West Chester University
Ethics-Emphasis Program Handbook

I. Purpose of the Handbook

This handbook was written by the original Ethics Subcommittee members of the General Education Committee in CAPC to aid faculty members in providing common ethics-emphasis competencies in their courses, and to enhance student learning about ethics. It serves as a guide for those interested in creating Ethics-Emphasis courses, but it is by no means intended to be a replacement for attending an Ethics Workshop or Faculty Seminar at WCU.

The Handbook also provides details on the development of Ethics Across the Curriculum programs--a result of National Science Foundation funding--the foundations of which include cross-curricula ethics emphasis courses. These programs address the necessity of exposing our students to ways of noticing and examining the ethical issues they will encounter in their daily lives and in their careers.

In addition to explaining the requirements for Ethics-Emphasis courses and the basis for this initiative, this Handbook is also a source of ideas and models. It provides recommended ethics activities, as well as explanations of those activities to give interested faculty an idea of what ethics content may be used across the curriculum. Faculty are also encouraged to develop their own.

Ethics Subcommittee
August 2019
Dr. Joan Woolfrey
Dr. Cheryl Monturo

II. The Process of Obtaining the Ethics Emphasis Designation

It is strongly suggested that a faculty member new to teaching ethics proceed by first participating in an Ethics Workshop or Faculty Seminar held periodically at WCU. They can then begin the process of developing a new course syllabus or modifying an existing one to reflect the criteria stated in the "Criteria for Ethics Courses" (see Section III) and the "Checklist for Ethics Course Criteria" (see Appendix A). When the new syllabus is finished, it should first be submitted to the faculty member's department for approval.

After acquiring department approval, faculty should complete the necessary information in the Course Inventory Management (CIM) system including upload of the syllabus and any other required documents. The course should be designated as a full CAPC review. The application will then be electronically forwarded to the Ethics Subcommittee of CAPC and potentially other subcommittees depending on other course designations. The Ethics Subcommittee is comprised of (at least) 2 appointed faculty members with extensive knowledge in the areas of Philosophy and/or Ethics.

After reviewing the application, the Ethics Subcommittee will either return the application to the applicant with questions and/or a request for revisions, or forward the application and recommendation for Ethics designation to the CAPC General Education Committee. From there, the application will go through other required Committees as per CAPC bylaws ending with CAPC Executive Board. It then will be included on the agenda for the next scheduled CAPC General Assembly. If members of CAPC approve the application, it will be forwarded to the Provost. Finally, with the Provost's signature, the course will receive the Ethics designation as of the date specified by the Provost.

III. Guidelines and Recommendations for Ethics-Emphasis Courses

A. Criteria for the Ethics-Emphasis Designation

Ethics Across the Curriculum courses at West Chester University must meet the following criteria. (Please note that although Distance Education is not inconsistent with these criteria, you must clearly demonstrate how you will meet these criteria in a distance education format.)

1. Ethics courses must engage students in a variety of activities that encourage them to problem-see and problem-solve with an ethical lens. Ethics courses should provide at least three different kinds of activities, such as: a) in-class collaborative activities (debates, case study analyses, etc.), b) formal writing or multimedia projects, and c) informal activities, such as class discussions, in class writing reflections, interviews, journaling, and the like.

2. Ethics courses may provide students with instruction in discipline-specific thinking on ethics, or in more general ethical theories from the discipline of Philosophy. If they are discipline-specific, Ethics courses should include lessons focusing on ethical frameworks for acquiring skills for ethical decision-making specific to the discipline. This will include instructor-led practice in processes for evaluating decision-specific dilemmas or case studies. The syllabus should make clear that these lessons take place throughout the course.

3. Ethics courses encourage collaborative activities and assignments that include clear indication that there are better and worse answers to ethical questions, and that there are processes through which those judgments can be made. While there frequently may not be single absolute answers, understanding the range of solutions that are appropriate vs. those that are inappropriate is one of the goals of studying ethics across the curriculum.

4. Ethics courses encourage ethical exploration with instructor guidance, and will offer students practice in identifying a diverse range of perspectives on ethical issues, putting oneself in another's shoes and/or presenting arguments charitably which are not your own perspective.

5. Ethics course syllabi should designate at least one writing/multimedia assignment as a candidate for upload to the ePortfolio.

6. Ethics course syllabi should indicate clearly that the course is an approved Gen Ed course and will focus on ethical problem-seeing, ethical reasoning and ethical problem-solving in the discipline under study.

7. Ethics course syllabi should make clear the percentage of the final grade to be derived from the ethics components. Should be $\geq 25\%$.

8. Ethics course syllabi should make a clear statement that the course meets the following three general education goals: Goal #1 (communicate effectively), Goal #2 (think critically and analytically), and Goal #7 (make informed decisions and ethical choices).

Goal 1 SLOs (pick one or more of the following)
- Express oneself effectively in common college-level written forms
- Revise and improve writing and/or presentations
- Express oneself effectively in presentations
- Demonstrate comprehension of and ability to explain information and ideas accessed through reading

Goal 2 SLOs (pick one of more of the following)
- Use relevant evidence gathered through accepted scholarly methods, and properly acknowledge sources of information, to support an idea
- Construct and/or analyze arguments in terms of their premises, assumptions, contexts, conclusions, and anticipated counter-arguments
- Reach sound conclusions based on a logical analysis of evidence
- Develop creative or innovative approaches to assignments or projects

Goal 7 SLOs (pick two or more of the following)
- Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: can identify and explain ethically relevant theories, concepts or perspectives
- Ethical Issue Recognition: can identify core ethical issues in scenarios or dilemmas
- Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: can apply relevant ethical theories and/or concepts to fictional or real-world scenarios
- Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: can offer intellectually honest critiques and evaluations of ethical positions, including one's own

9. Course description must include language that emphasizes the study of ethics.

10. For Ethics courses that are discipline-based, Ethics course syllabi should include a learning objective for the course that emphasizes the specific code of ethics of the respective discipline, and, where appropriate, the general grounding of that code of ethics in broader ethical theories. Where no code of ethics exists, the "Generic Code of Ethics" (see Appendix B) can be substituted.

B. Suggestions Concerning Evaluation

1. Use rubrics so students can focus in on what content is important.
2. Be clear on where instructor guidance can be found in the syllabus.
3. Be clear on the framework for ethical problem-seeing.
4. Be clear on specific processes for making ethical judgments.

5. Demonstrate (rather than merely state) how students will acquire practice in problem-seeing, moral reasoning, and problem-solving.
6. Include hands-on (discussions, collaborations, debates, written evaluations, etc.) activities which are especially valuable for confidence-building.
7. Refer to the rubric CAPC uses for evaluating the overall goals of E-emphasis courses: Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric.
8. Note: "Assigning essays to students in which they are to offer an ethical analysis of a case, including offering a judgment of what ought to be done and reasons supporting this judgment (i.e., practicing relevant reasoning/reflective skills, not only articulating awareness of what is at stake) is probably the single most effective means for securing the students' learning both in awareness and in reasoning/reflective skills." (David T. Ozar, "Learning Outcomes for Ethics across the Curriculum Programs," *Teaching Ethics*, Fall 2001, p. 20.)
9. Consider the use of a course map (See Appendix C for 2 examples and The Quality Matters site on developing course maps).

C. Recommended Ethics Activities

While it is impossible in written form to communicate the richness to be sought in the in-class setting, below are some examples of the kinds of activities that could be done in-class to generate thoughtful deliberation on ethical matters.

1. Case Study Method: In Appendix D, we include numerous resources that offer case studies and discuss ways of building your own cases. With a particular case study in front of them, students should work through the case with guided questions:

    Step 1: What's the most important question to be answered [in the case in question]? What's the "ethical epicenter?"

    Step 2: What still needs to be determined? What information don't you have (that it is possible to get) that would be helpful in deciding what to do?

    Step 3: Who are the "stakeholders?" List those who have an interest in the outcome of this case. Be thorough.

    Step 4: What are the relevant ethical values in this case for each stakeholder? (The following list is suggestive, not exhaustive, so add and supplement: *protecting humans from harm, fairness, promoting others' welfare, truthfulness, trust, respect for others' choices, promise-keeping, empathy, altruism, dignity, compassion, integrity.)*

    Step 5: What alternative courses of action are there? How many different ways can you come up with for resolving this problem? Be creative.

    Step 6: Decide on the three most acceptable alternatives from Step 5, and the four most important relevant values from Step 4, and fill in the chart, below. Then, decide, amongst those, which take priority. Apply a 3 to the alternative which best reflects the values you

list. Apply a 1 to that alternative which least reflects the value. (2's are for in-betweens.)
Use the last row to calculate.

Values // Alternatives below // to the right →	A:	B:	C:
1)			
2)			
3)			
4)			
Ethics Calculation →			

Based on your calculation, what should be done? Defend your response here:

* * * * * *

2. In-class Debates: These work best when students are asked to defend the side of the
question with which they are least in agreement, or, alternatively, when students are
assigned their positions randomly.

Several articles offering options appear in Appendix D. Teaching students to recognize
obstacles to good argumentation is an important aspect of using debates.

Tips for identifying a weak argument:
● Attacks the person instead of the argument;
● Is based on assumption rather than fact;
● Gives the impression that there are only two possibilities when there may be
more;
● Appeals to emotion, tradition, popularity or patriotism;
● Scapegoats or avoids responsibility by placing blame;
● Presents a caricature of a person or group;
● Relies on an extreme example to justify a position (Brown & Keeley, 2010).

* * * * * *

3. In-class Writing: In-class writing, followed by discussion can be an excellent way to get
students thinking about the ethical issues in their everyday lives. Examples of prompts:
● Describe the concept of friendship. What makes for a good friend? What actions
or attitudes can jeopardize a friendship? During discussion, then, issues can be

discussed that raise ethical content. When does loyalty go too far? When might betrayal be appropriate? Should confidentially always be maintained?

- Craft a complaint letter to a company or organization with which you have had personal experience, explaining what harm has (or could) occurred. These should be real complaints about real issues. Class discussion can then raise awareness about ethical issues in the real world.
- Description of the most moral or virtuous person you know/a description of a person or an action that you would like to emulate. In discussion: What elements or traits appear repeatedly? Why are those aspects admirable?
- Discipline-specific: What characteristics make for a good scientist? Sociologist? Social worker? Accountant? Pianist? Etc.? Why?

D. Examples of Ethics Strategies Used by WCU Instructors

1. **The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks** Reading/Class Discussion Assignments: 15pts

   There will be 3 designated classes in which a pre-class discussion assignment (5pts each) will be given regarding ethical dilemmas surrounding the Henrietta Lacks readings. We will have designated class time to discuss your answers, while providing a historical and current framework on how ethical judgments are made. It is important to do the assignment before class to ensure a better class discussion! The specific assignment must be posted on D2L and are due before class, no late submissions. (From Dr. Sullivan-Brown's BIO440)

   * * * * * *

2. **CITI Human Subjects Ethics Training** (15 pts; must achieve at least an 80% to get the points).

   I have provided links to two required online videos in the "Ethics and Human Subjects" folder on D2L (there is also an optional video). After watching the assigned videos, you must complete the CITI Human Subjects Training (instructions on D2L in Ethics and Human Subjects folder). Check schedule for due date. You must get at least 80% and upload certificate to D2L by the due date to get credit. (From Dr. Mitchell's PSY476)

   * * * * * *

3. **Class Debate: Is it ethical for pharmaceutical companies to raise drug prices significantly?**

   Increasing drug prices has received considerable attention recently (see the attachment for news report on this). On the one hand, it is expensive to develop innovative drugs and effort put in developing new drugs should be recognized and rewarded. On the other hand, their ethics are questioned when pharmaceutical companies raise, or keep raising, drug prices. Please use the Daraprim price hike during 2015 as an example to discuss ethical decision making in business in your discussion.

First, identify important stakeholders in the case of Daraprim's price going up. Collectively, we will identify these four: pharmaceutical companies, patients, hospitals, FDA.

Then, we will form 4-person groups and debate about whether it is ethical to raise the drug price. Each of you will take a role as one of the identified stakeholders. As homework, please do research on this issue. To strengthen your argument, use facts, numbers, and expert testimony; please bring one page of debate notes and turn it in after the debate; in your debate notes, please list at least 3 points that support your position.

Formal writing assignment: writing debate notes. Since this note will incorporate the research students will conduct on this issue, it is a research-based report. (From Dr. Liu's MGT313)

<div align="center">* * * * * *</div>

4. **VoiceThread Book Report**:

VoiceThread allows students to report on a book in a creative and interactive manner. This platform permits both faculty and peers to view the "book report" and provide feedback. Given that there are so many books related to bioethics, this platform was also chosen to allow students to learn about multiple bioethical issues in a brief period of time. In the past this has led to increased student interest in reading additional books after the end of the course.

Assignment Overview

In Week #1, you'll find a link to participate in a Doodle poll. You will have the ability to sign up for one of the books listed at the bottom of this page. Select a book that you wish to read this semester. You may select only one book and no one else can select the same book.

You will read this book independently over the course of the semester and will create a 10-minute VoiceThread presentation using the following guidelines.

Questions for you to answer

1. **How much does the book agree or clash with your professional and personal view of the world, and what you consider right and wrong?**
   You may use some quotes or paraphrasing of text as examples of how it agrees with and supports what you think about the world, about right and wrong, and about what you think it is to be human. Use quotes or paraphrasing of text and examples to discuss how the text agrees or disagrees with what you think about the world, history, and about right and wrong.
2. **How were your professional and personal views and opinions challenged or changed by this text, if at all?**
   Did the text communicate with you? Why or why not? Give examples of how your views might have changed or been strengthened (or perhaps, of why the text

failed to convince you, the way it is). Please do not write "I agree with everything the author wrote," since everybody disagrees about something, even if it is a tiny point. Use quotes or paraphrasing of text to illustrate your points of challenge, or where you were persuaded, or where it left you cold.
3. **How will your professional practice change as a result of this text, if at all?**
In what ways will it change?
4. **To sum up, what is your overall reaction to the text?**
To whom would you recommend this text? Would you read something else like this, or by this same author, in the future or not? Why or why not?

If directions are not followed, the assignment will be returned to you for re-submission with a total possible score of 90%. Please do not go over the 10-minute limit.

(See Appendix G for Rubric)   (from Dr. Monturo's NSG537)

<p align="center">* * * * * *</p>

5. **EthicsGame:**

Addition of the EthicsGame to this course is new and intended to offer an innovative way to complete a values clarification exercise (ELI) and to respond to various case studies. This platform not only allows students to stop and start at any time, but to pace themselves in completing the assignments. It also provides a different format for completing assignments versus a written case study. The flexibility of the platform was particularly important since it is easily edited to meet the needs of students from semester to semester. Use of the ELI data is also important for students to understand the differences in how they and their peers see the world. EthicsGame plots the information on a graph without identifiers, so students can see the homogeneity or diversity in their particular class.

Overview

EthicsGame is an online learning tool that we'll be using for the first time this semester. I'm excited to include this product in your learning and hope to hear much feedback about it. There are two parts to this product, the Ethical Lens Inventory (ELI) and then Case Studies and/or Hot Topics. The inventory is a values clarification type exercise and everyone completes the same one. As I mentioned in my communication to you last week, the cases will relate to your specific track in the MSN program; i.e. Nurse Educator or Clinical Nurse Specialist and will therefore be different.

Assignments
- ○ ELI Video
- ○ View EthicsGame Overview of Four Ethical Lenses
- ○ Complete ELI

EthicsGame Exercises:

- ○ MSN CNS Track - Sinking Ship (4 modules) due Monday of Week 3 by 11:30PM

○ MSN Educator Track - Dilemmas A & B (2 modules) due Monday of Week 3 by 11:30pm

Grading & Feedback
- EthicsGame automatically grades all assignments.
- In the ELI, you are awarded 100% for completing the assignment.
- In the exercises, you can see your grade in the EthicsGame Platform.
- This letter grade will be recorded numerically according to the WCU grading criteria as stated in the syllabus.

As you complete the inventory and the exercises, you will have the ability to read more about particular situations and explore the why or the foundation of ethics information behind the answers. These are all housed within the EthicsGame site and available to you. (see Appendix E for Rubric)   (from Dr. Monturo's NSG537)

* * * * * *

6. **Written Assignment #1 Disability Ethical Controversies: Plastic Straws**

The goal of this assignment is for students to learn how to identify emotional, ethical, and logical fallacies in the current disability ethical controversy about how banning plastic straws to protect the environment affects individuals with disabilities. After learning specific fallacies, student will identify at least one fallacy in each of the two assigned readings.

For Written Assignment #1, you must:

Read the assigned articles by:
Danovich & Godoy
Hitselberger

Write a Summary: Briefly summarize each of the assigned readings [this summary should be approximately 75-100 words in length (cannot be shorter, but can be longer)];

Identify one fallacy in each reading: Identify and explain one emotional, ethical, or logical fallacy you have identified in each of the assigned readings [this explanation should be approximately 100-150 words in length (cannot be shorter but can be longer)].
                                                                        (from Dr. Jenks' COM295)

* * * * * *

7. **Discussion Board:**
This platform allows the student to comment once or multiple times to each of their peers and provides a safe space to conduct potentially difficult conversations. The faculty member is able to interact with one or many students publicly or privately.

- The discussion board is not a live chat. All students will participate in the discussion (asynchronously) on the D2L learning platform. The discussions are scholarly conversations between the class members related to the topics posted. The faculty will monitor and at times enter the discussion. These postings must address the questions posed- for example, focusing on the ethical issue of conducting a study on salt consumption in prisoners, vs the clinical issue of a high salt diet. Once addressed, the posting should then tie together required readings with potential practice examples and include your preferred ethical lens from the ELI. Postings should focus on the ethical topic only; please remember this is a bioethics course and therefore keep this focus in mind.
- The discussion board will open at 6:00am on Sunday. In order to be sure that everyone has time to have a conversation, the first post is due no later than Tuesday at 11:30 PM EST, additional responses no later than Saturday at 11:30pm EST. If a student misses the Tuesday deadline, it will be reflected in the rubric. If a student misses a discussion topic, they cannot make up the assignment. A post is defined as a minimum of 75 words; maximum 200 words. For further details see the Discussion Board Rubric (below). You must meet all criteria for a level to achieve that score.
  (see Appendix E for rubric)   (from Dr. Monturo's NSG537)

* * * * * *

IV. Purpose of Ethics Instruction

The recent changes to the General Education Goals, and the state of the world at large, both are indicators that we would be doing our students a major disservice to reduce the emphasis of ethics in their curriculum. Implementing ethics-emphasis courses is part of a program becoming more popular around the country that endeavors to more fully and more adequately attend to the necessity of exposing our students to ways of noticing and examining the ethical issues they will encounter in their daily lives and their careers. According to moral psychologists (beginning with James Rest in the 1990s), moral maturity comes from four main components: ethical sensitivity--noticing that ethical issues exist; ethical knowledge--understanding what makes an issue an ethical issue; ethical judgment--knowing how to evaluate said issue; and ethical willpower--knowing what the right thing is to do and then actually doing it. Each of these takes training and role modeling. People in leadership roles who model ethical behavior play a large role in creating an ethical culture in any organization; academia is no exception. Faculty in any discipline who demonstrate an interest in ethical matters can communicate that interest to their students, and thus, play an important role at the university level in increasing the moral maturity of its members.

However, the purpose of an ethics course is NOT explicitly and bluntly to make students more ethical. There is much doubt in the literature as to whether or not that can be done. What ethics courses CAN do is more subtle. According to the Stanford McCoy Family Center for Ethics in Society, what we CAN do is teach students "to fruitfully and confidently engage in ethical dialogue." Ethics courses can help students to become "less dogmatic and more tolerant, and yet at the same time more clear about their own value commitments."[1] Modeling attention to ethical matters in itself can heighten awareness of the worth of being ethical. Studying ethical theory and examining moral deliberation emphasizes that there is structure to ethical decision-making and that there can be better and worse arguments for moral positions.

Ethics is a public matter. We don't have an instinct for ethical behavior (although the notion of reciprocity may play a role in evolution),[2] we need a community to mold us. This is not a matter of cultural relativism. This is about being enculturated into an understanding of the importance of critical thinking—the lifeblood of a university.

---

[1] https://ethicsinsociety.stanford.edu/research-outreach/buzz-blog/stanford-panel-debates-does-teaching-ethics-do-any-good

[2] Martin A. Nowak & Karl Sigmund. 2005. "Evolution of indirect reciprocity." *Nature* 437: 1291–1298.

V. Ethics Across the Curriculum (EAC)

Begun in the 1990's with National Science Foundation grants (5% of which budget was earmarked for the study of ethics within science and engineering programs and beyond), *Ethics Across the Curriculum* (EAC) programs have emerged and taken shape in a number of colleges and universities across the country, frequently but not solely in STEM-related schools and programs. Illinois Institute of Technology, for instance, was an early grant recipient, receiving funding to develop a program that could be passed on to other institutions.[3]

As just one representative branch of the research that highlights the need for EAC, the work of recently retired Rutgers business professor Donald L. McCabe—known as "The Cheating Guru"—has documented college cheating going back to the 1960s. His most recent work (2012) confirms a trend with no indication of decline. Two-thirds of college students (from a survey of 16,000 students nationwide) self-report that they have engaged in "some sort of academic dishonesty in the last year" and this comes out of "cheating cultures" formed in high school. Those cheating cultures also tend to blind incoming college students to the realities of academic dishonesty. As the last practice space before the real world, it is our view that colleges and universities owe their students a rigorous introduction to ethical decision-making, including but going far beyond, the ramifications of fabrication, falsification and plagiarism (the historical main ethical concerns of STEM fields).[4]

An institution can actually heighten its culture of integrity under certain circumstances. This includes the creation and deep embrace of an Honor Code which should be infused throughout campus culture, and in-class examination of frameworks for raising ethical awareness. An institution can create a strong ethical culture, embedded in concerns about social justice, ethical problem-seeing and problem-solving, and in so doing can actually lower the rates of cheating in its classrooms. Most importantly, however, it will be sending its degree-earners out into the world with a higher level of moral development (accessible through a well-calibrated tool for measuring moral development known as the Defining Issues Test [or DIT]).[5] (See Appendix G)

Rationale

A growing number of colleges and universities are implementing an "Ethics Across the Curriculum" (EAC) approach. The list includes institutions such as Harvard University, Dartmouth College, and Brandeis University.

Taking a coordinated approach that involves many aspects of university life, EAC recognizes that there are ethical questions and implications associated with all of the disciplines found in institutions of higher learning, and there are a host of approaches to ethics already embedded in many of these curricula. These more discipline-specific treatments of ethics are to be applauded and encouraged. However, in her article "Ethics Across the Curriculum," Nancy Matchett

---

[3] http://ethics.iit.edu/teaching/ethics-across-curriculum

[4] Donald L. McCabe, Kenneth D. Butterfield, Linda K. Treviño, Cheating in College: Why Students Do It and What Educators Can Do about It, Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2012

[5] See The Center for Ethical Development Center website at the University of Alabama, http://ethicaldevelopment.ua.edu/

outlines a host of unintended and unfortunate consequences if these efforts are left uncoordinated.[6]

The first unfortunate consequence is in communicating the perspective that all ethical decisions are relative and/or subjective. College students are exposed to a wide variety of values as they interact with their peers, and often this is the first time they have come to experience perspectives significantly different from their own. One frequent reaction to any conflict over values, dubbed "student relativism" by Steven Satris,[7] finds the students deferring to an unreflective "we all have different opinions." This tendency toward ethical relativism is further supported by the implicit message that disciplines have their own codes of ethics, and even further that these fail to apply across the variety of life situations students will face.

Another negative consequence that Matchett identifies is the tendency to internalize a view of ethics as dependent on an external authority, whether that is an accrediting body, a student code of conduct, or a fiat on a syllabus. This view can serve to discourage students from seeing ethical decision making as requiring their own critical reflection and examination or desiring to develop the skills necessary to do so.

Finally, an uncoordinated approach to ethics can also carry with it the implicit message that ethical reflection is somehow less important than the more "objective" accomplishments available through reasoned inquiry focused on the particular "content" of a given class. In this context, ethical deliberation is often seen as "all talk" with no clear outcome and/or just a matter of personal proclivity.

The growing number of colleges and universities adopting some version of *Ethics Across the Curriculum* comes out of a recognition of these pitfalls, and a conviction that we can do better in preparing students for ethical deliberation around the wide variety of issues they will inevitably face, and for taking their place as informed global citizens reflective about the implications of their decisions.

West Chester University is well-positioned to initiate our own approach to *Ethics Across the Curriculum*—of which an ethics-emphasis course in every major is a solid first step. The implementation of the new general education program provides opportunities to incorporate explicit treatment of ethical deliberation in not only a single ethics-emphasis course, but also in first year experiences, capstone courses, and student's electronic portfolios. In addition, President Fiorentino has clearly articulated ethical decision-making as an important component of a West Chester University education, and our mission statement emphasizes the need to "understand the ethical implications of decisions and the world in which [we] live." These are important first steps for providing a path toward making *Ethics Across the Curriculum* a reality for our students.

Implementation

We've begun to implement very general concepts of EAC at WCU including:

---

[6] *New Directions for Higher Education*, 142, Summer 2008.
[7] Stephen Satris. 1986., "Student Relativism." *Teaching Philosophy* 9(3): 193-205.

1) Workshops to train faculty developing (or modifying) syllabi in their disciplines to fulfill an "E" designation in the General Education requirements. In the winter of 2019, we ran a three- day workshop that taught Applied Moral Philosophy to interested participants. We had 23 participants, 11 of whom submitted new or modified syllabi that were approved by CAPC as designated "E" courses.

2) A seminar program to provide faculty development in ethical theory and its application, with an eye to creating or revamping ethics courses in their home discipline that is in line with EAC program (began Fall 2019). In Fall 2019, we are running a Curriculum Integration Seminar, much like those run in the early 2000s aimed at creating appropriate "J" (Diverse Communities) courses for the university's Diverse Communities Gen Ed goals. These require 3 credits of AWA and 7 faculty have been approved for this. Faculty will acquire a working knowledge of moral philosophy, sufficient to ground a course in ethical decision-making in their discipline, will help to build the database of resources for the relevant disciplines on campus, and will be offered a variety of pedagogical tools for examination and evaluation of ethical/moral issues in, around and beyond the specific expertise of the faculty member. The seminar will culminate in the production of syllabi for courses already in the catalog or brand-new proposals which will be aimed at the CAPC approval pipeline.

It is hoped that additional steps will be taken in the near future. These include:

3) The codification of basic ethical values and principles embraced by the university, communicated consistently throughout the campus (e.g., an Honor Code, student handbooks, the student catalogs, etc.)
4) Workshops to train faculty to incorporate the ethics components into FYE courses and Capstone courses.
5) The development of an ethics resource website for instructors.
6) An Annual Presidential Lecture on Ethics, which would focus on topics that have broad appeal across disciplines, or on particularly important and timely topics in ethics.

Integral to the success of implementing an *Ethics Across the Curriculum* program is developing a shared set of terms and meanings, and shared methods of addressing ethics issues. For example, James Madison University developed an 8KQ system (Eight Key Questions) (See Appendix F), a fairly open procedure of determining which of eight ethical concerns apply to a given case, to what extent and in what priority.[8] Such a system allows for common language across disciplines, a common way to structure discussions and assignments, and a common way to assess student learning and performance. This common language can develop among faculty engaged in workshops and seminars, and through feedback from a variety of faculty bodies.

FYE courses and Capstone courses plan:
The goal would be for ethics facilitators to develop and run one day or half-day workshops that allow instructors who will be teaching these courses to get up to speed on the Case Study method

---

[8] https://www.jmu.edu/ethicalreasoning/8-key-questions.shtml

of ethical decision-making. In the FYE courses, students would spend 10-20% of the term working on evaluating case studies relevant to the college experience that raise ethical issues they are likely to encounter. These can include cases relevant to bystander ethics, sexual ethics, substance abuse concerns, friend-to-friend dilemmas, residence hall issues, race/gender/sexual orientation/disability/class kinds of questions, etc. The workshops would assist potential instructors in the process of developing case studies, and would provide a template for evaluating case studies in order to get faculty comfortable raising moral/ethical questions around the case studies. The same workshops would be available to faculty who will likely teach the Capstone course in their department. The evaluation of the cases would follow the same model, but Capstone courses would focus on ethical issues raised in the practice of the profession or discipline.

Ethics Resource Website Plan:
Ethics facilitators and/or appropriate graduate assistants would develop a SharePoint site with the resources necessary for easy access to case studies relevant to disciplines across the university. This website would also eventually contain resources for "E" (Ethics) course instructors (see below) as well.

Ongoing Ethics Seminar/Workshop Plan:
The university would commit to provide ongoing training workshops annually or bi-annually for any new faculty wishing to develop or modify a syllabus to bring it in line with the EAC program, and instructors who will be new to already existing EAC courses (e.g., FYE, Capstones).

Inaugural Annual Presidential Lecture in Ethics Series Plan:
A campus wide committee would be tasked with inviting expert speakers to come to campus and address ethical issues facing our communities and disciplines. These speakers would have wide appeal across campus or be of a particularly pressing nature to smaller cohorts. Sustained commitment to this lecture series would help precipitate the long-term goal of creating a WCU Ethics Institute to orchestrate the EAC program and perpetuate conversations on ethics and an ethos of ethics throughout the campus.

VI. Sample Syllabus from WCU Faculty

(with permission from Dr. Schnell)

The Politics of Diversity   **Dr. Frauke Schnell**
PSC101 /   **Office hours:**
fschnell@wcupa.edu   **(Andersen, 3rd Floor, Political Science**
Dept.)

Distance Learning Statement: Distance education uses technology to facilitate learning without the limitations of time or place. In order to capitalize on this flexibility and become a successful online learner, participants should consider the following:

Self-motivation and self-discipline are critical: Students are expected to actively participate in the online classroom. They should log in daily, complete all readings, and respond fully to conference discussion topics or other assignments. All assignments must be submitted on time.

Planning and organization: Online students need disciplined work habits, effective time management skills, and the ability to work both alone and collaboratively. Also, please note that the winter term takes place within a condensed format. Regular classes meet daily for 3 hours and you are expected to complete a similar workload.

Communication skills: In the online environment, communication takes place through the written word. Students need strong English reading and writing skills in order to express their thoughts as they participate in discussions and other classroom assignments.

Technology skills: Students are expected to be competent in the use of computers, the World Wide Web, and commonly used software programs such as the Microsoft Office Suite of applications. Students without experience using the university's learning management system (Desire2Learn) can contact the instructor and/or the Student Help Desk to arrange instruction. Students will also be given instruction on the first day of class on how to successfully navigate and complete assignments within the Desire2Learn system. Students must have access to the most current version of Internet Explorer/Safari/Mozilla. It is expected that all students will be able to open Microsoft Office 2007 files. Students are encouraged to contact the student help desk to ensure that their computer equipment if sufficient for the D2L operating system. Students must be able to readily access the internet via cable or broadband as files may be large in this course. In this course we will be using the Desire2Learn (D2L) Learning Management System. If you are new to D2L please read the support manual explaining the various tools and functions. If you have questions about using D2L please contact the instructor or the helpdesk.

Teaching Philosophy and Goals:
My goals for this course are a product of my perspective on the broader goals of higher education. Most importantly, I feel that college should be an environment that promotes intellectual development beyond the mastery of course specific content. Hence, I do not want you to merely memorize facts from the lectures, discussions or readings. My goal is for you to think deeply about how the government institutions, policies and problems we discuss impact your life and the life of others, how policymaking processes and outcomes compare to American values such as equality and liberty, how ethical reasoning contributes to civic life, and how you can act to address social and political problems. Throughout the course, I will try my best to facilitate classroom activities and discussions that will help you become engaged with the course material. However, education is a cooperative endeavor that requires you to participate actively in the learning experience. What you get out of this course will in large part be a product of what you put into it. If at any point in time you are having trouble understanding the material, please contact me. If you have interesting ideas, please share them with me.

Course Ethics: You have several ethical responsibilities in this course. For this adventure to work for all of us, each of us needs to do the readings and think about them. We must respect each other's positions on the readings, and honor intellectual experiments (the "what if…." positions); that means people should be willing and able to change their minds, to defend their positions, and challenge the positions of others. Critically, one should never confuse an argument with the person making the argument – positions are not people. This means you should not attack people, only their claims and you should do so based on reasoning. Similarly, you should defend your positions as if they were ideas to be kicked around, not children to be protected.

Cheating and plagiarizing are not acceptable. They will be punished to the greatest extent permitted by West Chester University. All exams, papers, and other work products are to be completed in conformance with the WCU Code of Academic Integrity.

Course Description:

PSC101 is an approved **Behavioral and Social Science General Education course**, as well as a **Diversity** (J) and an **Ethics Requirement** (E) course. In this course we will examine American government by analyzing how historically underrepresented and marginalized groups such as women, members of the LGBTQA community, racial minorities and the poor have or have not been represented by the American political system and its institutions. In addition, the course examines how different theoretical approaches such as pluralism, elitism, socialism, liberalism and critical race theory value the concept of equality vs. individual liberty, and how social movements have contributed to social change. By focusing on elements of political culture and social experiences of these groups, we will also consider how historical and cultural contexts have shaped the differential experiences of individuals and how race, class, gender, and sexual orientation influence an individual's role in the political system. Within this context, this course will include discussions of the U.S. Constitution in both historical and contemporary contexts, social movements, interest groups and political parties, voting patterns, the media, public opinion, the Congress, President, Supreme Court, civil rights and civil liberties, as well as economic and social policy. These materials and discussions are embedded in a political science ethics framework. This means that we will examine questions about ethical leadership, the 'character' of elected officials and the 'morality' of political decision making and resulting public policies. In order to probe the question of ethics in politics and government, the course discusses eight ethical criteria (i.e., fairness, outcomes, responsibilities, character, liberty,

empathy, authority, and rights) and includes lessons on ethical frameworks and practice in evaluating ethical dilemmas and case studies.

We will use the internet and supplemental readings from men and women who represent a variety of races, ethnicities, classes, and sexual orientations to explore the state of politics in the United States. This information will also contribute to preparing students to assume a participatory role in their political, social, and governmental environments.

PSC101 fulfill the diverse communities (J) requirements by:
- Studying historically marginalized groups: Students will be able to identify, compare, and differentiate critical issues related to historically marginalized groups – women, racial minorities, the LGBT community, and individuals from lower socio-economic classes.
- Analyzing different theoretical frameworks for structural inequalities: Students will demonstrate the ability to effectively apply theoretical framework(s) such as elitism, pluralism, feminism, conservatism and liberalism, and socialism to analyze structural inequities relative to the groups studied.
- Fostering an informed and reasoned openness to diversity: Students will be able to articulate an informed and reasoned openness to differences related to the groups studied and will understand the historical, political, and social underpinnings of structural discrimination.
- Fostering the university's goal of graduating students committed to creating a just and equitable society: Students will be able to assess and evaluate the impact of social policies and practices and will examine how social movements have managed to alter these policies.

PSC101 fulfills the Ethics requirement (E) by:
- **Fostering ethical issue recognition (ability to identify core ethical issues in scenarios and dilemmas).** This is done by examining theories of political ethics and the regulation of political ethics through elections and legislation and by examining what constitutes ethical leadership or political courage and what other virtues are important for public officials to have.
- **Applying and evaluating different ethical perspectives or concepts to fictional and real-world scenarios**. This is accomplished by giving students opportunities to apply, weigh, and balance completing considerations to ethical situations or dilemmas and determine the most ethical course of action and distinguish between the value of short vs. long-term solutions.

This course also strives to fulfill many of the Department of Political Science's learning goals and objectives:
- **Knowledge:** Students will demonstrate knowledge of the discipline of Political Science and its subfields in terms of content, purpose and methods and will be able to transfer and apply this knowledge in applied settings inside and outside of the classroom.
  - Content-specific knowledge about the American political system will assessed through multiple choice and short answer exam questions on the mid-term and final exam and written assignments (i.e., Toomey v. Casey assignment and Newspaper analysis).
- **Information Literacy**: Students will develop the knowledge and skills necessary to identify the information needed for a task, to critically evaluate the sources and content of information, and use that information efficiently and effectively within appropriate ethical and legal limits.

- o   As part of the course, students learn to become critical consumers of media content and learn how to assess the validity of various media sources. This media literacy outcome is assessed through the newspaper analysis assignment, the discussion groups, and exam questions, both multiple choice and short answer in nature.
- **Critical and Analytical Thinking**: Students will develop and master critical thinking and analytical reasoning skills. This includes the ability to apply major methodological tools in Political Science to effectively describe, explain, and predict political phenomena.
  - o   Throughout the entire course, students utilize the five principles of politics to analyze and critically assess the structures, principles, and evolution of American government. This learning outcome is assessed through exam questions (both multiple choice and short answers) and in class discussions, the Casey v. Toomey assignment, and the ethical reasoning skills paper.
- **Oral and Written Communication Skills**: Students will demonstrate the necessary oral and written skills to convey their knowledge about political science to others.
  - o   Students are challenged to articulate themselves both in class discussion and in written forms, which are assessed through class participation and in essays and exam short answers, as well as the other writing assignments.

Please see evaluation criteria (below) for an explanation of how these learning outcomes will be assessed.

PSC101 is a social science distributive general education course. Specifically, the course meets requirements by emphasizing:

- General Education Goal #1: Effective Communication.
- General Education Goal # 2: Critical Thinking and Analysis.
- General Education Goal# 5: Responding thoughtfully to diversity (by focusing on multiple theoretical perspectives [e.g., pluralism, elitism, different political ideologies] and historically marginalized groups [i.e., race, gender, class, sexuality], the course provides frameworks and techniques for understanding and responding thoughtfully to diversity.)
- General Education Goal # 6: Demonstrating the ability to understand human activity in cultural and/or social contexts AND demonstrating an understanding of varied historical, cultural/and/or philosophical traditions.
- General Education Goal # 7: Ethical issue recognition (ability to identify core ethical issues in scenarios or dilemmas) AND application of ethical perspectives and concepts to fictional and real-world scenarios.

Summary of General Education Goals and Learning Outcomes:

General Education Goal	Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Tools (for more details, please see 'Method of Evaluation,' below)
Effective Communication (#1)	- Express oneself effectively in common college-level written forms	- Short essays (mid-term and final exam) - Ethical reasoning

		- skills paper - Casey v. Toomey assignment
	- Demonstrate comprehension of and ability to explain information and ideas accessed through reading	- Short essay exams (mid-term and final) - Participation in Discussion Boards - Casey v. Toomey Assignment
Critical Thinking and Analysis (#2)	- Use relevant evidence gathered through accepted scholarly methods, and properly acknowledge sources of information, to support an idea	- Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper - Casey v. Toomey assignment
	- Develop creative or innovative approaches to assignments or projects	- Race Card Project - Discussion Groups - Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper
Responding thoughtfully to diversity (#5)	- Demonstrate an understanding of the perspectives of historically marginalized groups - Evaluate the ideological, historical and cultural causes of structural inequality - Examine assigned issues from a diverse community's perspective.	- Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper - Discussion Groups - Essay exams - Race Card Project - Race card project / Ethical Reasoning skills paper / essay exams / newspaper analysis - Toomey v. Casey analysis / race card project
Develop students' ability to understand the cultural and social context of human-behavior and decision-making (#6)	- Demonstrate the ability to understand human behavior in cultural and social contexts - Demonstrate an understanding of varied historical and cultural contexts	- Essay exams - Discussion groups - Casey v. Toomey Analysis - Essay Exams / Newspaper Analyses / Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper
Ethical Issue Recognition AND application of ethical theories and concepts to real-world and fictional	- Demonstrate the ability to identify core ethical issues in scenarios or dilemmas - Demonstrate the ability to	- Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper - The Ethicist Assignment

scenarios (#7)	apply and evaluate different ethical perspectives to fictional and real-world scenarios	- Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper - The Ethicist Assignment - Discussion Groups - Newspaper Analysis

Texts and other materials:

- Thomas R. Dye, Harmon Zeigler, and Louis Schubert (D&Z). *The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*. Cengage Learning, 16th (2014) or preferred 17th (2016) edition. You have the following options:

  - Purchasing the 17th edition (quite pricey)
  - Purchasing a used copy of the 16th edition at Cengage or other websites or campus bookstore
  - Renting the 17th edition for $30
  - Purchasing 17th edition eBook for about $50
  - Purchasing 16th edition eBook for $40

Please go to www.cengagebrain.com for more information, options, and pricing.
- *The New York Times*, online subscription or paper (you can either purchase the *New York Times* daily or subscribe to the paper electronically. Electronic subscriptions are $.99 cents per week. You can cancel this introductory offer after four weeks or continue to pay the reduced college rate (50% of regular price) thereafter (go to www.nytimes.com/subscriptions/eduol).
- Additional readings on the course website (Desire to Learn, D2L).
- Two videos: "Brother Outsider: The Life of Bayard Rustin" (available via amazon) and "The Murder of Emmett Till" (available on YouTube).

Class Policies, Requirements

This course is fully conducted online. In order to guarantee academic success, the following rules and expectations apply:

Online Attendance and Participation: A strong desire to learn and attain knowledge and skills via online courses requires a strong commitment to participate in order to achieve. Students are expected to access the online lectures daily, read all the accompanying materials when they are assigned (i.e., textbook and other readings), participate in online discussions, newsgroup discussions, and complete all assignments.

Attendance online is monitored via D2L. Only excused absences in accordance with the Excused Absences Policy for University Sanctioned Events, or absences for illness or other unforeseen circumstances with verification of treatment will not be penalized. Absences on days on which you are required to take an exam, submit an assignment, or participate in a discussion group will lead to forfeiture of the points assigned for the examinations/assignments/presentation.

If you miss a class because of an unforeseen illness (i.e., you cannot get word to me in advance) you may make up missed assignments, tests, etc., by showing me evidence of a visit to a doctor (i.e., a note). I will discuss other arrangements with anyone for whom some other unforeseen event prevents attendance in a given session. In either case, we would expect that you would contact me as soon as possible after the missed class.

The quality of this course depends on you and your engagement with the materials and with each other. In the online discussion groups, you are encouraged to say anything you can defend using reasoned argument. While feeling free to contribute your insights to the class, it is also important that you treat your classmates' contributions with respect and basic courtesy by reading them carefully, taking them seriously and challenging them. Opinions are important in this class but they will be especially useful when they engage the readings and concepts discussed in class.

Students with Disabilities: If you have a disability that requires accommodations under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), please present your letter of accommodations and meet with me as soon as possible so that I can support your success in an informed manner. Accommodations cannot be granted retroactively. If you would like to know more about West Chester University's Services for Students with Disabilities (OSSD), please visit them at 223 Lawrence Center. The OSSD hours of Operation are Monday – Friday, 8:30 a.m. – 4:30 p.m. Their phone number is 610-436-2564, their fax number is 610-436-2600, their email address is ossd@wcupa.edu, and their website is at www.wcupa.edu/ussss/ossd.

Academic Dishonesty and Personal Integrity: It is the responsibility of each student to adhere to the university's standards for academic integrity. Violations of academic integrity include any act that violates the rights of another student in academic work, that involves misrepresentation of your own work, or that disrupts the instruction of the course. Other violations include (but are not limited to): cheating on assignments or examinations; plagiarizing, which means copying any part of another's work and/or using ideas of another and presenting them as one's own without giving proper credit to the source; selling, purchasing, or exchanging of term papers; falsifying of information; and using your own work from one class to fulfill the assignment for another class without significant modification. Proof of academic misconduct can result in the automatic failure and removal from this course. For questions regarding Academic Integrity, the No-Grade Policy, Sexual Harassment, or the Student Code of Conduct, students are encouraged to refer to the Department Undergraduate Handbook, the Undergraduate Catalog, the *Ram's Eye View*, and the University website at www.wcupa.edu.

Reporting Incidences of Sexual Violence: West Chester University and its faculty are committed to assuring a safe and productive educational environment for all students. In order to meet this commitment and to comply with Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 and guidance from the Office for Civil Rights, the University requires faculty members to report incidents of sexual violence shared by students to the University's Title IX Coordinator, Ms. Lynn Klingensmith. The only exceptions to the faculty member's reporting obligation are when incidents of sexual violence are communicated by a student during a classroom discussion, in a writing assignment for a class, or as part of a University-approved research project. Faculty members are obligated to report sexual violence or any other abuse of a student who was, or is, a child (a person under 18 years of age) when the abuse allegedly occurred to the person designated in the University protection of minors policy. Information regarding the reporting of sexual violence and the resources that are available to victims of sexual violence is

set forth at the webpage for the Office of Social Equity
at http://www.wcupa.edu/_admin/social.equity/.

Emergency Preparedness: All students are encouraged to sign up for the University's free WCU ALERT service, which delivers official WCU emergency text messages directly to your cell phone. For more information, visit www.wcupa.edu/wcualert. To report an emergency, call the Department of Public Safety at 610-436-3311.

Electronic Mail Policy: It is expected that faculty, staff, and students activate and maintain regular access to University provided e-mail accounts. Official university communications, including those from your instructor, will be sent through your university e-mail account. You are responsible for accessing that mail to be sure to obtain official University communications. Failure to access will not exempt individuals from the responsibilities associated with this course.

Online office Hours: The instructor monitors her email two to three times during the workday. I will try and answer your email on the same day, but please be patient. If student questions or concerns cannot be addressed online, the instructor can also communicate with the student via skype or telephone. These telephone appointments will be scheduled during mutually agreeable times. Please contact me if you need clarification of any issue that was raised during online discussions and/or lectures or to discuss any other concerns about the management of the class. The instructor welcomes any suggestions or ideas that many enhance the learning benefits of the course. Students can also meet with me at my office in Ruby Jones Hall, West Chester University (please contact me by email to schedule an appointment).

Method of Evaluation, Assignments and Grading

Student assessment is divided into the following categories:

Method of Assess-ment	Description	% of Final Grade
Mid-term and Final Exam	Two exams (these exams combine multiple choice and essay questions): See course outline for scheduled dates and times. Essay exams might include questions about current events and how they relate to class themes of the topic of ethics in politics, diversity, and structural inequality. Thus, daily reading of the *New York Times* is required.	30%
Online discussion groups	There are a total of 12 and you must participate in 10 of them. This accounts for a total of 20% of your final grade. Please refer to the online discussion board guidelines (below) for a description of what constitutes good discussion board contributions and how these entries are graded. Each discussion board requires you to submit three entries, a primary and two secondary entries. The class schedule is organized by week and all entries (primary and secondary) are always submitted on or before Thursdays (10pm) of a particular week. Earlier entries are strongly preferred. Online discussions can be one of the richest elements of your online experience. Electronic discussions offer a unique opportunity for you to be "heard." You don't need to raise your hand and wait to be called on. You can think carefully about what you want to say and look it over before you post it. You can consider the contributions of your peers more thoughtfully and go back to comments again when a second reading offers clarification and a deeper understanding. Each lesson contains one discussion question that is connected to that lesson's learning outcomes. In addition to responding to these prompts, you should engage in the board by initiating posts and responding to the posts of others in ways that advance the conversation. You might, for instance: 1. Post an opinion based on reading/research you do on the topic and back up your opinion with relevant research/ arguments. 2. Identify and/or apply and/or evaluate the ethically relevant theories underlying the issue. 3. Respond thoughtfully to a topic from your own experience and explain the cultural and social contexts that have shaped your attitudes and behaviors. 4. Provide links and resources related to the topic that would be of interest to other participants. This includes an explanation of why these sources are important. 5. Post a thought-provoking question related to the topic. 6. Collect multiple perspectives on a topic or provide an alternate perspective to the one currently dominating the discussion. 7. Thoughtfully rebut another participant's comments. 8. Synthesize the current class discussion by summing up arguments or discussion points. Grading of discussion board entries: • You will receive full points for your entry **only** if it: - fulfills one of the above requirements (see criteria 1 through 7 above).	20%

	- If it is sufficiently long (typically, two to three substantial paragraphs) and if it is submitted within the required time frame. (Each discussion board requires you to submit a primary entry and two secondary entries). Please remember: a primary entrance is your first response to my prompt (see #s 1 to 7 above), a secondary entrance refers to your response to another student's entry.	
News-paper Analysis	Based on your daily reading of the *New York Times*, two contributions are required on the days assigned by the instructor. Each day several students (scheduled alphabetically by instructor, schedule to be posted on D2L) will be in charge of creating commentaries about news items and their analysis (based on their reading of the *New York Times*) relevant to the content and learning goals of this class (e.g., what is happening in the United States and abroad, what is the controversy, why and how is this relevant to the content of this course, and, especially, how does it relate to politics of race, class, gender, and sexuality?). In other words, each student in a group has to submit a news analysis and comment on the entries of at least two other students. All newspaper analyses assignments are due on Thursdays (see schedule). **News Analysis - Frequently Asked Questions:** First of all, please double-check that your name is listed two times on the D2L document. • **How many days**? You will see on the schedule (to be posted on D2L) that your name shows up two times on two different days. • **How many articles**. On those days, you are assigned to analyze and comment on the day's news (as reflected in the *New York Times*). In particular, you should focus on a specific article that relates to diversity issues we discuss in class (i.e., race, class, sex, sexuality). Also, articles which raise issues about the theme of 'democracy,' especially as it relates to issues of class, race, gender and sexuality are relevant. You are also expected to comment on two other entries members of your group submitted. • **What sections of the paper should I focus on?** Obviously, focus on the national and international politics sections. However, if there are relevant articles in the business or sports sections feel free to include them as well. For instance, there might be articles about discrimination in sports (e.g., discrimination of gays in professional football, women in professional sports) or an article in the business section about women business owners. Those are relevant as well. • **Should I also read the paper on the days I am not assigned to write the news analysis?** Yes, definitely and there are three reasons for this: First of all, I might include a question about current issues on the exam. Second, citizens need to be informed, the more knowledge and information you have, the less likely it will be that you are manipulated by someone else's opinions. Lastly, reading a daily paper builds your literacy and writing skills.	10%
Race Card Project	This project requires participants to use exactly six words to express their thoughts on race, ethnicity and cultural identity. For this assignment, you are required to create a race card and post it on the discussion board. You must also complete the following two tasks: a) Post your race card to the discussion board on D2L along with an approximately five paragraph explanation of why you chose those six words, particularly reflecting on how your race card may be connected to the politics of race and ethnicity in American society. b) Read and comment on at least two of your classmate's race cards through the D2L discussion board. c) Read contributions from all other classmates	10%
Casey v. Toomey comparison	1. Short written assignment (about 3 pages): Analyzing the positions of PA Senators Toomey v. Casey 10%). See D2L for more details. This assignment asks you to reflect on your own policy positions on issues related to equality and compare them to the voting records held by the two PA senators (Toomey, the Republican and Casey, the Democrat). This is a very useful exercise. As a citizen you need to know your representatives and you need to know whether or not his or her positions align with your issue preferences.	10%

Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper	**This assignment needs to be uploaded to the ePortfolio**	10%
	Ethical Reasoning Skills Paper (credits for designing this fictional thought experiments goes to William J. Hawk, Ph.D., James Madison University)	
	Scenario: A category 5 hurricane with sustained winds of more than 155 miles per hour, Sharon, strikes the northeast coast of the United States bringing devastating wind damage, fires, and severe flooding that punish New York City and the northern coast of New Jersey. Millions are without water, electricity, and basic survival needs of food and shelter. Thousands are totally isolated, and hundreds are presumed dead. Your group, the Federal Emergency Management Agency's regional response task force, is assigned to direct the rescue and recovery of those whose lives remain at risk. The on-going devastating effects of Sharon place hundreds, perhaps thousands, in immediate peril. Time is of the essence. Unfortunately, the material and human assets set aside for emergency response have been severely compromised and your management task force is made aware that only two operational rescue teams are available. You have before you the following requests for immediate assistance necessary to save threatened lives and resources.	
	A section of Staten Island took a direct hit from Sharon experiencing a storm surge of 15 feet and devastating nearly everything in its path. Information available to you makes clear that some 200 families ignored a mandatory evacuation notice. Many children were among those left behind. There are no reports on how many may have survived but there have been isolated communications indicating that survivors remain and are in grave peril.	
	The damage to Atlantic City was great. Those who remain at risk in the area are mostly tourists who were unable to flee before the storm hit. The wealthy business owners in the region will be hurt economically if the tourists are not rescued promptly. The Governor of New Jersey just called claiming that he received a personal promise from the President of the United States that assistance would be immediate and adequate. Hundreds of known survivors are trapped in upscale but devastated hotels along the coast.	
	The Bronx is home to the poorest inhabitants; many of whom heard the warnings of the impending hurricane but had no adequate means of transportation by which to escape. Prior to the storm public transportation had been diverted so as to accommodate more "well-established" neighborhoods. Sketchy information indicates that thousands of potential survivors are at risk.	
	Long Island is home to the Governor of New York's immediate family. She has economic interests in the area. After the storm hit the Governor issued an executive order declaring Long Island the top priority in rescue and recovery. She identified important resources for the state of New York at risk in Long Island as her rationale for the prioritization. Your task force suspects the order to be a result of her personal interests. You have no direct information on the status of the area or possible survivors.	
	Two of your team members are from Queens where they are coaches to youth soccer teams. Prior to your meeting and before phone service was lost, these two members each received desperate phone calls from their soccer players. You don't know how many people are at risk in Queens but you do know that at least two 15-year-old girls, well-known to members of your task force, are crying for help.	
	At the last minute, you get word from the President of the United States that a federal prison, home to thousands of women, is flooded. The prison is located near Bridgeport and there was no way for them to avoid Sharon. He reported that it appears that many will perish unless help comes immediately.	
	Time is of the essence, your resources are depleted, and you have only two rescue and recovery teams. For this exercise, assume that there is no difference in logistical capabilities, i.e. the two teams can get to any of the rescue areas in the same amount of time.	
	Where should your response team send them? How would you make that decision? Your paper should address at least four of the following eight key dimensions to evaluate the ethical dimensions of the situation. One of them most be the **Fairness** consideration.	

Please see rubric on D2L for grading criteria.

- **Fairness** – How can I (we) act justly, equitably, and balance legitimate interests?
- **Outcomes** – What possible actions achieve the best short- and long-term outcomes for me and all others?
- **Responsibilities** – What duties and/or obligations apply?
- **Character** – What actions help me (us) become my (our) ideal self (selves)?
- **Liberty** – How do I (we) show respect for personal freedom, autonomy, and consent?
- **Empathy** – How would I (we) act if I (we) cared about all involved?
- **Authority** – What do legitimate authorities (e.g. experts, law, my religion/god) expect?
- **Rights** – What rights, if any, (e.g. innate, legal, social) apply?

(Please refer to class lectures and Eight Key questions booklet)

(https://www.jmu.edu/ethicalreasoning/Docs/131101%208KQ%20Handout%20Revision.pdf) for more explanation and background)

The Ethicist Assignment	This is a two-part assignment. For the first part, students respond to an ethical dilemma (taken from the *NYT* "The Ethicist" column by Kwame Anthony Appiah):	10%

I am currently a senior in high school and am lucky enough to have been admitted to a prestigious private university. I'm strongly considering attending this school because of its excellent academics and the other opportunities it offers me, and because my family can afford it.

Both my parents attended this school at various points, so I'm sure that being a legacy didn't hurt my application. But I'm worried about the ethics of inserting myself into a system that so many criticize as racist, unfairly influenced by privilege like my race (I'm white), the legacies that I have and my socioeconomic status. However, even if I were to turn down this school, I'm sure someone else would take my place, and I'd still most likely be attending a fancy private college; it seems unlikely that my individual decision would impact the overall system.

Do I have an ethical obligation not to enter a system that is clearly deeply flawed, if it so happens that those flaws seem to have worked out to some degree in my favor? (Name Withheld)

Part I: Student responses should address the following questions:

- What reasons does the unnamed student give for considering declining his acceptance to the prestigious college?
- What is the question of ethics here?
- Which stance (decline or accept) do you think is more ethical? Why?
- Which stance do you think is most helpful to students in the long and short run?

Part II: The second part of this assignment involves students reading Kwame Appiah's short response to the student's ethical quandary. Students then submit a short reaction to Dr. Appiah's ethical advice:

Yet it's not your job to solve the problem on your own. Turning down this opportunity isn't going to make a detectable difference to the

	system, but it may well make a significant difference to you. Better to take your unearned advantages and put your shoulder to the wheel of making things better at the college you've been admitted to. Within a few years, you'll be in the alumni association. When it comes to the legacy system, you could start a campaign of reform there. And while you're still in college, you can make sure to study up on the larger sources of inequality and injustice in our society and the strategies for doing something about it. *Many people consider the legacy system to be among the social mechanisms that generate significant inequality of opportunity in this country. This would seem to be your view too. You worry, more broadly, about how the other advantages you have smooth your way toward the collection of yet more advantages — about what the Yale law professor Daniel Markovits calls "snowball inequality." Fair enough. In dozens of elite colleges, there are more students from households in the top 1 percent than there are students from the bottom 60 percent.*	
Ungraded Require-ments	Although these components are not graded, completion is required in order to pass the class. - First day of class or earlier, send me an email that syllabus was read and understood and/or include questions about the syllabus or other class-related matters. - In addition, students are required to complete a series of mini multiple choice exams online. These exams will not be graded, but used by the instructor to assess learning outcomes. Also, they are very useful in your self-assessment of how you are doing in this course. - Alabama Literacy Test	

A final letter grade will be assigned based on performance in the course according to the following scale:

Grade	Quality Points	Percentage Equivalents	Interpretation
A	4.00	93-100	Excellent
A-	3.67	90-92	
B+	3.33	87-89	Superior
B	3.00	83-86	
B-	2.67	80-82	
C+	2.33	77-79	Average
C	2.00	73-76	
C-	1.67	70-72	
D+	1.33	67-69	Below Average
D	1.00	63-66	
D-	0.67	60-62	
F	0	< 60%	Failure

CALENDAR (preliminary and subject to change) – organized by week
Please note that discussion contributions and newspaper analyses are always due on or before Thursday (before 10pm) of a given week.

SUMMARY OF SCHEDULE AND DUE DATES

And please remember, you have to submit ten discussion board entries (which always have to include 2 replies to classmates), two newspaper analyses (with 2 replies to classmates), one race card analysis, the final paper (Ethical Reasoning Skills), the Casey v. Toomey analysis, as well as the two-part Ethicist assignment.

Topics are scheduled by week, the online discussion contributions, as well as the newspaper analyses (for assigned students only, see information on D2L in 'syllabus and other materials' in content area) are always due on Thursday prior to 10pm.

SUMMARY OF SCHEDULE AND DUE DATES

Topics are scheduled by week, the online discussion contributions, as well as the newspaper analyses, (for assigned students only, see information on D2L in 'syllabus and other materials' in content area) are always due on Thursday prior to 10pm.

Date	Required Discussion Board Contributions	Required News Analysis (please make sure that your name is listed 2 times)	Other required components	Brief Topic outline (please refer to D2L site for more details and readings)
Week 1	Discussion Board Entry 1 (based on White Privilege article)		Please send me an email that you read and understood the syllabus or ask me questions about course and syllabus Also complete Alabama literacy test (ungraded)	**Intro to class, discussion of key concepts** The evolution of the U.S. democracy A short primer of ethics and the Eight Key Questions Freedom and Equality: can we have both? Pluralism vs. Elitism? Ethics and Politics The Eight Key Questions
Week 2	Discussion Board Entry 2 (based on Thurgood Marshall's Speech on 200th anniversary of the U.S. constitution)	Newspaper analysis (assigned students only):		**Constitutional foundations of U.S. government** The elite foundations of U.S. government Issues of fairness and distributive justice throughout constitutional history and change
Week 3	Discussion 3 (based on readings: What kind of federalism	Newspaper analysis for assigned students	The Ethicist Assignment, part I (see above) – for Part II, see	**Federalism** Ebb and flow of federalism Case studies: Gay marriage and gun control

	promotes the greatest good for the greatest number?)		discussion board # 4 below	A utilitarian approach to evaluating the benefits of federal vs. state action
Week 4	Discussion 4 (based on Kwame Appiah's response to ethical quandary (students posted initial reply in wk. 3, this is the second part of the assignment)	Newspaper analysis for assigned students	Watch documentary: 'Brother Outsider' about civil rights leader Bayard Rustin	**U.S. Courts** (main focus on Supreme Court) Supreme Court nominations SC decision making and the question of legitimate authority (various case studies of court decisions)
Week 5	Discussion 5 (based on MLK's speech from Birmingham Jail and Bayard Rustin documentary: when is it legitimate to disobey authority?	Newspaper analysis for assigned students.	Watch the 'Emmett Till' documentary	**Civil Rights, Part I** The Evolution of Civil Rights nonviolent resistance and social movements The Civil Rights movement's response to illegitimate authority
Week 6	Discussion 6 (based on Michigan Affirmative Action case – What's fair?)	No newspaper analysis	Race Card Project due	**Civil Rights, Part II** Contemporary Issues – Access to equal education, the role of Diversity and Affirmative Action (changing standards in jurisprudence)
Week 7	No discussion group	No newspaper analysis	Review materials and take first exam / make appointment with instructor to discuss course progress	
Week 8	Discussion 7 (documenting media bias)	Newspaper analysis for assigned students		**Media and Public Opinion,** I. The role and responsibilities of the media / primer of media ethics The media's watchdog role The impact of social media
Week 9	Discussion 8 (based on *NYT* news quiz / students examine what they know about politics and evaluate if they meet standards of good citizenship	Newspaper analysis for assigned students only		**Media and Public Opinion,** II. The roles and responsibilities of citizens Media effects on public opinion: agenda setting and framing How race, class, gender, and sexuality shapes public opinion
Week 10	Discussion 9 (evaluating Citizens United, 2010, SC decision. Is this	Newspaper analysis for assigned students	Submit Casey v. Toomey analysis	**Elections** The U.S. electoral system Electing women and minority candidates – the role of

	fair?)			stereotypes and structural barriers The ethics of campaign finance
Week 11	Discussion 10 (advocating for climate justice / how to solve the tragedy of the commons / responsibilities of citizens)	Newspaper analysis for assigned students		**Interest Groups and Parties** Theoretical frameworks for analyzing structural inequalities: pluralism vs. elitism The role of money in politics The U.S. party system
Week 12	Discussion 11 (why are women underrepresented in the U.S. Congress? Are quotas fair?)	Newspaper analysis for assigned students		**Congress** The role of race, class, gender, and sexuality The legislative and committee process Congressional powers
Week 13	Discussion 12 (what are the desired virtue or traits of character you want to see in a President? How can you discern these?	Newspaper analysis for assigned students only		**Presidency** The maleness of the U.S. Presidency The evolution of presidential powers A question of character? Case Studies of presidential leadership
Week 15 04/29-05/03	Discussion 13 (Have you ever experienced an ethical dilemma; how was it resolved? For extra credit or make-up for those who missed a discussion group		Ethical Reasoning Skills paper due	**Challenges of the U.S. Democracy** and review of materials for 2nd exam
Final Examination Week			Take final exam	

VII. Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The Ethical Reasoning rubric was revised by West Chester faculty in 201, and articulates the fundamental criteria for ethical reasoning learning outcomes, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubric is intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading.

The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

Find the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric on the CAPC website (on the bottom right):

General Education Assessment Report

- 2011 Gen Ed Assessment Report
  - Goal 1 Rubric (Oral Communication)
  - Goal 1 Rubric (Written Communication)
  - Goal 3 Rubric
  - Goal 5 Rubric
  - Goal 6 Rubric
- 2012 Gen Ed Assessment Report
- Middle States Commission on Higher Education: 2013 Follow-Up Report
- 2014 Gen Ed Report
- 2015 Gen Ed Report
- 2016 Gen Ed Report
  - 2016 Critical Thinking Value Rubric
  - 2016 Ethical Thinking Value Rubric
  - 2016 Oral Communication Value Rubric
- 2017 Gen Ed Report
- 2018 Gen Ed Report

Appendix A
Checklist for Ethics Courses

Ethics Across the Curriculum courses at West Chester University must meet the following criteria:

1. _____ At least three different kinds of activities that encourage students to problem-see and problem-solve with an ethical lens. E.g. a) in-class collaborative activities (debates, case study analyses, etc.), b) formal writing or multimedia projects, and c) informal activities, such as class discussions, in-class writing reflections, interviews, journaling, and the like.

2. _____Instructor-led processes in discipline-specific thinking on ethics. Lessons on ethical frameworks, practice in processes for evaluating decision-specific dilemmas or case studies. The syllabus should make clear that these lessons take place throughout the course.

3. _____ These activities should clearly indicate that there are better and worse answers; and specific processes for making ethical judgments.

4. _____ Ethical exploration with instructor guidance of student practice in identifying a diverse range of perspectives on ethical issues, putting oneself in another's shoes, and/or presenting arguments charitably which are not your own perspective.

5. _____ One writing/multimedia assignment as a candidate for upload to the ePortfolio.

6. _____ Syllabus makes clear this is an Approved Gen Ed course and "E" course focusing on ethical problem-seeing, ethical reasoning, and ethical problem-solving in the discipline under study.

7. _____ Syllabus makes clear the percentage of the final grade to be derived from the ethics component ($> 25\%$).

8. _____ Syllabus should make a clear statement that the course meets the following three general education goals: Goal #1 (communicate effectively), Goal #2 (think critically and analytically), and Goal #7 (make informed decisions and ethical choices).

Goal 1 SLOs (pick one or more of the following)

- · Express oneself effectively in common college- level written forms
- · Revise and improve writing and/or presentations
- · Express oneself effectively in presentations
- · Demonstrate comprehension of and ability to explain information and ideas accessed through reading

Goal 2 SLOs (pick one of more of the following)
- · Use relevant evidence gathered through accepted scholarly methods, and properly acknowledge sources of information, to support an idea
- · Construct and/or analyze arguments in terms of their premises, assumptions, contexts, conclusions, and anticipated counter-arguments
- · Reach sound conclusions based on a logical analysis of evidence
- · Develop creative or innovative approaches to assignments or projects

Goal 7 SLOs (pick two or more of the following)
- · Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: can identify and explain ethically relevant theories, concepts or perspectives
- · Ethical Issue Recognition: can identify core ethical issues in scenarios or dilemmas
- · Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: can apply relevant ethical theories and/or concepts to fictional or real-world scenarios
- · Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts: can offer intellectually honest critiques and evaluations of ethical positions, including one's own

9. ____ Course description should include language that emphasizes the study of ethics.

10. ____ Syllabus should include a learning objective for the course that emphasizes the specific code of ethics of the respective discipline, and/or, where appropriate, the general grounding of that code of ethics in broader ethical theories. Where no code of ethics exists, the "Generic Code of Ethics" can be substituted.

Appendix B
A Generic Code of Ethics[1]

For courses without obvious codes of ethics linked to the subject matter

A code of ethics offers ethical guidelines that should govern decisions and behavior in organizations, in disciplines, in professions, in daily life. When a course is not tied to a specific context or discipline with an already existing code of ethics, the following can be a valuable touchstone.

Code of Ethics:

The following concepts should guide my behavior in this class and far beyond:

1. Fairness: Since I am no more or less valuable than any other human I encounter in the world, I should always ask myself: "What is the fair or the just thing to do"? How can I/we act fairly and equitably?

2. Consequences: I should be aware that my actions and decisions will often have an effect on others. I should be alert to short- and long-term consequences of my actions on others. I should avoid harm to others that is not ethically justifiable.

3. Responsibilities: The roles we adopt, the work we take on, our relationships with others, all bring responsibilities. I should be alert to what my duties and obligations are; what I owe to other beings or institutions.

4. Character: Who we are matters. What character traits do I possess that are of benefit to myself and others? What character traits do I possess that are a detriment to myself or others? I should work to nurture the former and eliminate the latter.

5. Liberty: Personal autonomy is important to us all. How do I honor my own freedom of choice without inhibiting others' freedom of choice? And, how does my freedom of choice tie in with the other concepts in this code of ethics?

6. Empathy: Would I be ok with my action(s) if someone else were doing it? Would I want what I'm doing to others to be done to me? If I cared about those involved, would I be doing [X]?

7. Authority: There are legitimate authorities in all of our lives: experts, the law, religion or spiritual guides, etc. What do they expect from me? Are those expectations morally justifiable?

8. Rights: As citizens of a democratic country, we all have legal rights, established in the U.S. Constitution. The 1949 Universal Declaration of Human Rights established basic global human or moral rights. While culturally complicated, the goal is to acknowledge that an individual's moral status (and moral status [or standing] may need to be extended to groups, non-human animals and/or the environment). That moral status is the basis for being entitled to a minimum standard of treatment.

---

[1] This code of ethics is tied to the ideas and principles emphasized throughout the history of moral philosophy (both East and West) and borrowed from the version of that history developed by James Madison University for their "Eight Key Questions" program. (www.jmu.edu/ethicalreasoning)

Appendix C

BIO440 Course Map Example*

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES (SLO)

At the completion of this course, the student will:

1. Critically evaluate scientific studies and reports
2. Identify the research milestones that have shaped this field and recognize the current problems and approaches that scientists are using today to study important questions in the field
3. Gain a deeper understanding of the ethical issues surrounding the field of human genetics and develop informed decisions regarding these issues
4. Research a topic that excites you
5. Formulate your own research ideas and hypotheses
6. Become familiar with the code of ethics of a genetic counselor and understand the principles of non-directive counseling
7. Communicate science professionally with peers and colleagues, and informally with family, friends, and the broader public

*This course map only includes examples of ethics related materials in this course, with permission from Dr. Sullivan-Brown's BIO440).

Module	Module Objectives (SLO alignment)	Learning Materials	Learning Activities (Module Objectives alignment)	Assessments (Module Objectives alignment)
1: Principles of Bioethics	1. Become familiar with the principles of bioethics (SLO3)	1. Bioethics Reading Pre-Class Readings and In-Class activities Assignments:	1. Bioethics Readings 1 (MO1)	1. In-class assignment
2: The Ethics of Genome Editing	1. Discuss the ethical implications of genome editing (SLO2)	1. Bioethics Reading Pre-Class Readings and In-Class activities Assignments:	1. Bioethics Readings 2 (MO2)	1. In-class assignment

3: Henrietta Lacks Assignments / History of informed consent	1. Recognize the ethical issues of informed consent surrounding the Lacks case (SLO3)	1. The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks Reading/Class Discussion Assignments	1. Pre-Class Discussion Assignment 1 (MO3)	1. There will be 3 designated classes in which a pre-class discussion assignment (5pts each) will be given regarding ethical dilemmas surrounding the Henrietta Lacks Readings. We will have designated class time to discuss your answers, while providing a historical and current framework on how ethical judgments are made. It is important to do the assignment before class to ensure a better class discussion! The specific assignment must be posted on D2L and are due before class, no late submissions.

NSG537 Course Map Example*

STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES/COURSE OBJECTIVES

At the completion of this course, the student will:
1. Apply ethical analysis and clinical reasoning to evaluate advanced nursing care delivery
2. Evaluate your clinical practice in reference to ethical conduct
3. Facilitate interdisciplinary teams to address ethical concerns, and the risk/benefit ratio of patient outcomes
4. Develop a practice conducive to providing ethical care
5. Collaborate for equitable patient care through participation in systems, community and policy-making activities

6. Apply the concepts of ethical conduct of research and translational scholarship

*this is an example of two modules within a 7-module graduate course, with permission from Dr. Monturo's NSG537).

Module	Module Objectives (SLO alignment)	Learning Materials	Learning Activities (Module Objectives alignment)	Assessments (Module Objectives alignment)
1: Founda-tions	1. Recall facts from the syllabus and resource pages on the Course Welcome page 2. Determine the philosophical underpinnings of ethics and bioethics in clinical practice (SLO1) 3. Identify their own individual values and morals (SLO2)	1. Grace, P. (2018). Nursing Ethics and Professional Responsibility (3rd ed.). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning. 2. Ethical Lens Inventory video 3. Overview of the Four Ethical Lenses document	1. Review Syllabus (MO1) 2. Review resource pages (MO1, 3) 3. Read Nursing Ethics and Professional Responsibility (Chapters 1 and 2) (MO2) 4. Select the book that you'll read this semester in the Doodle Poll (MO1)	1. Course Scavenger Hunt (MO1) 2. D2L orientation (MO1) 3. Ethical Lens Inventory Assignment (MO2, 3) 4. VoiceThread Introduction Assignment (MO1)

2: Common Ethical Issues	1. Discuss a patient related ethical dilemma in your clinical practice (SLO1 & 2) 2. Examine the ethical dilemma through your "ethical lens" (SLO2) 3. Apply best practices including interprofessional ethical care and risk-benefit analysis to dilemmas (SLO3 & 4)	1. Grace, P. (2018). Nursing Ethics and Professional Responsibility (3rd ed.). Burlington, MA: Jones & Bartlett Learning.	1. Read Nursing Ethics and Professional Responsibility (Chapters 3, 4, & 5) (MO2, 3)	1. Respond to the Discussion Board Question: Give an example of a patient related ethical dilemma you've faced as an RN. Indicate how you resolved this dilemma including an interprofessional approach. Did your readings and knowledge of your ethical lens cause you to reflect on how to handle this dilemma differently now? (MO1, 2, 3) 2. EthicsGames Sinking ship modules (CNS track) or Dilemmas A & B modules (Educator track) (MO2)

Appendix D

Resources for in-class activities:

- Case Study Writing Method: [Ethics Case Writing](#)

- Resources for Business Faculty:
  [University of Colorado Helpful Ethics Links](#)
  [University of Colorado Ethics Cases and Debates](#)
  [Using Debates to Teach Information Ethics](#)

Resources for In-Class Debates:

- "Daring to Debate: Strategies for teaching controversial issues in the classroom." by Nicole Fournier-Sylvester. *College Quarterly*; Summer2013, Vol. 16 Issue 3.

- "Using Debate to Teach Pharmacy Students About Ethical Issues," by Lezley-Anne Hanna, PhD, Johanne Barry, BSc, Ryan Donnelly, PhD, Fiona Hughes, MPharm, David Jones, DSc, Garry Laverty, PhD, Carole Parsons, PhD, Cristin Ryan, PhD. American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education 2014; 78 (3) Article 57.

- "Using Debates to Teach Information Ethics" by A. Graham Peace. 2011 *Journal of Information Sciences* Vol 22(3): 233 ff.

- Brown, N.M. & Keeley, S.M. (2010). *Asking the right questions: A guide to critical thinking.* Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Appendix E
Rubrics

VoiceThread Book Report Rubric

VoiceThread is being used to allow students to report on a book in a creative and interactive manner. This platform allows not only the faculty member to view the "book report" but peers within the course. Given that there are so many books related to bioethics, this platform was also chosen to allow students to learn about multiple bioethical issues in a brief period of time. In the past this had led to students deciding to read additional books after the end of the course.

Assignment Overview

In Week #1, you'll find a link to participate in a Doodle poll. You will have the ability to sign up for one of the books listed at the bottom of this page. Select a book that you wish to read this semester. You may select only one book and no one else can select the same book.

You will read this book independently over the course of the semester and will create a 10-minute VoiceThread presentation using the following guidelines.

- I've created a VoiceThread group and this is where you will register, create and upload your presentation. If you've used VoiceThread in the past, please do not use your old login. I've created this group so you can easily see each other's presentations. If you've never used VoiceThread or need some brushing up, there are several threads to help you. Once you register, login and then go to Browse on the top left side of the screen. The first group of videos are tutorials. Learn how to create a VoiceThread. Remember that you must make your video viewable, so learn how to share a VoiceThread. Once your Voicethread is viewable by others, you'll need to learn how to comment on VoiceThread presentations. The browse section also includes some great ideas for presentations in higher education.

- Any technical questions, please contact the Office of Distance Education. Any questions for me or your peers about the assignment, post them on the Water Cooler.

- You'll record your presentation in any of the following ways:
    - Audiovisual VoiceThread that includes your voice and a Powerpoint/Prezi type presentation.
    - Audiovisual VoiceThread that includes your voice and other audiovisuals related to your book.

- You will also review everyone else's presentation and respond. At least 5 of the responses must be audiovisual (no prepared slides/etc., just your face/voice); the remainder can be either audiovisual or written comments. In your response to peers, relate your peers' responses to your own practice and ethical milestones.

Questions for you to answer

1. **How much does the book agree or clash with your professional and personal view of the world, and what you consider right and wrong?**
   You may use some quotes or paraphrasing of text as examples of how it agrees with and supports what you think about the world, about right and wrong, and about what you think it is to be human. Use quotes or paraphrasing of text and examples to discuss how the text agrees or disagrees with what you think about the world, history, and about right and wrong.

2. **How were your professional and personal views and opinions challenged or changed by this text, if at all?**
   Did the text communicate with you? Why or why not? Give examples of how your views might have changed or been strengthened (or perhaps, of why the text failed to convince you, the way it is). Please do not write "I agree with everything the author wrote," since everybody disagrees about something, even if it is a tiny point. Use quotes or paraphrasing of text to illustrate your points of challenge, or where you were persuaded, or where it left you cold.

3. **How will your professional practice change as a result of this text, if at all?**
   In what ways will it change?

4. **To sum up, what is your overall reaction to the text?**
   To whom would you recommend this text? Would you read something else like this, or by this same author, in the future or not? Why or why not?

If directions are not followed, the assignment will be returned to you for re-submission with a total possible score of 90%. Please do not go over the 10-minute limit.

Books

- Casarett, D. *Stoned.* Maine: Current, 2015.
- Emanuel, E. *Reinventing American Healthcare.* New York: Persius, 2014.
- Fadiman, A. *The Spirit Catches You and You Fall Down.* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1997.
- Fink, S. *Five Days at Memorial: Life and Death in a Storm Ravaged Hospital.* New York, Crown Publishing, 2013.
- Gawande, A. *Being Mortal.* New York: Metropolitan Books, 2014.
- Gawande, A. *Complications.* New York: Picador, 2002.
- Hornblum, A. *Acres of Skin.* New York: Routledge, 1998.
- Jones, H. *Personhood Revisited: Reproductive Technology, Bioethics, Religion and the Law.* Minneapolis: Langdon Street Press, 2013.
- Jones, J. *Bad Blood: The Tuskegee Syphilis Experiment.* New York: Free Press, 1993.
- Moreno, J. *Is There an Ethicist in the House?* Indiana: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Moreno, J. *Undue Risk.* New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Moreno, J. D. *Mind Wars: Brain science and the military in the 21st century.* New York: Bellevue Literary Press, 2006 and 2012.
- Shilts, R. *And the Band Played On.* New York: St. Martin's Press, 2007.
- Skloot, R. *The Immortal Life of Henrietta Lacks.* New York: Crown Publishing, 2010.

- Veatch, R. & Ross, L. F. *Transplantation Ethics.* 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Georgetown University Press, 2015.
- Warner, J. *We've Got Issues: Children and Parents in the Medication Age.* New York: Riverhead Books, 2010
- Wittenstein, V. *For the Good of Mankind.* Connecticut: 21st Century Books, 2013.

VoiceThread Book Report Rubric					
Criteria	**Below Standard** **(1 point)**	**Approaches Standard** **(2 points)**	**Standard** **(3 points)**	**Above Standard** **(4 points)**	**Master** **(5 points)**
Presentation	Views are unorganized, incomplete, or completely lacking in comparison to book	Somewhat organized presentation of professional and personal views in contrast with book	Organized and generally complete presentation of professional and personal views in contrast with book	Well-organized and complete presentation of professional and personal views in contrast with book	Extremely thorough, well-organized presentation of professional and personal views in contrast with book
	Does little more than state the position of the book	Minimally outlines book	Outlines or lists professional and person views in contrast with book but does not generate interest	Successfully frames the issues	Engages the interest of audience
Response	Is unable to respond to colleague's video in a meaningful or accurate way	Offers tentative, somewhat accurate, but possibly vague or illogical responses to colleague's video	Responds to most in the colleague's video with generally accurate comments	Responds to coll-eagues' video with accurate and generally concise comments	Responds to colleagues' video with concise, accurate, logical comments
	N/A	Attempts to respond to video	Offers opinions, but no reference to ethical milestones or their own practice.	Responds to video; with reference to ethical milestones or practice, but not both.	Effectively responds to video with well thought out discussion of own practice and ethical milestones.
Effective	Demonstrates	Demonstrates a	Demonstrates a	N/A	Demonstrates a

VoiceThread Book Report Rubric					
Criteria	**Below Standard** **(1 point)**	**Approaches Standard** **(2 points)**	**Standard** **(3 points)**	**Above Standard** **(4 points)**	**Master** **(5 points)**
Presentation of Book's Content	an inadequate understanding of the content as presented in the book	generally accurate understanding of relevant issues, events and facts, but may exhibit minor confusion or misunderstandings	basic and accurate understanding of the issues, events and facts as presented in the book.		sophisticated understanding of the issues, events and facts as presented in the book
	Supports statements with vague or irrelevant information, or no information at all	Seems to understand general ideas, but does not support their ideas with relevant facts; OR, seem to understand facts but is unable to connect them with professional/ personal opinions	Demonstrates the ability to make basic connections between the book and professional/ personal opinions	N/A	Demonstrates thorough and accurate understanding of details as well as the ability to make original connections and interpretations
Language Use	Uses language and syntax that is unclear	Uses basic but clear language	Generally uses language that is appropriate for a professional setting	Uses language that is appropriate for a professional setting	Uses language that is stylistically sophisticated and appropriate for a professional setting
Performance	N/A	Lacks confidence	Appears nervous, yet somewhat confident	Exhibits confidence and energy in the course of the presentation	Exhibits confidence, energy, and passion in the course of the presentation
	Fails to maintain respectful tone	N/A	N/A	N/A	Maintains respectful tone
	Demonstrates little or no preparation	Use of preparation materials distracts from quality of performance	Use of preparation materials does not distract	Uses preparation materials effectively	Accesses preparation materials with ease

(With permission from Dr. Monturo's NSG537)

Discussion Board Rubric

Discussion Board is being used to promote interaction between students in response to an ethical issue or dilemma. This platform allows the student to comment once or multiple times to each of their peers and provides a safe space to conduct potentially difficult conversations. The faculty member is able to interact with one or many students publicly or privately.

Overview

- The discussion board is not a live chat. All students will participate in the discussion (asynchronously) on the D2L learning platform. The discussions are scholarly conversations between the class members related to the topics posted. The faculty will monitor and at times, enter the discussion. These postings must tie together required readings with your practice examples and/or your values/morals. Postings should focus on the topic only; please remember this is a bioethics course and therefore keep this focus in mind.
- The discussion board will open at 6:00am on Sunday. The first post is due no later than that Tuesday at 11:30 PM EST, additional responses no later than that Saturday at 11:30pm EST. If a student misses a discussion topic, they cannot make up the assignment. A post is defined as a minimum of 75 words; maximum 200 words. For further details see the Discussion Board Rubric (below). You must meet all criteria for a level to achieve that score.

Discussion Board Grading

- I have set it up so that grading is formative, meaning that responses submitted in the beginning of the semester are worth less than those submitted in the end. By doing it this way, you can incorporate my feedback from early boards into later boards. The weighting of the discussion boards are as follows:
  - Discussion Board #1 - 15%
  - Discussion Board #2 - 25%
  - Discussion Board #3 - 30%
  - Discussion Board #4 - 30%
- You will be graded based on the following rubric:

Discussion Board Rubric					
Criteria	Unsatisfactory (0 points)	Developing (1 point)	Satisfactory (2 points)	Proficient (3 points)	Exquisite (4 points)
Participation in Discussion	Does not enter discussion	Provides minimal comments and information to	Sporadically provides comments and some new	Provides comments and some new information in	Provides comments and new information in

Discussion Board Rubric					
Criteria	**Unsatisfactory** (0 points)	**Developing** (1 point)	**Satisfactory** (2 points)	**Proficient** (3 points)	**Exquisite** (4 points)
		other participants. Participates infrequently in discussion and postings are irrelevant or superficial.	information. Interacts with only one or two participants by posting queries, comments, and thoughtful responses.	a fairly regular manner. Interacts with a few selected participants by posting queries, comments, and thoughtful responses.	a regular and equitable manner. Interacts with a variety of participants by posting queries, comments, and thoughtful responses.
Content of Posting	Does not add to discussion.	Adds little to the substantive discussion but may contribute to the social aspects of the course.	Reveals a restricted understanding of the topic limited to information that could be derived from prior posts.	Makes significant contributions to the discussion. Reveals adequate understanding of the topic as evidenced by posts telling us something new.	Postings are accurate, original, and relevant. Even better than telling us something new, participant raises new questions that lead to further discussion from a variety of people. Reveals a solid understanding of the topic as evidenced by thoughtful responses and questions.
Critical Thinking Evidenced by Posting	Does not enter posting.	Provides no evidence of agreement or disagreement with existing discussion. No insight or analysis	Agrees or disagrees with existing discussion but provides no justification/ explanation (e.g. text	Agrees or disagrees with existing discussion and provides limited justification/ explanation	Offers a critical analysis of an existing posted idea or introduces a different interpretation

Discussion Board Rubric					
Criteria	**Unsatisfactory** **(0 points)**	**Developing** **(1 point)**	**Satisfactory** **(2 points)**	**Proficient** **(3 points)**	**Exquisite** **(4 points)**
		displayed.	readings, literature).	(e.g. text readings, resources).	to an existing idea.
Responsiveness	Does not respond.	Posts initial comments but does not respond to others' posts.	Initial post is the minimum required and responds to two other posted discussions.	Initial post is slightly above the minimum required and responds to at least two posted discussions.	Initial post exceeds the minimum required but is succinct. Responds to more than two (2) other posted discussions.
Writing Style	Does not write response.	Limited availability to convey ideas with writing style. Below expectations of work at this level. Errors noted in spelling, punctuation, and grammar.	Able to present ideas. Comes close to expectations for work at this level. Some punctuation and spelling errors, but no errors in grammar identified.	Explicitly presents ideas. Work appropriate for this level of student. No spelling or grammar errors noted. A few minor punctuation errors identified.	Highly skilled presentation of ideas. Engages reader. Work exceeds expectations for this level of student. Absolutely no errors in spelling, punctuation, or grammar noted.

Discussion Board overall score:

- 0 - 4 points - Unsatisfactory
- 5 - 9 points - Developing
- 10 - 17 points – Satisfactory
- 18 - 19 points – Proficient
- 20 – Exquisite

(With permission from Dr. Monturo's NSG537)

Appendix F
The Eight Key Questions (8KQ)
(From James Madison University)

The Eight Key Questions reflect the best of humanity's ethical reasoning traditions. The Madison Collaborative operationalized these into a flexible and open framework to be used as prompts at the point of decision making. The questions, which can be voiced in first or second person and stated using culturally diverse content, highlight eight vital human values: fairness, outcomes, responsibilities, character, liberty, empathy, authority, and rights. These values may be expressed by different words, e.g. outcomes as "consequences," "results," "the future," or "karma;" or in different languages, e.g. consecuencia (Spanish). Each names a distinctive—we believe cross-culturally common—ethical consideration.

Fairness - How can I act equitably and balance legitimate interests?

Outcomes - What achieves the best short- and long-term outcomes for me and all others?

Responsibilities - What duties and/or obligations apply?

Character - What action best reflects who I am and the person I want to become?

Liberty - How does respect for freedom, personal autonomy, or consent apply?

Empathy - What would I do if I cared deeply about those involved?

Authority - What do legitimate authorities (e.g. experts, law, my religion/god) expect of me?

Rights - What rights (e.g. innate, legal, social) apply?

https://www.jmu.edu/mc/8-key-questions.shtml

Appendix G
The Defining Issues Test (DIT)

Another assessment tool which we can use to more broadly assess the impact that the many avenues of embedding a culture of integrity at WCU are having is called the Defining Issues Test. This assessment emerged out of the work of moral psychologists Lawrence Kohlberg and Carol Gilligan, and later James Rest. It gauges whether one is examining the world through a self-interested lens, a conventional (cultural- or community- or authority-dependent) lens, or a post-conventional one. At the post-conventional stage, individuals are able to critique the status quo, use principles of justice and fairness, and/or demonstrate a commitment to ethical relationship-nurturing or ethical caring (known in the literature as an "ethics of justice" or "ethics of care" approach).

To track our progress in an EAC program, we could survey a large selection of our incoming first year students, and our out-going students as a baseline, and follow the cohorts of those immersed in our EAC/Honors Code/growing culture of integrity to see what ethical evolution they go through as they develop.

King, P. M. and M.J. Mayhew. 2002. "Moral Judgement Development in Higher Education: Insights from the Defining Issues Test." *Journal of Moral Education* 31(3): 247-271:

> King and Mayhew examined 172 studies evaluating the changing moral judgments of college-aged students. They found that the college experience itself—at liberal arts institutions—generally helps move the needle of moral maturity (controlling for age and other variables). A liberal arts education that includes active learning, community-service components, and attention to social diversity and social justice is especially helpful in awakening students to more principled, deliberative, empathetic decision-making and moral judgment.