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INTRODUCTION

“The way to gain a good reputation is to endeavor to be what you desire to appear.”

– Socrates

Socrates expounded on the value of moral development over 2,400 years ago, and his words may be even more fitting for the 21st century as ethical breaches in politics and corporate America have become common headlines. Fortune 500 executives are being convicted of illegal accounting practices, elected officials are misappropriating funds, and corporate decisions are leading to physical and financial harm. No private or public sector industry is immune from the detriment of bad ethics. As the commercial world diversifies, the need to understand the consequences of unethical behaviors from multicultural perspectives becomes increasingly essential.

California State University, Long Beach (CSULB) faculty have been tasked with developing ethical citizens who will succeed in their chosen careers. This is a charge we welcome and embrace. While it is clear that successful leadership requires the ability to make ethical decisions (Oliver & Hioco, 2012), the efficacy of ethics training in the classroom is not a foregone conclusion. To study the impact of ethics training across a curriculum, a foundation of understanding is needed regarding what and how ethics material is being taught.

In order to lay the groundwork and build an infrastructure for continual learning across the campus, the Ukleja Center for Ethical Leadership (UCEL) embarked on a longitudinal study. The goal of this investigation was to clarify three aspects of ethics training at CSULB: (a) topics covered; (b) methodology used; and (c) assessments employed. Specifically, campus faculty were asked the following questions:

1) What (if any) are the ethics-related learning objectives in the courses they teach?
2) What content are they exposing CSULB students to with respect to ethical behavior and decision-making?
3) How are students being taught this material? How do faculty facilitate skill-building?
4) What assessment methods are used to measure student outcomes?

This white paper begins with a literature review highlighting previous work on the impact and focus of ethics training in a variety of settings. A discussion of common challenges in ethics education is next, followed by a description and results of the campus study and subsequent initiatives that have since been
implemented. We conclude the paper with an invigorated commitment for further study in the search for ways to support campus development in ethics training and research.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

**The Value and Importance of Depth of Ethics Training on Campus**

Employers expect college students to receive training in ethics and social responsibility (Nicholson & DeMoss, 2010) and organizations want to hire an honest and ethical workforce (Abaté, 2011). Ethical behavior plays a large role in promoting employee morale, which ultimately leads to business success (Thompson, Thach, & Morelli, 2010).

Conversely, unethical conduct and decision-making can destroy a business internally and in the public eye. An ethics breach can obliterate employee trust, decrease morale, and degrade organizational commitment. External implications, such as bad publicity, public mistrust, and financial losses, can be equally if not more damaging. In order to be prepared for the workforce, students must move beyond self-interest and strongly consider the consequences of their decisions and behavior.

To achieve the desired outcome of graduating ethical citizens, faculty must go beyond a cursory introduction of codes of ethics and provide students with the opportunity to practice ethical decision-making and embody ethical principles. The work of Cordingley, Hyde, Peters, Vernon, and Bundy (2007) indicated that while medical students had a high level of confidence in their knowledge of ethics, their confidence in dealing with ethical challenges was very low. This implies that there are gaps between the transfer of knowledge and practical application in the area of ethics.

To increase the practical application of ethics, academics have suggested that ethics training focus on instilling a sense of moral obligation and personal responsibility (Muskavitch, 2005). For example, Thomas (2003) recommends the following goals for ethics training: (a) to prepare students to understand the ethical make-up of the field; (b) to train students on how to apply theoretical knowledge to solve ethical dilemmas; (c) to encourage students to be trustworthy; and (d) to establish the long-term goal of developing public trust through the implementation of ethical principles. He suggests that ethics be taught to “promote ethical practices, and to prepare students for the multitude of ethical decisions they will confront” (p. 285).

While the benefits of effective ethics training are clear – and a basic premise of this paper – resistance to openly exploring ethical dilemmas in the classroom can exist for instructors and students. The next section describes some of the barriers holding faculty back from a more in-depth examination of ethics and related topics, such as values and morals, in the classroom.

“To believe in something, and not to live it, is dishonest.”

– Mahatma Gandhi

**Ethics Training: Common Challenges**

Although reasons for teaching ethical decision-making on a college campus are easily identified, the success of such endeavors can be thwarted. Three hurdles which faculty reportedly face are: (a) contemporary United States culture; (b) student attitudes; and (c) lack of instructor confidence and preparation. Although these challenges are distinct, the effects are interdependent, and these help create an exigent milieu in which barriers to learning are erected (see Figure 1).
Student attitudes are heavily influenced by U.S. culture which idolizes wealth and power and celebrates selfish behaviors, while chastising good Samaritans and whistleblowers. In this context, the value of ethical behavior can be called into question by students who enter the classroom with negative dispositions toward social “goodness.” The influence of a society’s culture on one’s perceptual framework predominantly occurs at a subconscious level. Enron whistleblower Sharon Watkins warns that “students need to learn the subtlety of how unethical behavior can take hold of you” (Beenen & Pinto, 2009, p. 275).

**Student baggage.** Giacalone and Promisloa (2013) describe this phenomenon in their paper, *Broken when entering: The stigmatization of goodness in business ethics education.* This work describes three types of “baggage” that students carry into the modern classroom: (1) “a mindset that disparages virtue” (p.89); (2) “demonizing those needing help” (p. 90); and (3) “a stigmatization of goodness” (p.92).

Monin, Sawyer, and Marquez (2008) empirically support these observations with multiple studies focused on the social interactions of undergraduate students. In their work, students who demonstrated higher moral standards than their peers were rejected for their ethical stance. These “moral rebels” were intimidated and abused for standing firm on principled ground. Moral rebels are defined as “individuals who take a principled stand against the status quo, who refuse to comply, stay silent, or simply go along when this would require that they compromise their values” (p. 77). Moral rebels were reportedly rejected in their study because of their implied criticism which posed a threat to the self-esteem of individuals who do not rebel. These findings are consistent with observations made in corporate settings. Individuals with good character can be viewed as a threat to organizational power because of their refusal to succumb to, or be manipulated by, an unethical climate (Elliott, Ziegler, Altman, & Scott, 1982).

While ethics educators may not be able to prevent the influence of cultural dynamics outright, they can facilitate students’ abilities to recognize warning signs and help them identify principles to inform and guide behavior (Rasche, Gilbert, & Schedel, 2013). In other words, faculty can provide a crucible to develop skills that can increase one’s awareness of the extent to which an organization’s culture can influence individual thought and action. The aforementioned are challenges that could impact student readiness and willingness to grow ethically. The next section explores some hesitations from the instructors’ view.

**Faculty Challenges: Confidence and Preparation**

Another angle on the effectiveness of training is faculty confidence and preparation, or the lack thereof. Teaching ethics is not simple. Faculty are faced with complex challenges and hesitate to incorporate ethics into their curriculum for a variety of reasons (Dean & Beggs, 2006; Evans, et al., 2006; Evans and Weiss, 2008; Swanson & Fisher, 2009). Four barriers to instruction are described here in brief detail: 1) doubt that morality and ethics can be taught; 2) perceived threats to one’s value system; 3) concern that ethics training in the classroom is an invasion of privacy; and (4) lack of faculty training and preparation.

**Doubt that morality and ethics can be taught.** One of the compelling criticisms of teaching ethics is the belief that ethical values are determined early in life and are intractable once set. Thus, training would have little to no impact on a person’s thoughts or actions. Another critical view is that students don’t actually learn ethical behavior through instruction, but rather just become more adept at using ethical reasoning to justify current behavior. Students may learn tools and terminology in class, but can do so without increases in ethical action (McDonald & Donleavy, 1995).

Although these doubts exist, research in education, psychology, and neuroscience report the contrary (Dean & Beggs, 2006). The human brain continually changes in structure and function throughout one’s lifetime in response to
environmental cues (Tokuhama-Espinosa, 2010). Understanding and behavior are therefore malleable. Furthermore, research in business and academic settings has indicated the significant impact of ethics education in a variety of settings. The following section provides a sample of investigations into the effectiveness of moral sensitivity and ethics training.

**Studies with conclusive results.** Latif (2000) studied the effectiveness of a mandatory course in communication ethics for pharmacy students. Efficacy of moral reasoning skills was assessed by using the Defining Issues Test (DIT), which was developed and refined by James Rest and colleagues (Rest et al., 1999). The DIT measures the relationship between students’ moral development and their perceptions regarding the difficulty of resolving common ethical problems. The study concluded that moral reasoning skills are both teachable and measurable, and that ethical dilemma case discussions can enhance moral development (Latif, 2000).

Self, Baldwin, and Wolinsky (1992) used the DIT to measure the extent to which teaching medical ethics can enhance students’ moral reasoning. An experimental group that participated in a medical ethics course was compared with a control group of students not enrolled in class. The course focused on critical thinking, self-knowledge, issues in medicine, tolerance, and moral reasoning skills. Statistically significant increases were found in the moral reasoning of the course participants.

Jones (2009) looked at the impact of training on the moral reasoning of first-year business majors in a university setting. Five 75-minute classes on business ethics and two assignments designed to foster ethical reasoning skills were employed. A control group design with pre- and post-training measures was utilized. Results indicated that students in the training group demonstrated higher levels of post-training principled moral judgment than students in the control group.

Cagle and Baucus (2006) assessed the effectiveness of a case-based pedagogy on students' ability to make ethical decisions. A pre- and post-test was conducted to assess the use of cases as a teaching methodology in a finance course. Researchers wanted to determine whether recent corporate ethics scandals might have impacted students' perceptions of the importance and prevalence of ethics in business. The results indicated that studying ethics scandals enhanced students' perceptual understanding and decision-making in analyzing ethical business dilemmas.

Furthermore, Nowak-Fabrykowski (2010) conducted a 15-week training designed for teachers to increase their ethical sensitivity. Participants engaged in multiple simulated parent-teacher conferences. Results indicated advances in multicultural awareness and ethical sensitivity upon completion of the intervention.

The studies cited above are a small sample of studies published indicating a significant positive impact of ethics training on learners. However, research with inconclusive results can also be found.

**Studies with inconclusive results.** Goldie et al. (2002) assessed the results of teaching ethics to a cohort of 111 medical students entering Glasgow University. At this institution, ethics learning is formally measured in years 1 and 5 of the program. The training included three years of ethics curricula, 30 hours in the first year (mainly small group teaching) and 14 hours in years two and three (predominantly lecture format). The authors concluded that while ethics training can be effective in developing students' identification with the profession of medicine, its effectiveness is dependent on the amount of small group teaching provided. The lack of formal assessment in years two and three was also felt to contribute to the lack of impact.

Schonfeld, Dhalke, and Longo (2011) looked at how effective the teaching of applied ethics was at the University of Nebraska Medical Center. This study employed a pre- and post-case analysis to assess the impact of an online
course where applied ethics was taught to students preparing for health professions. Questions that guided the analysis included the following: How did students’ responses to the case change after taking the course? What concepts did the students grasp and what was the evidence for this? What concepts were least appreciated in their complexity, and why? Were students’ responses more complex in the post-test than in the pre-test? The post-analysis revealed that, while many students were able to identify ethical concepts, their responses included very little critical discussion. The researchers concluded that pre- and post-test comparisons failed to demonstrate that students gained a greater understanding of the key concepts presented – respect for autonomy, decisional capacity, informed consent, and role of the provider.

The question then arises. Was the failure to demonstrate the achievement of ethics-based learning objectives a result of futile training methods or inaccurate assessment? While challenges with assessment could contribute to inconclusive results, it might also be true that some training is simply ineffective. What contributes to failed training efforts is an important question but beyond the scope of the current paper. An area for future research would be to clarify the distinctions between lessons that make an impact and lessons that do not. Two questions are raised for further study. How can knowledge transfer be maximized in the area of applied ethics? What are the most accurate assessment methods to employ?

A threat to individuals’ value systems and invasion of privacy. Another possible barrier for faculty is the discomfort that comes from the realization that conflicting values exist among classroom participants. McDonald and Donleavy (1995) found that the teaching of ethics courses was considered “unprofessional or even invasions of the students’ and the instructors’ privacy” (p. 842). These authors suggested that this criticism extends from the view that business obligations are only to maximize profits and, therefore, ethics do not fit within the realm of business. If this is the climate in which our students will be working, how can we expect to prepare them to act ethically without discourse and training? Hence, as is true with all lessons in appreciating diversity, we must not shy away from hearing about and expecting value systems distinct from our own.

Socio-cultural and familial influences help shape moral development. A person’s ethical principles will naturally reflect his or her upbringing. In an environment of broad cultural diversity, some professors may not be comfortable opening up this Pandora’s box in the classroom (Ziff & Erikson, 2010). A faculty member might not feel confident facilitating a real-time discussion that can be inclusive and non-judgmental when exploring core personal values. Teachers may shy away from this discourse because of the risk of having their own values challenged.

The fear of being vulnerable can hinder open conversations and one’s willingness to share. To illustrate, in 2010 a University of Wisconsin student was punched in the face for being a lesbian. She was a victim of harassment not once, but three times, and all because she was sporting a T-shirt that had “Legalize Gay” written on it. The university also experienced hate crimes against African American students. In this context, students as well as teachers might understandably be discouraged from openly expressing a personal value or point of view for fear of being attacked.

Lack of training and preparation. Quayle (2009) described several faculty challenges when teaching ethics at the college level. One difficulty found was that many professors were unsure about whether their lessons are interesting or applicable to the real world. Another challenge was that some instructors had a difficult time describing the importance of teaching ethics and questioned why it was necessary. Lastly, teachers lacked confidence and doubted their ability to make the subject significant to students in their chosen careers.
Maruyama and Ueno (2010) analyzed mandatory ethics education for engineers, nurses, and school teachers in Japan. The engineering ethics class consisted of role-plays and case studies involving a variety of realistic ethical dilemmas. Study results indicated that these teaching methods required special training and were ineffective with larger groups of students. Additionally, they found that the case studies lacked realism and that the teachers were ill-equipped to guide ethical class discussions due to lack of experience. Clearly, educators need to be prepared to lead and motivate their students to participate in ethical discussions and develop skills (Maruyama & Ueno, 2010).

Willemse and colleagues (2008) reported that lesson plans for teaching ethics varied with the individual values of the instructors. Their study revealed inconsistencies in methods and a lack of moral language among educators. Educators’ efforts were for the most part ad hoc and implied, and some found it difficult to explicitly discuss their values with trainees. The authors concluded that there was not enough time allocated to lessons on moral issues and that learning opportunities were limited.

Holsapple, Carpenter, Sutkus, Finelli, and Harding (2012) reported that ethics education in undergraduate engineering programs was unsystematic and viewed as potentially irrelevant for students. The study consisted of interviewing engineering students, faculty, and administrators on 18 campuses. Results demonstrated that the ideas of faculty members and administrators on ethics education did not relate to a student perspective. It was impossible to understand the effectiveness of lectures when educators did not comprehend their students’ experiences.

Lessons from the above literature can guide our next steps in developing ethical citizens in important ways. First, previous studies identify why ethical behavior is critical to career success and effective leadership, a fact that can inspire both students and faculty to develop in this area. Second, evidence that ethical behavior and decision-making skills can be improved with education can motivate faculty and provide best practice knowledge. Third, previous studies have identified barriers to effective ethics training such as cultural milieu, student and teacher attitudes/fears, lack of teacher confidence/preparation, and the disconnect between teaching materials and student experiences. Once barriers are identified, solutions and best practices can be explored and tested. In summation, the previous research on ethics training leads to many more questions for further investigation.

Thus, gaps in understanding and opportunities for improvement in the areas of ethics training abound. Questions such as the following arise: (a) how to address psychosocial barriers; (b) how to discuss controversial positions in the classroom; (c) how to identify and learn from competing values; and (d) how to talk about difficult and emotional subjects without insulting each other.

In light of the quandaries faculty face and to uphold our UCEL purpose, the following question surfaced, “How can we best support faculty to enhance ethics training across campus?” Admittedly, this is a question we will be asking ourselves both continuously and in perpetuity. However, we must begin with an inaugural effort to document a baseline of the training and assessment activities on campus. Therefore, a study was conducted to describe the state of ethics training across the curriculum at CSULB.

CAMPUS STUDY

ETHICS TRAINING AT CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH

To achieve the goal of establishing a baseline for ethics training at CSULB, the following campus-wide study was conducted.

Methodology

During the months of December 2011 and January 2012, the Ukleja Center for Ethical
Leadership at CSULB conducted the study, "Ethics on the Campus: A Survey of California State University, Long Beach Faculty." The objectives of this investigation were: (1) survey CSULB faculty to understand the extent to which they teach ethics; (2) identify the learning objectives and means of assessment employed by ethics educators in their ethics-related coursework; and (3) clarify opportunities for UCEL to support ethics training activities on campus.

**Assessment Development and Data Collection**

The development of the survey began with pilot questions generated from grounded theory and input from faculty and UCEL staff. The initial item set was then reviewed and further refined by a team of subject-matter experts (SMEs). With SME input, a pilot survey was generated and administered to CSULB faculty at a fall faculty roundtable on October 14, 2011. Twenty-three CSULB faculty members and three invited guests participated in this pilot administration. The roundtable concluded with further suggestions and revisions to the survey. The pilot results were analyzed and reviewed by the SMEs. A final version of the survey for campus wide administration was established, comprised of multiple choice check lists, scale items, and open-ended questions. In December 2011 and again in January 2012, all faculty teaching on campus at the time were invited via email to participate in an online survey by the Provost and College Deans.

**Results**

Two hundred and forty-eight (248) responses were recorded out of a subject pool of 1,980 faculty members, representing a 12.5% response rate of the entire CSULB faculty at the time of the survey’s administration. The respondents of the study were part-time and full-time lecturers, tenure-track faculty, and tenured faculty. Table 1 below displays demographic details about the respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Survey Respondents Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching</strong> (All Respondents):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach ethics or have in the past included ethics in some or all of their courses; of these, 88% teach ethics as a component in a course in another subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong> (All Respondents):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of female to male CSULB faculty respondents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Title</strong> (All Respondents):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-Time Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-Time Lecturers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure-Track Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenured Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level Taught</strong> (Base: Those who teach/include ethics):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both undergraduate and graduate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the survey questions, eighty-six percent of CSULB survey respondents either agreed (25%) or strongly agreed (61%) with the statement, "universities should teach students to be ethical decision makers." Below is a description of other key findings in the areas of: (a) learning objectives; (b) teaching methods; (c) assessment of learning; and (d) faculty opinions, preparation, and barriers.

**Learning objectives (LO).** When asked who determines the ethics-related LOs for their courses, 43% of faculty reported that they do, followed by 33% reporting that the department set the objectives. The two most commonly mentioned learning objectives were "describe the role of ethical thought in a practice, professional and/or academic discipline" (71%) and "know the code of ethics of a practice professional and/or academic discipline" (69%). Other learning objectives included using critical thinking skills to analyze an ethical dilemma, identifying the conflicting values in ethical dilemmas, and demonstrating an understanding of what it means to act ethically. In comparison, fewer respondents cited any LOs at the higher levels of Bloom’s taxonomy of Analysis and
Synthesis. Bloom's taxonomy is a scale faculty members use to indicate the depth and complexity of learning objectives (see Forehand, 2010).

Teaching methods. The most popular method used for teaching ethics was classroom discussion, at 88%. Following closely at 80% was lecture. The third most popular training method identified was case study, at 56%. A majority of faculty source materials came from journal articles (58%), online resources (53%), and cases (52%). When asked, "Approximately what percentage of class time do you dedicate to teaching ethics?" fifty-five percent of faculty responded "10%" of in-class time. When asked about assignment time, sixty-three percent of faculty responded "10%" of their assignment time.

Assessment methods. The measure most commonly used for assessing student achievement of LOs was participation in classroom discussion (85%), followed by papers/essays (57%). Exams were used to measure student achievement by 48% of course subjects, oral presentations by 38%, written case studies by 27%, and simulations by 15%.

Methods used to access achievement of ethics learning objectives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participation in discussion</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papers/essays</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral presentations</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written case studies</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty opinions, preparation, and barriers.

Faculty opinions. Faculty members were asked several questions regarding their opinions of campus ethics training. Sixty-one percent (61%) of respondents believed ethics should be taught on campus, while only 36% believed ethics can be taught effectively in a university classroom setting. Forty-six percent (46%) reported a belief that ethics should be taught in every class, while 49% strongly agreed that ethics should be part of every course that deals with questions of values or public policy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty members' opinions on ethics training on campus.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taught on campus</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught effectively in a university classroom setting</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taught in every class</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of every course that deals with questions of values of public policy</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if faculty should model ethical behavior in their classrooms, 77% agreed. In response to the question of whether "the students on your campus are, in general, quite ethical," 3% of faculty strongly agreed, 25% agreed, 31% neither agreed nor disagreed, and 11% disagreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The students on your campus are, in general, quite ethical.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agreed</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreed</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agreed nor disagreed</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagreed</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Faculty preparation. When asked the question, "What kind of preparation have you received for teaching ethics?" the top three responses were as follows: personal reading in ethics (72%); academic or professional seminars (64%); and some graduate ethics classes (36%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What kind of preparation have you received for teaching ethics?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal reading in ethics</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic or professional seminars</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate ethics classes</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barriers: reasons for not teaching ethics. Twenty-two percent (22%) of the survey respondents reported that they do not personally teach ethics. This is not a surprising finding given the fact that the survey invitation declared the topic of ethics education, and thus faculty members who do not teach ethics were less likely to respond. The reasons provided for not teaching ethics varied, with the largest single group reporting that ethics...
was not relevant to their field (49%). The second largest response on this question (28%) was that they "don't know how." The third largest response (13%) was that ethics is woven through the coursework but not called out as a separate topic. Only 3% responded that they could not define ethics, do not have enough time to teach ethics, or ethics is covered in other classes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for not teaching ethics.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not relevant to their field</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Don't know how&quot;</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics is woven through the coursework but not called out as a separate topic</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Could not define ethics, do not have enough time to teach ethics, or ethics taught in another class</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion

What do the results tell us about the state of ethics education at CSULB and opportunities for improvement?

A few observations could lead to improvement measures. The first suggestion is to review the depth of engagement and discourse that takes place with respect to ethics training on campus when it does occur. Survey results indicated that the majority of learning objectives were set at lower levels of Bloom’s taxonomy (e.g., to know, to describe). Additionally, the most commonly reported teaching methods were discussion (88%) and lecture (80%). Furthermore, participation in discussion was mentioned by 85% of faculty respondents as a measure of learning about ethics. Lecture and discussion are low-level engagement activities, and allow some students to hide and altogether disengage without notice.

The research literature cited in the previous section suggests that ethics training can be more impactful when taught at deeper levels of analysis and synthesis and applied to real world challenges (e.g. Latif 2000; Cagle & Baucus, 2006). Therefore, an opportunity for enhancement is to encourage faculty to set more complex learning objectives (i.e., higher in Bloom’s taxonomy), training methods, and assessment strategies.

A related point and potential contributor to the lack of training depth might be time and attention allocated to ethics. With only 10% of classroom and assignment time spent on ethical issues, as indicated in the majority of responses, faculty might not be allocating sufficient time for depth and critical thinking. This might be intentional, as faculty often feel pressured to fit more into the syllabus than they can adequately cover. It may also be unintentional, as faculty may not fully understand the importance of ethics to their discipline or student population. More complex activities require more time and more than basic approaches in order to be effective. Developing forums for faculty to discuss these challenges and set priorities could support faculty in aiming for higher level LOs.

Another intriguing finding was that while sixty-one percent (61%) of respondents felt that ethics should be taught on campus, only thirty-six percent (36%) believed ethics can be taught effectively in a university classroom setting. The juxtaposition of these results suggests that while a majority of the faculty respondents agreed that ethics training is important, only a minority of them feel confident in the effectiveness of training.

When asked about the ethical behavior of students, 28% of faculty members agreed that students were “quite ethical,” while 42% responded that they were either neutral or disagreed. This suggests that, at least from a faculty perspective, there is much room for improvement in the ethical understanding and behavior of our students.

The findings of the inaugural campus ethics survey has allowed for an establishment of baseline data, as well as elucidated areas for future study and improvement. With many possible directions on which to next focus, UCEL has reached out to campus faculty for their input on how best to facilitate the enhancement of ethics training across the curriculum.

Continual improvement for ethics training.
To help identify how the study results could best be used to support faculty, a “Town Hall” was held to provide a crucible for an unbounded exploratory conversation. The intent of this event was threefold: (1) to discuss the meaning of the findings; (2) to clarify next steps for UCEL; and (3) to further engage faculty. Using the survey results as a jumping-off point, a lively discussion ensued, bringing forth ideas, challenges, and recommendations.

Three key challenges were identified and matched with ways UCEL could play a facilitative role.

1) To encourage faculty to aim for learning objectives representing deeper levels of Bloom’s taxonomy, UCEL can support faculty to enrich their competencies by providing “train-the-trainer” sessions and other development events.

2) As faculty research is limited by workload and resources, UCEL can assist faculty with ethics research stipend awards.

3) To foster student engagement, UCEL can increase the opportunity and visibility of the benefits of ethics training for students on campus.

**Enrich faculty competencies for ethics training.** The first opportunity where UCEL can play a facilitative role is to support faculty in building their competencies and confidence for ethics training, and to inspire the enrichment of ethics content in their courses. The finding that the majority of Learning Objectives were on the basic levels of Bloom’s taxonomy was discussed at length at the Town Hall. The conversation concluded with the suggestion to develop train-the-trainer sessions to introduce methodology for teaching at higher, more complex levels in Bloom’s scale.

To address this challenge, three of the faculty members in attendance volunteered to develop and present “train-the-trainer” modules for their colleagues. Each set of materials exhibits a unique and scholarly method to engage students in complex and meaningful ways. Activities for developing critical thinking and decision-making skills in the context of ethical challenges are presented. Brief descriptions of the train-the-trainer modules are displayed in Text Box 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Box 1: Train-the-Trainer Ethics Module Descriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tyler Reeb presents &quot;Ethical Synthesis Across the Curriculum,&quot; which includes methods to inspire and instill a moral compass in students by synthesizing the most important ethical concerns of our time into teaching curriculum. This module explores ways faculty teaching in the life sciences, social sciences, and humanities can use Bloom’s Taxonomy of Learning Domains to integrate ethics into the specific context of their chosen professions and disciplines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Sauceda presents “Ethics Through The Eastern Door,” which includes methods to broaden our frame of reference beyond Western ethical thinking into one which encompasses Global Ethics. The introductory exploration will focus upon three seminal figures: Buddha, Kong Fuzi (“Confucius”), and Meng Ke (“Mencius”).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Tiggs-Taylor presents &quot;A Framework for Curriculum Design, Teaching, and Learning&quot; to guide faculty in constructing student-learning-centered ethics curriculum modules, using the ethics instruction as an opportunity to build student learner critical thinking skills by applying the case-study approach and structuring the learning experience to meet multicultural settings of the 21st century classroom.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This initiative soon expanded with the development of an online community of learning to provide an access point for modules and materials. With the assistance and support of the campus Faculty Development Center, the web portal is now up and running on the internet learning system that all campus faculty use. In addition to the three train-the-trainer modules, the site houses a variety of ethics training resources such as a discussion board, suggested reading, video clips, presentation slide decks, and lesson plans.

All campus members were invited to join the community of learning through email promotions, event announcements, and word of mouth. In subsequent years the web portal will
continue to develop in response to the community’s needs and suggestions.

Encourage and support faculty research on ethics in their discipline. The second need for support expressed by faculty at the 2012 roundtable was in the area of research. In response, staff at UCEL developed an Ethics Research Stipend award of $2,000 to be granted to two faculty researchers each year. The ethics stipend’s main purpose is to promote and support CSULB faculty ethics research and contributions to the body of knowledge.

This is a competitive award modeled after the “Ethics Across the Curriculum” award that UCEL has granted each year since 2005. So far, four research stipend awards have been bestowed upon campus faculty. Two awards were granted in the 2013-2014 academic year, and two awards were granted in the 2014-2015 year. Both award amounts are slated to be increased for the 2015-2016 cycle.

Student engagement. A third opportunity for enhancement identified by faculty was that of student engagement. To address this area, an idea emerged during the Town Hall session for the establishment of an achievement certificate to be awarded for completion of ethics training on campus. The award would be modeled after a passport program. Students would be required to attend specified UCEL events, as well as complete a minimum number of courses across the curriculum (with strong ethics content) to qualify for the special designation. As of this writing, the certificate initiative was in the incubation stage. Depending on strategic needs and available resources, development of the certificate will be revisited for the 2015-2016 academic year.

“Be more concerned with your character than your reputation, because your character is what you really are, while your reputation is merely what others think you are.” – John Wooden

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the inaugural UCEL campus ethics study and subsequent faculty discussions have identified faculty needs and opportunities for growth in ethics training and research. Our study validated earlier findings of Dean and Beggs (2006) which describe that, while faculty believe ethics training is important, it is also admittedly challenging. Faculty can feel inadequately prepared and doubt the efficacy of their methods. Another finding was that, while the practice of ethical behavior requires deep levels of analysis, ethics training is predominantly being conducted at surface levels. Dean and Beggs identified “a disconnect between instructors’ own approaches to teaching ethics and what the business world thinks or, more important, hopes is happening in our classrooms” (p.41), suggesting that more experiential approaches might go further in facilitating ethical behavior.

Another disconnect identified during the Town Hall discussion, and also reported by Dean & Beggs (2006), was that although faculty felt more complex learning objectives would be critical for ethical decision making, we were not employing training methods and assessment tools that achieved these deeper levels of learning and skill. This insight was a primary motivator for the Town Hall faculty participants, and sparked ideas about how we can engage our students in higher levels of the Bloom’s taxonomy.

Specifically, three mechanisms to support faculty emerged from the Town Hall discussions and have since been implemented: (1) train-the-trainer session modules; (2) the online learning
community; and (3) ethics research stipend. The student engagement certificate was also identified as a fourth potential mechanism and future opportunity.

In addition to the aforementioned resources now available to faculty, other benefits for the participants materialized. Several faculty expressed the value of providing time for internal reflection and dialogue with colleagues. Events were stimulating and energetic, topics for future study emerged, and potential collaborative partners connected.

The next step for UCEL is to build on this momentum. This includes continuing to develop, support, and track progress on the three aforementioned initiatives, as well as identifying and nurturing future initiatives. Potential metrics for these efforts might include but are not limited to: (1) faculty membership in the learning community and activity on the site; (2) growth in participation at faculty training events; (3) number of proposals received for ethics research stipends; and (4) the number of ethics-related faculty publications.

A follow-up campus study is also in progress to identify any changes in the ethics training and research landscape in the University.

May we not let fear or other obstacles deter us from the difficult task of struggling with conflicting values in the classroom. We need to be brave, ask difficult questions, and pose real-world ethical challenges that students can relate to. At the Ukleja Center for Ethical Leadership, our work in this area continues. With this first benchmark survey completed, UCEL will persevere in finding ways to enhance the effectiveness of ethics training and increase the breadth and depth of research across the disciplines on campus.
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