the two schools were bitter rivals. Each school consistently vied for region and state dominance in football, track and field, girls basketball and especially in wrestling. Either Fairview or Alexandria High School had won the last 10 state wrestling championships. The two schools’ dominance over the rest of the high schools in the state defied explanation. It was also a sport that both communities took extreme pride in based on their success.

In a less than proud example of the intensity of the wrestling rivalry, for a dual match three years ago, spectators were banned from the event due to pre-match

vandalism that had occurred at each school. A group of students from Fairview used a four wheel drive diesel truck and a set of tow chains to pull down the Bronco statue in front of Alexandra High School. Even with increased diligence due to concerns of retaliation, Alexandra students managed to burn a gigantic “AHS” in the middle of the Fairview High School football field. The banning of spectators created a furor from both sides of the county, but the district administration refused to back down. Since the day of that wrestling match, no other vandalism has occurred around any other athletic competitions.

### *The Superintendent*

Dr. Teri Chambers had been recruited to apply for the Alexandra School District superintendent position when the former superintendent, Dr. Edgar Booker, announced his retirement a little over three years ago. After a statewide and national search produced three finalists, Dr. Chambers was appointed to the position with almost unanimous support from the hiring committee as well as the school board.

Dr. Chambers had worked previously for Montgomery School District, one of the state’s most progressive districts. She was recruited, in part, based on her success as an assistant superintendent overseeing the larger district’s programs that focused on improving student performance in Title I designated schools. Dr. Chambers was a self-described “thief” of successful instructional strategies. As she stated in a radio interview during the superintendent search process, “I look for award winning overachieving schools in cities with similar demographics to ours [Montgomery School District’s]. Then I take the principals and teacher leaders from our highly impacted schools so they

see what these schools do differently than we do, and then we replicate the model. The principals, teachers and staff 'get on board or go elsewhere'. From my perspective, there isn't time or justification to support one minute of ineffective instruction for our students.

Dr. Chambers' orchestrated plan to put in place Montgomery district's early literacy programs, supplemental instruction, use of instructional technology in the classroom, middle school math and reading initiatives and intense focus on in-home and summer instructional programs contributed to the district's national recognition for increases in test scores. The programs helped meet school improvement based and student performance in lieu of the requirements of No Child Left Behind and the essential need to meet Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) benchmarks. These initiatives and positive results, in and of themselves, were enough of an incentive to recruit Dr. Chambers to work for Alexandra Public Schools.

Additional reasons for recruiting and hiring Dr. Chambers from the school board's perspective, was that Teri, prior to becoming an assistant superintendent in Montgomery County, had twelve years of experience as a building principal at both elementary and secondary schools and had also spent two years as the assistant to the director and four years as the director of personnel for the district. During her tenure in personnel, Montgomery County School District had successfully terminated eight teachers and an assistant principal for indiscretions ranging from incompetence and insubordination to inappropriate use of school funds and unprofessional conduct.

Securing the services of an individual committed to addressing the stagnant test scores in Alexandra School District, while also bringing to the table the acumen to understand the steps necessary to increase accountability of the district administrative

staff for the behavior of their employees was considered an incredible coup by the school board. For a board so divided, getting support from six of the seven board members for Dr. Chambers as the number one choice for Superintendent was almost a miracle.

Unbeknownst to the school board, Dr. Chambers had had an eye on Alexandra School District for several years. She wanted to become a superintendent, but not in a school district the size of Montgomery County (40,000 students). She was impressed with several of the board members she had met through the state school board association meetings. Teri also felt like the improvement potential for students in the district was something she could guide and facilitate successfully.

Dr. Chambers had six years left until being fully vested in the state retirement system. She intended that Alexandra School District would be the job that she stayed in until she felt that her love for education or her intense energy to work toward improvement of the system for students and staff waned. As she stated decisively in her interviews, a “six year minimum” is what the board could expect from her. If all worked out, her goal was to stay in the district for ten years then retire.

Teri had intentionally been methodical in her approach to addressing the critical issues she had been brought to Alexandra to address. She had made a decision early on that there would be a sequential approach to addressing the district’s primary issues, three of which were out-of-date teaching practices, stagnant test scores and the gap between high-performing Anglo students and second language learners.

From a curricular, instructional and programming perspective, all-day kindergarten for identified students, state and federal grants to support K-3 reading initiatives through additional staff, after-school and summer programs had been a

priority. Her “In Order to Arrive we Read by Five” project combined the district education foundation, PTA, PTO, and community education resources and had made significant inroads toward the focus of the district’s early childhood and kindergarten programs to increase students’ preparedness for first grade. Additionally, a cadre of younger energetic middle and high school core subject area teachers had caught fire with training on differentiating instruction, vertical alignment of the coursework and incorporating instructional strategies for second language learners into their frameworks for instruction.

While the shift in academic emphasis indicated positive steps in the direction that was hoped for, little had changed with regard to the perception of issues around employee behavior. Ineffective teaching, arriving late or leaving early, failing to post grades for homework and tests on the student information system in a timely manner were intermittent, but still problematic. As some of the principals, department chairs and grade level team leaders began to emerge to carry the momentum on some of the curricular and instructional fronts, Dr. Chambers’ efforts turned toward developing a system of support for her administrators to help them address inappropriate employee behaviors. She was determined to move forward with this priority despite a track record of a lack of support for the principals from the current personnel director.

### *A Positive Change*

From Dr. Chambers’ perspective, an ironic, yet somewhat fortuitous and timely turn of events occurred as she began her planning meetings with the current personnel director, Todd McLaughlin. Mr. McLaughlin, who had been the personnel director for

Alexandra School District for 22 years, developed a problem with the disk drive in his laptop, which was provided to him by the school district. The technology specialist that repaired the laptop discovered that there were photographs from inappropriate websites in a file that Mr. McLaughlin apparently believed had been deleted. Additionally, while trying out some new retrieval software for files that had been erased, a spreadsheet file tracking results from betting on college football appeared with dollar amounts, winnings and losses. At the bottom of the spreadsheet was a phone number that turned out to be for a cross- town bookmaker that had been in and out trouble for issues around gambling. As soon as all of this information was discovered, the tech passed it along to his supervisor, who in turn met with the superintendent to share the information.

When faced with the prospect of an investigation and possible disciplinary action and the fallout from possible public knowledge of these issues, Mr. McLaughlin retired/resigned “unexpectedly”. He moved from Alexandra County to the northern part of the state to provide care for an ailing aunt that raised him after his mother and father had passed away when he was in high school. An interesting note for those that were closest to Todd, he once mentioned that neither his late father nor mother had had any siblings.

### *Teaching Notes*

#### *Section 1*

1. Leadership is a quality that school districts from their administrators. What attributes does Dr. Chambers possess that are indicative of being a leader? From your experience in education, who have you worked with/for that you consider an excellent leader? What made them an effective leader? How are the superintendent’s vision and goals for Alexandra School district manifested in her actions?

2. Review the current internet/computer use agreement for students and employees in your school district/organization. For school districts, which is stricter with regard to violations – the student agreement or the employee agreement? Are employees and students required to sign a use agreement? If so, how often? If not, why not? Compare and contrast computer/internet use agreements across districts and/or with university policies.
3. Depending on their level of access, technology specialists have almost instantaneous access to any and all electronic information stored in the district. What ethical and professional standards are codified in your district based on their access to sensitive information? If a concern were brought to you as a supervisor over what an employee saw on another employee's laptop, what procedure would you be required to follow to gain access to that information?
4. With regard to the personnel director's retirement/resignation: are there legal issues that require the superintendent to inform local law enforcement of the information discovered on the computer? What action(s) could have been pursued against the personnel director had he decided to stay in his position and fight the issues about what was on his computer? Despite the resignation, should the personnel director be referred to the professional practices commission? Why or why not?

#### A Key Hire and a Call to Action

Dr. Chambers was faced with a critical and perhaps defining decision based on the unexpected resignation of veteran personnel director Todd McLaughlin. From a surprisingly shallow pool of applicants, Dr. Chambers and the school board went back and forth on the two finalists for the personnel director position. Would it be better to bring in someone from outside the district for a fresh start based on the current reputation of the district, or should they take a risk by hiring Jon Robertson. Mr. Robertson was a principal with no human resource experience, but he knew the school district issues frontward and backward. As the imposed deadline for the decision approached an interesting event occurred. Marny Powers, the most veteran principal in the district from

a rival middle school to Jon Robertson's school, requested an opportunity to address the superintendent and board members on behalf of Jon.

Curiosity was piqued as Marny and Jon had been openly antagonistic with one another about which school received preferential treatment from the district based on teacher assignments, supplemental program funding, who received computers first, which school's furniture cost more, and whose maintenance tickets were addressed more efficiently. In her presentation to the Board, Marny's points included that Jon had been an outstanding teacher at the high school prior to obtaining his administrative certification. He had been active as a department chair, served as an assistant girls basketball and track coach, and had become a mentor teacher. While working on his administrative endorsement, Jon spent time as a part-time intern at one of the district's elementary schools. He worked as the principal at the same middle school where he was hired as an assistant five years earlier. Put simply, he had come up through the system and was *deserving* of an opportunity to join the district administrative team.

Her support for an in-district choice and Jon specifically was key in swaying support toward Jon. Additionally, Dr. Chambers convinced the Board that her experience as a personnel director would allow her to mentor Jon on some of the more critical issues that may arise. As a result, Jon was hired as the new personnel director for the district. Mr. Robertson said good-bye to his students and staff on the last Friday of school and started as the new personnel director the next Monday. Based on the timing of the personnel director hiring, the district felt that they had missed the prime hiring season for principals. Dr. Chambers felt that most of the top flight candidates for a principal would already be under contract for the upcoming year. As a result, Jon's assistant principal

was appointed as the new middle school principal and a counselor that had been waiting for an opportunity to move into an administrative position was appointed as the assistant principal.

After one week on the job, Jon was sent to a week-long out of state training on personnel and human resource management. The training focused on the impact of policy, legislation, federal protection acts and case law around employee job actions as well as proven strategies on recruitment and retention, employee evaluations, salary structures, and employee benefits. After a full week of wading through the training, Jon began to realize how complex the issues are that arise based on something as simple as a letter of reprimand, much less the morass of considerations if the outcome of a job action is terminating an employee's contract for cause.

Having completed the personnel workshop, one of the first steps in putting the training into context was to meet each Friday at 4:00 p.m. with the superintendent. During that time Dr. Chambers would review situations that occurred when she was a personnel director. She and Jon would discuss appropriate actions, conversations, letters and disciplinary scenarios keeping in mind the inevitable, that these scenarios would prepare Jon when it became necessary to address personnel issues within the school district.

It was during these discussions that Dr. Chambers and Jon began playing with the idea of an in-service training for district administrators on corrective disciplinary procedures. The discussions and crafting of the presentation continued during the summer. During the week that Dr. Chambers and Jon were putting some of the final touches on an outline for the presentation (See Table 1), the State Department of

Education announced that they would be releasing a State Professional Practices Commission summary report on job actions against licensed school employees within the next week. Jon and Dr. Chambers decided that the presentation on corrective discipline would be a good follow-up to the report. They decided to present the information at an administrative meeting in September after the state report was released.

Table 1  
*Corrective Discipline: An Overview of Effective Employee Discipline*

---

- I. The role of the principal and other supervisors: “To Represent the Board of Education”
  - a. Providing leadership for teaching and learning
  - b. Providing support at district, building and classroom level
  - c. Solving problems
  - d. Correcting mistakes: “Failure to correct bad behavior is to condone bad behavior”
  
- II. The nature of corrective discipline (objective is to remediate problem behaviors)
  - a. Corrective not punitive
  - b. Progressive not explosive
  - c. Clear not vague
  - d. Based on facts not assumptions
  - e. Predictable not arbitrary
  - f. Civil not combative
  
- III. The components of corrective discipline
  - a. Foundation – Law
    - i. Statute and board policies
    - ii. Regulations and school policy
    - iii. Administrative guidelines and directives
    - iv. Just cause – reason to show harm
    - v. Due Process – protection of individual rights
    - vi. Disciplinary action
      1. Verbal warning
      2. Written directive
      3. Written reprimand
      4. Suspension with pay
      5. Suspension without pay
      6. Termination
  
- IV. Investigation
  - a. Investigate first
  - b. Fair – include the employee and others suggested by the employee
  - c. Complete – gather evidence, witness statements, documents, etc..
  - d. Take notes – date, time, place facts, witnesses
  - e. Written response – when appropriate, obtain a written response
  - f. Just cause
    - i. Improper conduct
    - ii. Neglect of duty

- iii. Insubordination
  - iv. Failure to perform duties properly
    - v. Excessive absenteeism
    - vi. Incapacity due to mental or physical disability
- V. Due process
- a. Was the rule, procedure, or directive known to the employee?
  - b. Was the rule procedure, or directive reasonably related to the orderly efficient, safe operation of the school?
  - c. Was the employee aware or warned of probable disciplinary consequences?
  - d. Was there an objective, fair investigation of the facts?
  - e. Was there valid, objective, substantial evidence of wrongdoing?
  - f. Did the corrective action fit the violation (i.e. was it reasonable?)
  - g. Was the previous record of the employee taken into account?
  - h. Was the treatment of this problem consistent with treatment of other similar cases?
  - i. Progressive sequence
    - i. Post, provide, create an awareness and review pertinent rules
    - ii. Keep personal notes
    - iii. Give verbal notice
    - iv. Give verbal warning
    - v. Give written directive
    - vi. Provide opportunity and support toward improved behavior
    - vii. Provide written reprimand (if no improvement)
    - viii. Recommend additional disciplinary action
      - 1. Suspension with pay
      - 2. Suspension without pay
      - 3. Termination
- VI. Prevention
- a. Provide balance of support
  - b. Post expectations
    - i. statutory laws and regulation
    - ii. board policies
    - iii. school policies
    - iv. professional agreement
  - c. Check for access to expectations
  - d. Clear, continuous communication
- 

### *The State Report*

The state level report summarizing the State Professional Practices Commission (SPPC) actions was released the first week in September. The information had been compiled from job actions taken by the commission since 1985, which is when the commission began keeping records. During the past 22 years there had been 444 suspensions and revocations of licenses by the State Board of Education whose actions

are guided by the SPPC (See Table 2). Of the 444 actions taken by the state, 35.1% were for inappropriate sexual behavior with students and 22.1% were for unprofessional conduct based on inappropriate relationships formed with students.

According to the SPPC report, the third leading cause for job actions overall was inappropriate use of the internet, primarily due to downloading or storing internet pornography or using the internet to entice minors into a relationship. However, all 58 of the these job actions had taken place since 1999, making inappropriate use of the internet the second leading cause for job actions over the previous 8 years. According to the State Board of Education attorney, approximately 100 cases were reviewed each year with between 6 and 30 certificated staff losing their licenses annually. Alexandra School District was cited as the only district yet to have a referral to the SPPC since they began keeping data on teacher suspensions and revocations in 1985.

Table 2  
*State Revocations and Suspensions: 1985 – 2007*

	Number Reported	Percent
Inappropriate Sexual Behavior w/Students	156	35.1
Unprofessional Conduct Involving Students	98	22.1
Internet Violation	58	13.1
Drug/Alcohol Offense	41	9.5
Misuse of Public Funds	16	3.6
Theft	12	2.7
Miscellaneous Other	62	14.0
<b>Total</b>	<b>444</b>	<b>100.0</b>

*Teaching Notes*

*Section 2*

1. What process is used in your district to hire and/or place building administrators? Is it an open process (positions are posted and advertised) or closed process (positions are assigned from current employees or a pool of candidates)? Is there

- a perceived ‘good ol’ girls/boys network’ in place? If so, what is the impact of this network?
2. What would you consider ethical or unethical hiring practices? How would you or how does your district guard against the latter? What are the advantages and disadvantages of your districts hiring process and practice?
  3. Contact your state department of education and/or professional practices commission. What type of information is available as a part of the public record regarding suspensions or revocations of teacher licenses?
  4. Have there been any high-profile sexual misconduct cases in your district/region/state? Under what circumstances did the information become public? How were these cases resolved? What actions were taken and by whom?

### Heading Down the Right Road

The superintendent responded publicly to the state report as pragmatically as possible by stating that she hoped that any previous disciplinary issues had been handled appropriately at the school level. Dr. Chambers also questioned whether a process for forwarding information to the SPPC had ever been formalized by the previous personnel director. Privately, she understood that principals had become loathe to try and discipline teachers with no support from Mr. McLaughlin, the district personnel director. She also knew the answer to the question she posed was that anything that did make it to McLaughlin’s desk, died there. According to Dr. Chambers, support from Jon Robertson when disciplinary action was necessary and a clear and concise process for informing the SPPC when appropriate were priorities from this point forward.

### *Getting Your Feet Wet*

On a relatively small scale, an initial personnel issue had presented itself during the first two weeks of school. A Fairview High School teacher who also served as the

soccer coach had gotten into a screaming match with one of the players and a parent. The confrontation was over the player being cut from the varsity team. The player in question was entering her senior year, but due to an influx of very talented sophomores, this difficult decision was one that the coach felt he had to make in the best interest of the team.

Jon felt that he should lead the investigation of this incident. However, Dr. Chambers convinced him that an investigation for this particular type of incident should be the responsibility of the building principal and athletic director. Jon's role was to be a support to both of them during the process and to make certain that the process was fair and complete. Dr. Chambers pointed out that there were two advantages to the principal and/or athletic director being the investigator(s). First, addressing the situation at a lower level would help establish administrator responsibility for investigating questionable actions of the employees they supervise. Second, investigating at the administrator level provides an avenue for an appeal. An appeal would be available for the parents and for the coach in the event that either sought additional input regarding the outcome of the investigation.

Jon met with the principal and athletic director after the interviews had been conducted with the coach, parent and the player that had been cut from the team. Other team members who had witnessed the confrontation were also interviewed. Jon and the two administrators discussed a continuum of possible disciplinary actions based on the situation. Options discussed included a verbal warning and note to the principal's employee file, a letter of reprimand, suspension and even removing the coach from his position as soccer coach.

Based on a clean history with students and parents during five years of teaching and coaching at Fairview, consensus was that the coach would provide a written apology to the parent and student for raising his voice inappropriately during the argument. Additionally there would be a warning letter about possible disciplinary action for any future issues with yelling at players or parents presented to the coach and signed by both the principal and athletic director. A copy of the letter would also be placed in the principal's file at the school. However, the student was not reinstated onto the team as both the principal and athletic director felt that to do so would undermine the process of selecting players on the part of the coaching staff.

#### *The Administration Meeting*

On the fourth Monday in September, the superintendent spent time discussing the state report with all of the school principals, assistant principals and classified supervisors. For the veteran administrators, the data in the report and subsequent fallout were not surprising. Following the discussion on the SPPC report, the superintendent the presentation on employee discipline. It was a long, thorough presentation, filled with many stories and examples of inappropriate employee behavior drawn from Dr. Chambers' previous experiences as a building administrator, assistant personnel director and personnel director. Jon was very pleased with the presentation, but also very impressed at how Dr. Chambers had moved through the presentation so flawlessly.

An indication that the presentation was well received by the building administrators was the discussion that followed regarding the former personnel director and the frustration on the part of the administrators, that their efforts to garner support for

poor teacher behavior, were not supported by Todd McLaughlin. All of the principals had been in place for a much shorter period of time than the previous personnel director. The administrators felt that Todd McLaughlin's connections and relationships with veteran employees overrode his support of the administrators attempting to address disciplinary issues. From Dr. Chambers' and Jon's perspective, the administrator's and supervisor's reflections on issues with the past was an important step in understanding how to support them in future situations.

Another positive aspect of the meeting were the comments from the Fairview High School principal about the support he received from the district office during the investigation of the coach who had yelled at the parents of the soccer player. One of the elementary principals added sarcastically that, depending on the coach, the previous personnel director would most likely have called the coach to congratulate him for having the guts to stand up to a couple of whiney parents. Laughter and nods of agreement followed that comment.

### *Teaching Notes*

#### *Section 3*

1. What information is written in policies or administrative rules that specifically outline the code of conduct or behavioral expectations for employees in your district? Is there a separate section for behavior of coaches during practices or athletic competitions?
2. Most coaches are considered at-will employees. What does this mean and how might it impact a disciplinary process for someone in a coaching position? What percentage of the coaches and advisors for student clubs and activities are teachers in the district? What percentage do not work in any other capacity for the district except as a coach or advisor for a particular sport or activity?

3. Does your district have a specific process for school level investigations in which all supervisors have been trained? According to state statute and district policy, under what circumstances can an employee's contract be terminated?
4. Consider the interpersonal impact an investigation on a teacher or coach. View the process from the employee being investigated and as the supervisor conducting the investigation. Create your own scenario that involves a disciplinary situation. Role play the situation and reflect on the process.

### I Have a Story to Tell.....If Someone Would Just Ask

A strong indication that attitudes might be changing about employee discipline occurred when Marny Powers made an appearance in Jon Robertson's office. She wanted to meet to report a situation that she felt could finally be addressed. It was the Friday afternoon following the presentation on discipline. She wanted to meet to talk about Le Mar Johnson. Jon's heart skipped a beat.

#### *Mr. Johnson*

Le Mar Johnson was an icon in the school district. He was an extraordinary math teacher with an equivalent passion for both teaching and coaching. He had produced an inordinate number of math scholars and consistently set the bar statewide for the number of students that took and passed the AP Calculus test. Mr. Johnson was a state recognized award winner. He was named the top teacher in the state five years ago. He had served on the district's math initiative and vertical alignment committees and had worked with the State Department of Education when the math curriculum was last rewritten.

While his performance as a teacher was outstanding, his reputation as a coach in girls basketball was becoming legendary. He was an intensely focused coach with a farm

system, of sorts, that stretched down into the local grade school county recreation leagues. For many of the players, the recreation leagues were “the” pipeline in preparation for an opportunity to play high school basketball for Le Mar. In fifteen years as a head coach, Alexandra High School had won 11 regional and 7 state championships. The past spring Alexandra High School won its third consecutive state title.

As additional fuel for divisiveness between Fairview and Alexandra High School, during Le Mar’s tenure, cross-district rival Fairview’s girls basketball team had managed only three wins against Alexandra. Alexandra had also beaten Fairview seven different years in the regional finals and on more than one occasion, the Fairview coaches accused Le Mar of running up the score unnecessarily.

Along with his standing in the academic and athletic community, Le Mar had been a friend and mentor early in Jon’s career. Not only had they worked together at the same high school for over a decade, Jon had actually been the assistant girls coach for four years, including during two of the state championship seasons. The prospect of hearing information from Marny about Le Mar that may have to be investigated was anything but a welcome prospect.

Marny began by talking about the impact that the state report and the training on school discipline had on her with regard to an event that happened almost 12 years ago when she was an assistant principal at one of the middle schools. She had followed the high school girls team as it began to develop after Le Mar had been named as the head coach. She had never seen someone as intensely focused on every detail of the game and able to break down every facet of offense, defense and fundamentals in a way that made

sense to his players. He was fiery in his support but never yelled at his players and his players were incredibly loyal to Le Mar.

One tradition that Le Mar started with his basketball teams in his first year was to name two captains; one senior and one junior. His senior captain that first year was a former student at Marny's middle school. As a rule, Le Mar expected the co-captains to spend extra time reviewing film, helping younger players and working as camp counselors during the summer. Marny recounted a sense that she had about Le Mar and his co-captains, in particular his senior captains. During the year that her former student, Patrice, was the senior captain, Marny recalled seeing them together several times, always with another coach or the other co-captain present, but there was something about the way they interacted that made her uncomfortable. It was just a feeling that they sat a little closer to each other than necessary and that they laughed a little too often when together as if sharing jokes that no one else was privy to.

One rainy day, after the season was over, Marny was on her way home from school and saw Patrice and Le Mar in his car together. This was a clear violation of district policy, unless the situation was approved by the building administrator. She called Le Mar in his classroom before school and confronted him about the situation. Le Mar assured her that the issue was one where Patrice's parents were not available and she could not find a ride home and he, without considering possible consequences, simply gave her a ride. When Marny spoke with Patrice, she told the same story. Marny also asked Patrice point blank if anything was going on with regard to an inappropriate relationship. Patrice blushed and seemed embarrassed by the question, but quietly and

confidently told her that nothing was going on. She accepted the explanation, thought nothing more of the situation and did not report it to anyone.

Later that summer Marny was with friends on the other side of town and while driving past a strip mall she thought she saw Le Mar and Patrice walking into a deli together. By the time school started after Labor Day, Marny had let go of the thought deciding she had been mistaken. Patrice was out of state at college and Le Mar was back at the high school teaching his math classes and preparing for the upcoming basketball season.

As Marny walked out of Jon's office after sharing the story, Jon dropped his eyes to the floor as a pit rose in his stomach. Jon had not been a part of the girl's basketball program when Patrice was the captain, but he had been an assistant for Le Mar over a four year period. During his third year as an assistant, there was a senior captain that also seemed to have a very close relationship with Le Mar. While he never had any proof that there was anything inappropriate, the way they interacted also made him a little uncomfortable. The additional piece of information Jon thought about that added to his discomfort was Le Mar's practice of inviting the senior captain to the team camp as Western State College following their senior season to work as an assistant coach. This was a tradition framed as a reward for the captains for their dedication to the program. Now Jon wondered if there was an ulterior motive for this ongoing tradition.

Jon's choice was at hand. Essentially, Marny was clearing her conscience from a situation she had concerns about 12 years earlier. However, one of the promises he had made to Dr. Chambers and the board members on the interview committee, was to

investigate any situation that was brought to his attention, regardless of who may be impacted.

For a moment, he thought about leaving the situation alone. Ms. Powers wasn't asking to open up an investigation based on something that happened twelve years ago. However, after that momentary thought, Jon opened the door and headed down the hallway toward Dr. Chambers' office. He already had a plan for the investigation if his feedback from Dr. Chambers' confirmed that he should pursue this situation. Naturally, it was Friday afternoon and once again Jon and Teri were locked into an intense conversation. Dr. Chambers agreed that the information could not be ignored, but that the approach to this investigation needed to be handled cautiously. The ramifications of any negative information about Le Mar Johnson becoming public prior to having a complete investigation including an opportunity for Le Mar to be made aware of the allegations, could be challenging if not a public relations disaster.

### *The Investigation*

In the upcoming closed session of the school board, Dr. Chambers would let the Board know that an investigation was underway regarding an employee based on some information that had been brought forward from another employee. In the meantime, Jon would go back through the list of senior captains over the last fifteen years and gather information from the high school alumni sight to locate the addresses and phone numbers for as many of the captains as possible. They agreed that Jon would make two phone calls in an effort to probe whether there might be any credence to the concerns. The first phone call would be to Patrice. The second call would be to the former player who was a

team captain during Jon's third year as the assistant coach. Her name was Jordan, she was the daughter of one of the current school board members. Ironically, it was a board member who had been opposed to Jon's hiring.

The conversations would be scripted stating that information had been brought to Jon's attention that he was required to investigate. The investigation was confidential and it was critical that the questions and discussion not be shared with anyone else at this time. There was no guarantee of complete anonymity depending on the outcome and the former student/athletes were under no obligation to participate, but it was hoped that if they had any information or evidence to contribute, that they would do so as it would be very helpful in concluding the investigation.

"If" any concerns about Le Mar's behavior were brought forth and substantiated by the first two phone calls, additional calls would be made to the other team captains at that point. Subsequently, statements, interviews and any evidence would be compiled and presented to Le Mar in a meeting with his direct supervisor, the high school principal. The athletic director would be included in the meeting as well. The allegations would be presented so that Le Mar would have an opportunity to hear what information had been brought forward in an effort to provide him an opportunity to respond to the allegations. Once he had an opportunity to respond, additional investigation toward his response would occur. If there were additional interviews or evidence, they would also be considered prior to meeting with the superintendent, the attorney and making a recommendation if deemed necessary.

There were so many things going through Jon's mind on the way back to his office to make the first call. Shouldn't he start by touching base with Le Mar? Should he

ask Marny if her intent was for him to look into the situation? If he talked to Patrice, would she agree not to speak about this with Le Mar during the investigation? If so, and if there was nothing to the investigation, could there be some fallout if Le Mar found out about the call? What would the board think if the first serious issue he had chosen to pursue blew up in his face? How would it make the superintendent look? What if there was credence to the concerns – then what? How could he sit across from one of his mentors and tell him that he was under investigation?

As he was dialing the phone, he had a list of questions in front of him, but his mind raced trying to think of ways to keep his voice calm. On the fifth ring, a female voice picked up. He asked if he was speaking to Patrice, she said yes and asked who was speaking. She immediately recognized Jon's name as she had followed Alexandra's basketball program even though she had moved out of state six years earlier. Her next question was why he was calling. When Jon told her that he had been promoted to the district office as personnel director and was calling about some concerns about Le Mar Johnson that had recently been brought to his attention during the time she was team captain there was a long, pregnant pause. Even over the phone, Jon was aware that Patrice had begun to cry.

"I'm sorry if I upset you by asking about this", Jon said sincerely. "Are you comfortable continuing?" Jon worried that she might hang up at this point. Patrice said, "I can't say I'm comfortable continuing, but I'm willing to answer some more questions. Who came to you with the concern?" Jon hadn't been prepared for this question, he hesitated and stumbled to defer attention away from Marny as the source. "I can't really

share that information at this point. I can tell you that it was a district employee who was following your basketball career.”

Jon made a decision to come straight to the point. “Patrice, again, I’m sorry to be so direct, but did you have a close personal or romantic relationship with Mr. Johnson when you were a student/athlete at Alexandra High School?” Another long pause. “Well, sort of” she responded. “We spent a lot of time together, almost always with others around. But when we were by ourselves, we’d talk about personal things like what I did on weekends, who I was hanging out with and eventually how much we liked each other.”

Jon literally began to perspire, but did not respond. Patrice continued, “One time he gave me a ride home when it was raining hard. I’d stayed late to watch films and my folks were out of town. When we got to my house, we kinda had this weird, awkward kiss –it was so embarrassing”. Jon pursued the situation by asking “Was that the extent of the physical contact?” Patrice paused, “Well sort of” she said again. “We didn’t ‘do’ anything although we’d share a look or sit a little closer together than we needed to and we talked on a very personal level about understanding that nothing could happen between us, at least until after I graduated.”

Jon’s heart sank further as he felt he knew what was coming. “What happened after graduation?” Well, Patrice responded, “I guess you could say we had an affair”. When we were at camp at Western State, I had my own dorm room and Le Mar was staying at a motel just off campus. Two of the nights we were there, I snuck out and went to his room. It was his idea and we ...well, we...um....we slept together.”

Patrice went on to say that for some unknown reason, she had kept the key to the motel room and could produce it if needed. She then stated that they had had one other rendezvous later in the summer. He had a friend with a condo across town that happened to be out of the country. After that day together, Le Mar “broke it off” saying that it was just too risky for them to see each other in such a small town. From the last statement about the relationship being “too risky”, Jon determined that Le Mar knew what he and Patrice were doing was wrong!

Jon was now beyond disappointed and had to control his own emotions hearing these accusations about his colleague, mentor and friend. “Patrice”, he said intensely, “are you willing to provide this information in writing with a signature?” Without hesitation she said, “absolutely” Jon followed, “May I ask why?” What followed startled him. “I’ll do it because he took advantage of me. After being hurt for awhile I got angry. Over time, another thing I found out is that I’m not the only one that this has happened to. I know about other girls he’s done the same thing to and someone needs to stop him. I’ve even talked to some of them...and, I’ll give you their names.”

### *Face-to-Face*

It took almost two months to gather information from different team captains about what may or may not have happened. Each team captain was informed that the questions were part of an investigation and that they were to keep the investigation confidential. While a majority of the former student athletes reported that there were no inappropriate advances by Le Mar, three other captains reported that they had developed

a romantic relationship with their coach. In each instance, the physical part of the relationship began after they had graduated and after they had turned eighteen.

Throughout the process, Jon had frequent contacts with the school district attorney and met at least twice per week with the superintendent to keep her apprised of the progress of the investigation. Jon, Dr. Chambers and the attorney were acutely aware of the ramifications of the investigation and the possible job action against Le Mar Johnson.

Once the last of the statements from the former student/athletes were received and compiled into the summary of the concerns, a meeting needed to be set up with Le Mar to present him with the allegations in full and give him an opportunity to respond. The question due to the time lapse from the actual events, led to a discussion of options about who should be involved in the meeting. Even though the current high school principal was not Le Mar's supervisor during the time of any of the alleged relationships, it was decided that he would be involved in the meeting. The athletic director would also attend the meeting. Due to the possibility that the actions, if substantiated, could result in termination of Le Mar's contract, the discussion of whether to include Dr. Chambers in the initial meeting went back and forth. A day before the meeting, Jon and Dr. Chambers agreed that she would not attend.

At the end of the second week of November, on Friday the 13<sup>th</sup>, a meeting was scheduled with Le Mar in the high school conference room. At 2:45 sharp, Le Mar Johnson walked into the conference room. The fact that Jon and the athletic director were at the meeting was unexpected and what was about to be presented based on the

investigation to this point was going to be the most difficult thing that Jon Robertson had ever had to do.

Jon's hands were sweating and there was a slight tremble in his voice as he explained to Le Mar that there were concerns about him from former basketball players that had been brought to the attention of the personnel department. It was Jon's obligation to investigate the complaints fully and at this time the initial investigation had been completed. The current meeting was an opportunity for Le Mar to see the allegations in writing and to respond. As the investigation was ongoing, Le Mar was not to approach any current or former players about the statements nor attempt to determine the identity of the individuals who provided the information. No action was being taken at this time, but this was an opportunity to answer questions about the allegations and he would have until Wednesday November 18<sup>th</sup> to respond in writing. As the girls basketball season was underway, Le Mar was also instructed by his principal not to meet with any of his captains or other players without the junior varsity or sophomore coach being present.

While the concerns were presented in writing and verbally, Jon did his best to maintain direct eye contact. As the information continued, Le Mar Johnson looked directly at Jon, his jaw clenched, his skin turning red and his eyes staring like lasers...not at Jon, but through Jon. As Jon finished his comments, Le Mar grabbed the papers on the desk and stood up from his chair. Ever so slowly he looked at Jon, the athletic director and then the principal and said seething with rage, "I have only one question and one comment. Jon, how in God's name could you do this to me after all that we have been

through?” The he hissed, “You know this is all a bunch of bullcrap and you can all go to hell!” He then turned around and walked out of the office.

### *Conclusion*

Le Mar’s defiance lasted over the weekend, but he responded in writing cryptically stating that none of the events ever took place and that a conspiracy had been hatched against him by former players. Unfortunately for Le Mar, his former players kept mementos via notes and cards, some of them with his signature or initials. After reviewing Le Mar’s letter and in consultation with the attorney and the superintendent, the recommendation was to terminate Le Mar’s contract for cause based on unprofessional behavior. Additionally, he was suspended without pay and removed as the girls basketball coach pending a board hearing. In a first for Alexandra School District, the case was also referred to the state professional practices commission so that they could conduct their own investigation of the events in question.

Le Mar went public with the case and once again the district was divided. The west side of the district was unsympathetic as they had been a whipping post for Johnson’s girls basketball teams for over a decade. Conversely, current and former Alexandra players, parents and many teachers at the high school were livid about the recommendation to terminate him and furious that he had been dismissed as coach just as the season was getting underway. His supporters could not imagine one of their prize teachers and coaches being involved in relationships with multiple students over the years. Under the barrage of patron outrage and media coverage, Dr. Chambers and Jon Robertson could only say the current recommended disciplinary action was one that

would be reviewed by the School Board. The recommendation would either be upheld or altered, but it was in the hands of the Board.

Due to the winter holiday and requests from the attorneys to have time to prepare for the hearing, the board did not meet to hear the full case until mid January. In a hearing that was closed to the public, several teachers and former players testified on Johnson's behalf, but the former players who testified about the relationships were most convincing. When Patrice, who came back to Alexandra for the hearing, actually produced a room key with the hotel name on it where she and Le Mar had met, any question about the outcome of the hearing was clearly over.

After a short deliberation, the school board, in a 5 to 2 vote, upheld the recommendation to terminate the contract. Le Mar announced his immediate plans to pursue the matter with further legal action against the school district for wrongful termination. His claim would be that the district had acted too harshly since each of the girls was over 18 and were no longer students of the district. Letters of support for Le Mar and condemnation for the school board, the superintendent, the process of investigation and decision making arrived daily. Dr. Chambers lamented that a lengthy court case with such a public figure was not something anyone involved would look forward to.

Two weeks after the school board meeting, the SPPC board met to review the case and Le Mar was provided an opportunity to meet with the state level commission based on their own investigation and findings. The individuals on the SPPC included teacher representatives, currently employed and retired principals, current and former superintendents, at-large community members and attorneys representing the state

department of education. Five days after listening to Mr. Johnson's response to the allegations, Mr. Johnson's license to teach was revoked permanently for unprofessional conduct by using his position of authority to establish inappropriate relationships with students and for a pattern of establishing sexual relationships with former student-athletes.

With the SPPC board supporting the district's decision, the union attorney advised Le Mar that further legal action against the district would be fruitless. Without a teaching license, even if a court overturned the district's decision, he would not be able to return to teaching.

The SPPC's revocation and cause for action are a public document. Once the findings were made public, letters from the public subsided immediately. Also, in a surprising show of support, several of the veteran teachers, some that had been most vocal in support of Le Mar, privately spoke with Jon Robertson about concerns they had had with Mr. Johnson, but didn't have any proof and weren't willing to come forward based on a hunch or a feeling. A few of them said that they knew nothing would happen since Le Mar and the former personnel director, Todd McLaughlin, watched college football together on Saturdays during the fall.

### *Teaching Notes*

#### *Section 4*

1. Employees have guaranteed rights. Some based on local policy and practice, other based on state and/or federal legislation. Under what conditions would the following employee rights need to be considered and which of these are applicable to this case
  - a. property right
  - b. expectation of continued employment

- c. career (tenured) status
  - d. due process
  - e. the Americans with Disabilities Act
  - f. the Family Medical Leave Act
  - g. Long Term Disability
2. Review the outline on employee discipline in Table 1. Determine whether appropriate steps were followed during the investigation into the allegations against Le Mar Johnson.
  3. Identify the intrapersonal struggles for Jon Robertson throughout this case. What are the personal and professional costs for him as a result of all that has happened?
  4. What can and should be done to protect students from being exposed to verbal, physical and/or sexual abuse? Discuss the kind of betrayal that occurs when an individual in a position of power, abuses that power by establishing inappropriate personal relationships with students.
  5. As a building administrator, at what point does an incident rise to the level of requiring an investigation and what responsibility does the administrator have in overseeing an investigation?

### Instructor Notes

This case may be used to illustrate and focus on several aspects of educational leadership. From the authors' perspective, the three primary lenses from which to facilitate activities and discussion include political, legal and inter/intrapersonal.

As an administrator at all levels in public education, there are political realities that must be understood and anticipated. From which students make the soccer team to which side of the county has their schools improved first, there are consequences foreseen and unforeseen. Opportunities exist to explore a public school system beginning with a split school board and the possible impact a controlling interest creates. The agenda that a relatively new superintendent and a new personnel director set after suffering the through the impact of an unsupportive former personnel director come with a price. Taking on the old guard and disciplining an icon are daunting tasks, even when inappropriate behaviors justify action being taken.

The legal aspects of investigations and discipline are critical for an administrator to understand. Administrators at every level will be presented with challenging situations that will require some type of disciplinary response. The response might be as casual as a brief conversation, but could rise to a level of an employee's contract being terminated for cause. A certain level of knowledge about individual rights and school policy is expected. More typically, an administrator will need to know how to access resources depending on situations that arise.

The final lens for this case has to do with the inter/intrapersonal aspects of being an administrator. The focus for this case is not the presence or absence of interpersonal skills. The case is very specifically about the interpersonal costs that can occur when difficult disciplinary issues arise and about the intrapersonal struggles that become a reality when such disciplinary issues involve co-workers, colleagues as well as friends and mentors. This particular emphasis in the case should provide excellent opportunities for developing scenarios, role playing and reflecting.

### Instructor Notes References

Owen, Jane C. (2006). *The impact of politics in local education: Navigating white water*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education (Comment: Interspersed throughout – could choose different chapters based on instructor preference)

Webb, D. & Norton, Scott M. (2003). *Human Resources Administration: Personnel issues and needs in education*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice Hall (Comment: Interspersed information in chapters 2, 3, 5, & 9)

Bolman, Lee G. & Deal, Terrence E. (2003) *Reframing organizations: Artistry, choice and leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass (Comment: chapters 8 – 11)

LaMorte, M.W. (2008). *School law: Cases and concepts*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

#### Case References

American Association of University Women. (2001: 1993). *Hostile hallways: The AAUW Survey on sexual harassment in America's schools*. Washington, D.C.: American Association of University Women.

The Digest of Education Statistics (2005). U.S Department of National Center for Education Statistics. Retrieved February 8, 2007.

[http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05/tables/dt05\\_004.asp](http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d05/tables/dt05_004.asp)

Gabris, Gerald (2004). Using stories to teach public administration theories and models. *Proceedings of the Midwestern Political Science Association*, Chicago, IL retrieved May 3, 2007.

<http://search.egscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=1605426&site=ehost-live>>Using Stories to Teach Public Administration Theories and Models,</A>

U.S. Department of Education, Office of the Under Secretary, *Educator Sexual Misconduct: A Synthesis of Existing Literature*, Washington, D.C., 2004.U.S. Retrieved February 12, 2007

<http://www.ed.gov/rschstat/research/pubs/misconductreview/report.pdf>.

Yin, R., (ed). (2004). *The case study anthology*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications

## Sample Headlines from Internet Search

### Judge stays sentence in teacher sex abuse case

By Arrin Newton Brunson

Special to The Salt Lake Tribune

Article Last Updated: 07/16/2007 03:03:12 PM MDT

### Ex-school therapist gets jail time for sexual conduct with teen

By Stephen Hunt

The Salt Lake Tribune

Article Last Updated: 07/16/2007 01:26:27 PM MDT

### Teacher, Coach Charged With Sexual Misconduct

Posted by WCCO-TV Jun 7, 2007 | [Permalink](#)

Posted in [Lonsdale News](#)

Full story: [Available on Topix from WCCO-TV](#)

### Former Teacher Sentenced For Sexual Misconduct

The Associated Press

August 13, 2007

### Out of Bounds: Sexual misconduct by educators in Texas

Chronicle investigation reveals relationship of coaches and students rife with abuse

April 22, 2001, 6:12PM

**WE TRUST OUR KIDS TO THEM EVERY DAY. BUT A CHRONICLE INVESTIGATION REVEALS THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SECONDARY SCHOOL COACHES AND STUDENTS IS RIFE WITH ABUSE.**

Tue. Aug. 14, 2007

### Sequim teacher convicted of sexually exploiting minors

*Thursday, December 20, 2001*

By [SAM SKOLNIK](#)

SEATTLE POST-INTELLIGENCER REPORTER

### Charges of teacher misconduct are on rise

[DESERET NEWS \(SALT LAKE CITY\)](#), Apr 22, 2006 by Copyright 2006

Deseret Morning News By Jennifer Toomer-Cook, Tiffany

**Coaches continue working for schools and private teams after being caught for sexual misconduct**

By **Christine Willmsen** and **Maureen O'Hagan**

*Seattle Times staff reporters*  
 Sunday, December 14, 2003

**State failing to weed out unfit coaches**

By **Christine Willmsen** and **Maureen O'Hagan**

*Seattle Times staff reporters*  
 Tuesday, December 16, 2003

**Schools' dirty little secret**

October 17, 2005

<http://www.nctq.org/nctq/research/1132675616477.pdf> retrieved February 8, 2007.

**Father of LaFave's boy toy: Debra should have got jail**

Dad says teacher shows no remorse at all: 'It's a horrible, ugly thing that she's done'

[http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE\\_ID=49466](http://www.worldnetdaily.com/news/article.asp?ARTICLE_ID=49466)

February 11, 2007

**One Table from the Shakeshaft Report**

**Percent of Student Targets by**

<b>Job Title of Offender</b>	<b>Job Title Percent</b>
Teacher	18
Coach	15
Substitute Teachers	13
Bus Driver	12
Teacher's Aide	11
Other School Employee	10
Security Guard	10
Principal	6
Counselor	5
Total	100

Source: Shakeshaft, 2003; AAUW, 2001

### Author Note

Tim J. McConnell, Director of Human Resources, Park City School District, Park City Utah.

I would like to thank my doctoral chairperson, Dr. Andrea Rorrer for her innovative approach to providing ideas in support of this project, for the edits toward finishing the project and for her enthusiastic encouragement. I also thank the rest of my doctoral committee, Dr. Bob Johnson, Dr. Diana Pounder, Dr. John McDonnell and Dr. Louise Moulding for their edits and comments.

Correspondence for the author can be made to [tmccconnell@pcschools.us](mailto:tmccconnell@pcschools.us).

### Dedication

This project is dedicated to my family for their tolerance, understanding, exasperation, prodding, support and ultimatums that helped me bring this paper to fruition. My wife, Bambi, my son William and my daughter William will have my gratitude always. My late mother, Lois McConnell was and will always be my inspiration. Thanks to all of you.