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Section I: Executive Summary

David Brooks (2011), a New York Times editorialist, expressed his concern on the state of America’s youth’s ability to think and talk about moral issues. In his article, he referenced a 2011 study conducted by Notre Dame sociologist Christian Smith and his colleagues, in which the researchers found that young people are not more depraved than previous generations, but they lack the language and training even to think in moral terms. In the study, Smith and his colleagues (2011) concluded that “not many of them have previously given much or any thought to many of the kinds of questions about morality that we asked.”

Ethical scandals and controversies that have surfaced over the last several years in various sectors of society may be reflections of Smith’s (2011) findings. These findings provide an opportunity for higher education institutions to re-examine their role in their students’ ethics training. However, within these learning institutions, young people’s ethical decision making skills are also troubling. Webber International University (WIU) has not been immune to unethical decision making by its own students. Poor decision making by some student athletes, for example, has led to negative consequences, not just for themselves, but for their entire team. To address this national and local trend, WIU adopted a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) dedicated to facilitating students’ development of ethical decision-making skills.

Over a year-and-a-half long process, various stakeholders from across the University, helped focus the University’s QEP on a topic that they believed would be essential to the success of the University’s graduates in their professional lives. The resulting QEP aligns with the school’s mission. That is, to “… offer students an array of business, liberal arts and sciences, and pre-professional programs of study that create a life transforming educational opportunity which is practical in its application, global in its scope, and multi-disciplinary in its general education core. Students will acquire depth of knowledge and expertise in their chosen field of study, balanced by breadth of knowledge across various disciplines. Special emphasis is placed on enhancing oral and written communication, and critical thinking skills.” Consistent with this mission, an ethics-focused QEP would have a transformative effect on students as it will facilitate their development of language to discuss ethical issues, as well as make ethical decisions with integrity in all areas of their lives as students, campus community members, future employees, and civic leaders.

Webber’s QEP, Ethical Decision Making, will equip students with ethical decision making skills, and enable them to apply these critical thinking skills in their decision making. Students will be expected to develop, refine, and apply these skills and abilities in their general education courses and in select courses in their academic majors. These courses will be embedded with ethical decision making topics and instructions. What they learn in the classroom will be supported and reinforced further by planned co-curricular activities.

To achieve the desired learning outcomes, a QEP Leadership Team, with an appointed QEP Chair, will lead this initiative. The QEP Chair will report to the WIU’s President and CEO, and will receive guidance and support from the QEP Curriculum Committee and Student Life Leadership. The QEP Chair and the QEP Leadership Team are responsible for implementing and sustaining the QEP.

The QEP Curriculum Committee is charged with guiding faculty in the general education curriculum and discipline-specific courses in instructional design, assessment, and provision of curricular
support for the QEP. This ensures that the general education curriculum and discipline-specific courses will contain learning experiences that help fulfill the QEP learning goals.

The Student Life Leadership (i.e., Dean for Student Life in the Florida Campus and Associate Dean for Student Life in the North Carolina Campus) will ensure that co-curricular activities that support the QEP are implemented as outlined in the plan, and modified, as necessary. In addition, they will ensure that appropriate data are collected to assess the quality of the co-curricular events and progress in students’ ethical decision-making.

To assess student learning through the QEP and to guide ongoing efforts to improve the QEP, the University will use the Ethical Reasoning VALUE rubric-scored course assignments/activities, embedded assessments, and the Defining Issues Test (Version 2).

The Associate Vice President for Institutional Effectiveness and Research will collaborate with the QEP Leadership Team, QEP Chair, and Student Life Leadership to assess student learning and monitor the plan’s implementation. Over the next five years, Webber has budgeted over $85,000 to help students develop ethical decision making skills, strengthen these skills, and teach students how to apply critical thinking in their personal and professional decision making.
Section II: Process Used to Develop the QEP

Development of Webber International University’s QEP, Ethical Decision Making, reflects a University-wide process that aims to facilitate students’ development of ethical decision making skills. The University’s QEP development process consisted of two phases: QEP Topic Selection and QEP Concept Development.

Phase I: QEP Topic Selection

The QEP topic selection process began in fall 2014, when the University’s President and CEO, Dr. Keith Wade, sent a university-wide e-mail to initiate engagement of the University community in generating ideas for the QEP. To assist in the facilitated brainstorming process, he included in the e-mail a list of QEP topics recently conducted in institutions similar to Webber (see Appendix A and Appendix B). The e-mail also specified the parameters for the selection of the QEP topic, which include:

a) It must directly and measurably impact student learning;
b) It should support the institution’s mission;
c) It has to be “just right” and fit within the timeframe for the QEP Impact Report in five years; and
d) It has to be doable for the institution.

A facilitated brainstorming session was held on the Florida campus to gather inputs from various university constituents; the session generated over 150 suggestions for the QEP (see Appendix C for a listing of ideas generated during the session). At the North Carolina branch campus, a survey approach was used to solicit suggestions from faculty and staff for the QEP (see Appendix D for instructions provided to solicit QEP ideas); the survey generated 29 suggestions for the QEP (see Appendix E for a listing of QEP topic ideas generated from the survey).

Further discussions among staff at both the Florida and North Carolina campuses of Webber International University resulted in narrowing down the lists from the campuses and the identification of nine topics for consideration as QEP. The topics were presented to the Joint Institutional Planning Committee (JIPC), which consists of the University President and senior administrators, on December 8, 2014. The nine topics that were presented to the JIPC for consideration for the QEP were:

A. Florida Campus:
1. Adopt a reading and multi-cultural global enhancement with a critical thinking focus;
2. Foundations of Management and Entrepreneurship;
3. First year experience; and
4. Preparing students not only to be college students but also productive citizens.

B. North Carolina Campus
1. Transforming the First-Year Experience;
2. Undergraduate Research;
3. Ethical Reasoning in Action;
4. Fostering and Applying Critical Thinking Skills; and
5. Ethical Decision Making.

During the December 8, 2014 weekly meeting of the JIPC, the nine topics were evaluated, with strong consideration for each topic’s relevance to student learning, the University’s mission, and attributes demanded of graduates in the workplace.
As stated, Webber’s mission is to:

“... offer students an array of business, liberal arts and sciences, and pre-professional programs of study that create a life transforming educational opportunity which is practical in its application, global in its scope, and multi-disciplinary in its general education core. Students will acquire depth of knowledge and expertise in their chosen field of study, balanced by breadth of knowledge across various disciplines. Special emphasis is placed on enhancing oral and written communication, and critical thinking skills.

The University awards degrees at the bachelor and master levels at locations in Florida and North Carolina, as well as at the associate level in Florida. Traditional classroom, online, and hybrid learning environments are available. Opportunities exist for students to draw on the courses and programs of study at both locations through online courses and/or periods of residence at either campus. Webber’s programs in Florida focus on the worldwide business environment, and emphasize development of skills in administration and strategic planning, applied modern business practices, and entrepreneurship. The St. Andrews branch campus in North Carolina offers an array of traditional liberal arts and sciences and pre-professional programs of study."

During the meeting, the JIPC members concluded that as an institution of higher learning, providing a life transforming educational opportunity is central to the University’s mission; therefore, focusing the QEP primarily on applied competencies and the development of life skills, particularly ethical decision making, is appropriate. Moreover, given the well-publicized failures of some of society's leaders to think critically during the ethical decision making process, the QEP topic was viewed as integral for the education of the next generation of the nation's decision-makers.

The JIPC, through the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research, also considered other relevant quantitative and qualitative data, discussed further in Section III, to determine the appropriateness of ethical decision making as a QEP topic. Quantitative data were derived from students’ performance in selected Ethics courses over several years. Their performance was assessed using faculty-designed rubrics to determine their ethical decision-making competence. For qualitative data, specific cases were reviewed and analyzed from academic affairs, athletic departments, and student life offices of both Webber campuses.

In summary, based on student, staff, and faculty input, verified through available institutional data, and with consideration for the University’s mission and relevance to the work environment, the topic of ethical decision making was selected as the University’s QEP topic.

Following determination of the QEP topic, a QEP Plan Development Disappearing Task Force (QEP Plan Development-DTF) was formed, with instructions to the faculty and staff members representing both campuses to familiarize themselves with the reaffirmation timeline and SACSCOC’s QEP guidelines. The concept of a DTF was implemented to facilitate institution-wide participation of staff in the QEP (see Appendix F for a March 8, 2015 e-mail from Dr. Wade providing explanation for the concept of a DTF and his instructions to the task force members). The DTF concept is based on the idea that each task force formed will have a finite set of tasks and timelines to complete its assigned tasks. Once the group completes the assigned tasks, members are disbanded and a new disappearing task force, consisting of a new set of members, will be formed. The roster of members of the QEP Plan Development Disappearing Task Force is found in Appendix G.

The QEP Plan Development-DTF’s organizational meeting was held on March 24, 2015. This meeting transitioned the institution’s QEP development process to Phase II.
Phase II: QEP Concept Development

During this phase of the QEP development, the QEP Plan Development-DTF, under the leadership of Dr. Charles Shieh, Chief Academic Officer, was charged with the following tasks:

1. Review and refine the rationale for the QEP;
2. Identify the student learning outcomes associated with the QEP;
3. Conduct a literature review to gain familiarity with the topic and identify available resources for implementing the QEP; and
4. Create an outline for the actions to implement the project.

In addition, the disappearing task force was assigned to identify a facilitation model that can be used as anchor for the acquisition of ethical decision making skills, and to research and propose evidence-based assessments to measure students’ achievements. Appendix H shows sample agenda of the QEP Plan Development Disappearing Task Force for their meetings last spring 2015. The DTF was also guided by a flowchart that depicted the QEP’s development and implementation process, enabling the DTF members to recognize and appreciate their role and assigned task for the QEP (see Appendix I).

It should be pointed out that after the disappearing task force’s organizational meeting on March 24, 2015, and its chair informed the JIPC of the team’s suggested titles for the QEP topic, the JIPC approved their recommendation, which included critical thinking in the topic (see Appendix J for e-mail regarding consideration for inclusion of critical thinking as part of the QEP). This resulted in a preliminary title that was developed for the QEP: Ethical Decision Making through Critical Thinking.

The QEP Plan Development-DTF’s work in spring 2015 yielded a draft of the QEP’s conceptual framework for implementation, which was presented to the JIPC. In particular, the task force suggested the following:

1) A Pre-test will be conducted on ALL incoming undergraduate students at the same time when the placement test is taken;
2) A Post-test will be conducted through the selected capstone courses in senior year;
3) Selected Gen Ed and major core courses will be identified as the best places to conduct QEP-related assessment; and
4) Co-curricular activities will not be used to assess students’ acquisition of ethical decision making and critical thinking skills. Instead, the planned activities will be used to enhance further the acquisition and development of ethical decision-making. Students will be required to participate in a certain number of co-curricular activities throughout their time at the University.

In developing this first draft, the QEP Plan Development-DTF considered a “sampling” design for the QEP’s assessments. However, after conducting a literature review, it was determined that this subject selection design was not the best approach for the University’s QEP. Thus, the QEP Plan Development-DTF did not adopt the “sampling” design in conducting assessments for the QEP.

The first draft was reviewed by the JIPC and feedback was provided to the QEP Plan Development-DTF. Feedback from the JIPC on the first draft of the QEP proposal included the following suggestions, as well as actions for consideration, to support each suggestion:

1) The outcome assessment of QEP will include ONLY the pre-test and the post-test. Student learning in selected Gen Ed and major core classes will not be included in the assessment design because the pre- and post-tests will satisfy the required QEP assessment. Courses taken will be for learning purposes, similar to participation in co-curricular activities. However, the implementation team will have to make sure that the
selected Gen Ed and major core courses will have the QEP learning topic included in course learning materials;
2) All incoming students—freshmen and transfers—will take the pre-test as part of the University’s QEP assessment. All graduating students will take the post-test in one of their capstone courses in their senior year;
3) Participations in co-curricular activities will be required; and
4) A monitoring program will be developed to ensure that students attending WIU will learn about “ethical decision making through critical thinking” by taking required classes AND participating in co-curricular activities before taking the post-test.

With consideration of the JIPC suggestions, the QEP Plan Development-DTF finalized the first draft of the QEP proposal on April 21, 2015. The University’s Board of Trustees members, who had been consistently apprised of the QEP topic and its development, discussed the draft’s conceptual framework during the board’s meeting in October 2015 (see Appendix K for an excerpt from one of the Board of Trustees meeting minutes).

Subsequently, a new DTF was formed in fall 2015: the QEP Final Version DTF, charged with refinement of the draft proposal and planning the implementation details for the QEP. The members of the QEP Final Version DTF are found in Appendix L. The QEP Plan Implementation-DTF’s work in fall 2015 yielded the final blueprint of Webber’s plan for the QEP’s implementation, which was presented to the JIPC for approval. In particular, the task force incorporated the following details to the conceptual framework that was developed previously:

1. **Narrowed focus of the QEP to ethical decision making:** In response to the JIPC’s recommendation, the QEP Final Version DTF task force members narrowed the focus of the QEP from ‘ethical decision making in combination with critical thinking’ to just ethical decision making. The JIPC members reconsidered the QEP topic and found that a combined ethical decision making and critical thinking initiative would be too challenging to manage due to its broad scope. In addition, the leadership team was concerned that the combined topic may constrain the University’s capacity and available resources to sustain the project over 5 years. However, despite narrowing its focus, the JIPC team members recommended that the DTF not completely eliminate the critical thinking component of the QEP as part of the strategy for students to develop ethical decision making (see Appendix M for excerpts from JIPC meeting and QEP Final Version Disappearing Task Force minutes).

2. **Revised literature review and use of the review to guide components of the implementation plan:** The QEP Final Version DTF expounded further the literature review, with increased emphasis on identifying a theoretical anchor in facilitating ethical decision making, and assessment strategies that can be applied to the QEP.

3. **Identified theoretical anchor for instructional strategies:** Through the literature review, the QEP Final Version DTF identified the “Integrative Model of Ethical Decision Making,” which combines critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and problem-solving in instructions, as a viable theoretical model that can be used to facilitate students’ acquisition and mastery of ethical decision making skills.

4. **Revised the pre- and post-test assessment design and identified a validated instrument to assess students’ learning outcomes:** Guided by the literature, the DTF identified two validated assessment instruments that could be used for the QEP: the Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric from the Association of American Colleges & Universities and the Defining Issues Test (Version 2) from the University of Alabama. The identification of the Defining Issues Test enabled the QEP Final Version DTF to revise the original pre- and post-test assessment plan for the QEP, which entails testing the students using faculty-
designed questions and having trained evaluators rate the students’ responses using an ethical decision making rubric that was created by the QEP Plan Development-DTF.

5. Detailed statements of expected QEP outcomes: The QEP Final Version DTF expanded on the originally proposed expected QEP outcomes, restated the outcomes in measurable terms, and aligned them with the identified assessment instruments.

6. Detailed curricular implementation plan: The QEP Final Version DTF added details to the academic/curricular component of the QEP’s implementation, breaking down the proposed activities into academic years and semesters.

7. Detailed co-curricular implementation plan: Similar to the curricular component, the QEP Final Version DTF added details to the co-curricular component of the QEP’s implementation, breaking down the proposed activities into academic years and semesters.

8. Created budget plan: With assistance from the VP of Business and Finance, the budget plan for the QEP’s implementation was developed. The breakdown of curricular and co-curricular activities into academic years and semesters facilitated the budget planning process.

9. Included a pre-QEP dissemination plan: The QEP Final Version DTF recognized the need for a broad-based participation of other stakeholders in the QEP. The QEP Final Version DTF capitalized on this need by creating a pre-QEP dissemination plan. The plan included activities to facilitate identification of an appropriate title for the QEP and branding.

After refinement and merging of ideas generated by the QEP Plan Development-DTF with those generated by the QEP Final Version DTF, and input from the JIPC, the current version of the QEP proposal came about. As outlined in the plan, the university is on track to start implementation of the QEP in fall 2016.
Section III: Identification of the Topic

As listed in Section II, multiple data sources were used to identify the relevance of the topic to students. These data consisted of:

A. Quantitative Data:

1. Data collected from MGT 321 (Business Ethics) course: This 3-credit hour course studies the ethical environment of business by isolating major current issues confronting decision makers. Students contend with decisions complicated by issues of legality, fairness and social responsibility, as well as personal conscience and consequential or duty based ethical issues in the course. The course utilizes discussions, research, and case analysis to achieve the goal of relating ethics to decision making. Table 1 depicts the percentages of students performing at each indicator level of the rubric.

Table 1. % of Students Ethical Decision Making Competency Levels by Course (N=100)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Competent</th>
<th>Effective</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3211-A (26)</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3211-B (26)</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3213-A (7)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
<td>14.20%</td>
<td>42.90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3213-B (7)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3213-A (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3213-B (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT321A-A (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT321B-A (4)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2015</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3213-A (9)</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT3213-B (9)</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:
Unacceptable- Intervention steps are brief and/or may not be appropriate.
Minimal- Intervention steps lack detail; important items that should be explained are missing or insufficient.
Competent- Intervention steps lack detail; instructor needs a more thorough plan.
Effective- Intervention steps are complete. Additional detail would be more beneficial.
Mastery- Explanation is detailed and complete.
Table 2 provides an extracted set of data to determine the actual number of students who performed below faculty expectation (i.e., at “Unacceptable” and “Minimal” levels). Using an instructor-designed rubric to assess students’ responses (N = 100) to ethical cases administered as part of final exams for spring 2013, fall 2014, summer 2015 and spring 2015, data analysis revealed that 31% of students demonstrated “Unacceptable” and “Minimal” ethical decision making skills (Table 2). Unacceptable level of ethical decision making for the courses is defined as “providing brief intervention and/or inappropriate intervention steps to address a dilemma.” Whereas, a minimal level of ethical decision making is defined as “providing intervention that lacks details and important items are missing or insufficient.”

Table 2. Percentage of Students Performing at “Unacceptable” and “Minimal” Levels of Ethical Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Minimal</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Rounded-off %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>16.12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total (n)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculations are based on (n) per section of the course

2. **Data collected from SBM 260 (Ethics and Issues in Sport Business Management) course:**
   This 3-credit hour course aims to: (a) promote critical self-evaluation of one’s own ethics and beliefs; (b) examine one’s philosophy, clarify values and refine any moral or ethical reasoning skills; and (c) examine ethical situations and issues within the sport environment. Through class discussions, projects, and debates, ethical issues and situations that affect sport managers are addressed in the course.

Table 3 provides a summary of the average percentage of students who demonstrated “Unacceptable” level of ethical decision making in the course over a 3-year period. Table 4 depicts the percentage of students who demonstrated “Unacceptable” level of ethical decision-making by topic area over the same period. Using an instructor-designed rubric to assess students’ responses (N = 153) to ethical cases administered as part of forum discussions during the course offerings in spring 2013, 2014, and 2015, data analysis revealed that on the average, 22.56% of students demonstrated “Unacceptable” level of ethical decision making skills (Table 3), with 26.51% of students demonstrating “Unacceptable” decision making for dilemmas pertaining to deviant behavior in sports and 24.61% for decision making regarding racial issues in sports (Table 4).
Table 3. Average % of Students Who Demonstrated “Unacceptable” Competency Level in Ethical Decision Making

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>% Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>22.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>21.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22.56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Average % of Students Who Demonstrated Unacceptable Competency Level in Ethical Decision Making by Topic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Topic</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business of Sport</td>
<td>20.63%</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
<td>19.97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Integrity Case Study</td>
<td>12.50%</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial Issues in Sport</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
<td>24.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deviant Behavior in Sport</td>
<td>30.16%</td>
<td>19.15%</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
<td>26.51%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A disaggregated and detailed raw data set that was used to calculate the data provided in Table 3 and Table 4 is presented in Appendix N.

3. **Data collected from alumni:** A 10-item survey (see Appendix O) was administered electronically to 136 alumni from the Florida and North Carolina campuses of Webber (33.0% return rate). The survey was designed to assess their perception of the level of importance of 10 job competencies on a 5-point Likert scale (with 5 being “Extremely Important” and 1 being “Not at all Important”). The listing of job competencies assessed in the survey was derived from lists of career readiness competencies generated by the National Association of Colleges and Employers and found to be essential work skills over several years.

Figure 1 illustrates the rank order of the job competencies based on the number of respondents who rated the competencies at a “5.” Of those who responded (N = 45), 80% of graduates ranked the ability to make ethical decisions as “Extremely Important,” followed by the ability to communicate verbally with people inside and outside an organization at 68.9%. Only 26.67% of respondents rated proficiency with computer software programs as “Extremely Important.” Appendix P presents an expanded data on the graduates’ perceptions of the level of importance for each of the 10 job competencies assessed in the survey.
4. **Data collected from the business community:** A 10-item survey (see Appendix Q) was administered electronically to 46 employers/board members of the Chamber of Commerce from Babson Park, Florida and Laurinburg, North Carolina communities (54.3% return rate). The survey was designed to assess their perception of the level of importance of 10 job competencies on a 5-point Likert scale (with 5 being “Extremely Important” and 1 being “Not at all Important”). The listing of job competencies assessed in the survey mirrored those that was used for the alumni survey.

Figure 2 illustrates the rank order of the job competencies based on the number of respondents who rated the competencies at a “5.” Of those who responded (N = 25), 92% of business representatives/employers ranked the ability to make ethical decisions as “Extremely Important,” followed by the ability to communicate verbally with people inside and outside an organization at 72%. Only 20% of respondents rated technical knowledge related to the job as “Extremely Important.” Appendix R presents an expanded data on the business representatives/employers’ perceptions of the level of importance for each of the 10 job competencies assessed in the survey.
**Figure 2.** Rank Order of Competencies Rated at Level “5” by Business Representatives/Employers (Expressed in %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies (Rank-Ordered)</th>
<th>% of N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Decisions (1)</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal Communication (2)</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teamwork (3)</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaptability (4)</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Structure (5)</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Planning (6)</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Processing (7)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem Solving (8)</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Skills (9)</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Related Technical Knowledge (10)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Qualitative Data:

1. While anecdotally no more prevalent than on any other college campus, Academic Affairs’ review of academic-related student cases received at both campuses revealed that plagiarism and cheating were the most predominant student issues referred for intervention over the most recent three years. In the area of cheating, students tended to use another student’s work for project reports or assignments.

2. The Athletics Department’s review of several cases involving student athletes that rose to the level of poor decision-making, based on the assessment of the coaches and athletic directors from both campuses revealed that student athlete’s poor decisions had heavy implications to their teams and the University. Three of these cases are presented below.

**Case 1: Falsified Information**

A student enrolled in the ESL program in the fall of 2013. He achieved an acceptable TOEFEL score in December 2013 and enrolled as a degree-seeking student in January of 2014. He met with the men’s soccer coach in late January 2014, indicated his interest in joining the team, and was told that he would have to go through the NAIA for a determination of eligibility.
The student submitted the necessary paperwork and was deemed eligible. He joined the team and played a number of games in the early 2014 soccer season. After a game at another school, I received a call from another A.D. informing me that a parent had done some background research on our player and discovered that the young man had played professional soccer in another country. An investigation by campus administrators and staff from the NAIA found the information to be true. The student had played professional soccer for several years before enrolling.

Further investigation revealed that the student did not truthfully complete the eligibility forms, which required him to fully disclose his athletic background. His poor ethical judgment resulted in the team forfeiting the games in which he played and him being banned from the NAIA. He will never be able to have any association with an NAIA program.

**Case 2: Withheld Information about Enrollment Status**

A female student withheld information pertaining to her class schedule and the number of hours in which she was enrolled. She was required to be a full-time student (12 hours) in order to compete. She knew the rule, but dropped a course which took her to part-time status. Her poor ethical decision making cost her a season of competition and resulted in the team forfeiting a large number of games.

**Case 3: Non-compliance with Eligibility Rules**

During the 2014-15 women’s basketball season, our women’s JV basketball team had a game scheduled at Hillsborough Community College in Tampa. The head JV basketball coach drove the squad to Tampa for the game. She had a total of seven girls, one of which was the team manager, who was a former player for Webber. Her eligibility was over, so she could not participate in any more basketball games. She worked as the team manager to continue her involvement in basketball and for scholarship reasons. For some reason, the coach took 7 uniforms with her and had the team manager dress in uniform and play. The former player obliged, without questioning the coach’s instructions.

The varsity head coach left after that team’s practice and drove to Tampa to watch the JV girls play. He arrived at the game in Tampa, about 15 minutes after the game had started. He saw the young lady playing.

The Athletic Trainer who traveled with the team reported the violation to his superior the next morning who, in turn, immediately reported the incident to the Athletics Director. After sanctioning the involved staff, the Athletics Director self-reported this incident to the NAIA national office. We were placed on one year probation by the NAIA.

3. The Student Life Deans’ review of cases received during the 2014-2015 AY revealed that the following incidences were found to be representative of students’ inability to demonstrate/apply ethical decision-making skills:

- A student electronically deposited his financial aid refund check into his bank account, then cashed it at a check-cashing facility. The student denied doing this for five days. On the fifth day the school’s attorney was able to determine that the refund check was cashed twice. The student eventually confessed.
- A student sold marijuana over a period of time to students on campus. The student confessed to doing this and gave up the names of all those he sold marijuana to.
• A student created a story wherein she entered her dorm room and was greeted by an intruder. She requested that local police officials be called to the scene. She recounted the story to the police who uncovered that the story was false. The student was arrested for making false statements to the police.

• A group of students took a video of a young teammate showering in the locker room after an athletic competition and posted the video on social media.

Although it appears that the quantitative data on students’ difficulty to master the theoretical constructs of ethical decision making is negligible, when these are analyzed with qualitative data, the far-reaching implications and impacts of students’ inability to appropriately apply ethical decision making in specific contexts cannot be underestimated. In many instances, the students’ poor decision making had an impact which went beyond the individual. Their athletic teams and the institution paid a price as well.

The DTF’s review of the literature revealed that ethical thinking is linked to critical thinking skills (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). Given a code of ethics from stated company policy, it is up to the individual to apply correct values, to ‘do what is right’, and to ascertain the proper direction of a decision that has ethical implications. The apparent lack of critical thinking skills as applies to ethical decision making is fairly rampant in business, where the limits and grey areas are stretched to make questionable decisions somewhat acceptable (Welker & Berardino, 2013). This conclusion may help explain the decisions made by students when they were faced with ethical dilemmas.

It also appears that although a majority of Webber students demonstrate cognitive mastery of ethical decision making at the end of a course, as evident in the students’ success in MGT 321 and SBM 260, they still struggle to apply their critical thinking skills within the context of ethical decision making, inside and outside the classroom, resulting in the sample cases presented as qualitative data for the QEP. As Meisel and Fearon (2006) stated, assuming you know an outcome when it really deserves critical thinking usually results in bad consequences.

Developing critical thinking skills and their ability to apply it within the context of ethical decision making is paramount to the success of students in pursuing their desired vocations and in their success. Aside from the links between the chosen QEP topic and the University’s mission, the topic’s relevance to the work environment, as described by data evidence from business entities and alumni strengthened further the need for Webber students to acquire and develop ethical decision making.
Section IV: Desired Student Learning Outcomes

Goals and Objectives

The QEP has two overarching goals/expected outcomes and eight supporting measurable objectives. The objectives are meant to serve as indicators for achievement of each goal. Although discussed in details under Section VIII: Assessment Plan, a brief description of associated assessment strategies are included in this section to provide an overview of how achievement of the learning outcomes will be monitored and determined.

The QEP’s goals and objectives are:

**Goal 1:** Students will use ethical knowledge and concepts in resolving an ethical dilemma.

**Objective 1.1:** Students will demonstrate ethical self-awareness, as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Ethical Self-Awareness indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

**Objective 1.2:** Students will demonstrate understanding of different ethical perspectives/concepts, as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

**Objective 1.3:** Students will recognize ethical issues, as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Ethical Issue Recognition indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

**Objective 1.4:** Students will apply ethical perspectives/concepts, as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

**Objective 1.5:** Students will evaluate different ethical perspective/concepts, as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

**Assessment Strategy:** Participating students will be assessed using the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric developed by the American Association of Colleges and Universities every semester. The rubric will be distributed to all instructors of courses designated as QEP courses and they will be provided guidance on how to use the rubric (see Appendix S for a list of courses selected for the QEP). At the end of every semester, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research will collect the rubrics and compile the data. At the end of every academic year, data will be analyzed and a report generated on the status of each of the stated objectives.

**Goal 2:** Students will demonstrate improvements in their ability to use their ethical decision making skills to address ethical dilemmas

**Objective 2.1:** Seventy percent (70%) of students will demonstrate improvements in their ethical decision making as indicated by their pre- and post-test scores comparisons

**Assessment Strategy:** A pre- and post-test design will be used to assess achievement of the objective. Participating freshman students will be assessed during their orientation week at the University using the Defining Issues Test (Version 2). Their scores will be recorded and tracked...
using an internally-developed student tracking system. Prior to their graduation, the students will be retested using the same test. Their pre- and post-test scores will be compared and analyzed to determine improvements in their ethical decision making skills.

**Objective 2.2:** Seventy percent (70%) of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events will reflect self-awareness in their evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts

**Objective 2.3:** Seventy percent (70%) of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events will express that the events are effective in facilitating their understanding of ethical decision making

**Assessment Strategy:** Every semester, students will be required to attend specific QEP-designated co-curricular activities. After each activity, the activity facilitators will administer a student survey to: a) to gather qualitative data that would provide indication of students’ self-awareness in their evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts and b) ascertain the effectiveness of the activity in facilitating the students’ understanding of ethical decision making. At the end of every semester, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research will collect the surveys and compile the data. At the end of every academic year, data will be analyzed and a report generated on the status of each of the stated objectives.

**QEP Implementation and Monitoring Evaluation**

In addition to the desired learning outcomes, expressed as QEP goals and objectives, there are three implementation and monitoring evaluation mechanisms that will be embedded in the QEP. These evaluative mechanisms will ensure that critical elements of the implementation plan are monitored, assessed, and modified accordingly and in a timely manner. The implementation and monitoring evaluation mechanisms are expressed in question form, which facilitates the collection of both quantitative and qualitative information. These questions are:

**Item #1:** To what extent do the QEP courses in general education and the academic disciplines support the achievement of the QEP student learning outcomes?

**Assessment Strategy:** Expert review of the course materials by the QEP Curriculum Committee to ensure that the QEP-designated courses incorporate learning objectives, instructions/activities, and assessments that facilitate students’ acquisition and development of ethical decision making skills. Course materials, such as syllabi, will be examined prior to the start of the QEP’s implementation, every semester that a QEP-designated course gets offered (or revised), and whenever a faculty who teaches a non-QEP designated course wishes to incorporate the topic of ethical decision-making in his/her course.

**Item #2:** To what extent do students perceive that they are learning and integrating ethical decision making skills in the QEP general education and academic discipline courses?

**Assessment Strategy:** Students’ responses on four Reflective and Integrative Learning items on the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) will be used to assess students’ perceptions of the extent they integrate ethical decision making skills as part of their coursework and educational experience at Webber International University. The four items are Items 2b, 2c, 2d, and 2e.
Item #3: What “best practices” have emerged from the QEP faculty and co-curricular activities and what suggestions do they have for improving the QEP-related instructions and co-curricular activities?

Assessment Strategies:

a) **QEP Faculty:** During designated faculty meetings, an agenda item for the meeting will include a forum or “sharing” from QEP faculty members on some of the “best practices” that they would have discovered and/or implemented in their courses as part of the QEP. In addition, faculty suggestions on how QEP-related instructions can be improved will be a part of these forums/discussions.

b) **Co-curricular Activities:** At the end of each activity, facilitators will administer a survey to ascertain the effectiveness of the activity in facilitating students’ understanding of ethical decision making. The survey results will assist the co-curricular activities facilitators to identify what worked well and any desired improvements for future events. Students’ attendance in the events will be a part of this assessment monitoring process.
Section V: Literature Review and Best Practices

Introduction

Graduates of institutions of higher education will be faced with many professional issues or problems, especially in the context of today’s ever changing society. Therefore, several scholars in the field of education note that institutions of higher education (IHEs) have an obligation to ensure that graduates are able to think critically and make ethical decisions (Newton, 2001). Colleges and universities play a vital role in the education of students in ethics and responsible citizenship (Thomson, 2011). Most notably, questionable business practices in the United States in recent years have caused many in society to question whether there is training in ethical conduct in a student’s coursework at an IHE (Baltosky & Steingard, 2006). Thomson (2011) explains that active learning strategies are needed in the 21st century classroom to “increase students’ competencies in ethical decision making and ethical leadership” (p. 74). Specifically, she suggests faculty members should incorporate an integrative model of ethical decision making that includes “good conversations” (Thomson, 2011, p. 74).

“Good conversations,” or arguments, also require critical thinking as a higher order thinking skill. Critical thinking is a “high-order thinking skill that assist[s] leaders, scholars, and practitioners in higher education in the formation of sound reasoning” (Thomson, 2011, p. 78). At “the core of critical thinking is a combination of cognitive skills and affective dispositions” (Meisel & Fearon, 2006, p. 154). Cognitive skills are a student’s ability to interpret, analyze, evaluate, infer and explain. Affective dispositions include inquisitiveness, concern to become and remain self-informed, alertness to opportunities to use critical thinking, confidence in one’s ability to reason, and open mindedness. In addition, it also refers to a student’s ability to be honest in facing his or her own biases and a willingness to reconsider and revise views where change is warranted (Facione, 2013). Students will need to use critical thinking skills in order to make ethical decisions. Ethics provides standards for behavior that help students decide how they should act in a variety of situations. Ethical decision making within the context of critical thinking enables students to make choices and provide reasons why they should make those choices (Bonde & Firenze, 2013). A commitment to an ethical way of thinking can provide the self-possession that makes critical thinking possible. Training in critical thinking provides the conscientious command of logic that guides ethical thinkers to valid conclusions.

Ethical Decision Making

In Sharp’s study, (as cited in Welker & Berardino, 2013), ethics can be defined as a code of behavior that restricts self-interest for the greater long term good of society. For students, ethical reasoning or decision making requires them to judge the right and wrong of human conduct (Welker & Berardino, 2013). Conflicts between individual differences make ethical decisions difficult and complex (Welker & Berardino, 2013). Students develop their own ethics and integrity long before they enter an IHE. In college, students should be challenged to continue to develop their own ethics but also develop professional ethics and integrity in order to be prepared to become professionals after graduation (Templin & Christensen, 2009). In an ever changing society, students must be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, understand how to apply different perspectives, and to consider the consequences of different actions (Welker & Berardino, 2013).

Bonde and Firenze (2013) identified two broad types of ethical theory: non-consequentialist and consequentialist. Non-consequentialist theories are broadly concerned with the intentions of the person making ethical decisions about particular choices. Consequentialist theories are primarily concerned with the ethical consequences of particular actions (Bonde & Firenze, 2013). In addition, Bonde and Firenze
(2013) also identified a specific arrangement of ethics into three different areas. Meta-ethics is defined as inquiry into the nature of right or good and the nature and justification of ethical claims. Normative ethics is defined as the standards and principles used to determine whether something is good or right. Finally, applied ethics is putting meta-ethics and normative ethics into practice (Bonde & Firenze, 2013).

Several models for ethical decision making exist. The American Counseling Association (ACA) presented a general outline for its model of ethical decision making, which was described by Forester-Miller and Davis (2015). The ACA-based ethical decision making model that Foster-Miller and Davis (2015) presented is composed of the following seven elements/steps:

1. Identify the problem
2. Apply the ACA Code of Ethics
3. Determine the nature and dimensions of the dilemma
4. Generate potential courses of action
5. Consider the potential consequences of all options, choose a course of action
6. Evaluate the selected course of action
7. Implement the course of action

In order for students to make ethical decisions, they must have a framework for ethical decision making (Bonde & Firenze, 2013). Individual variables that affect a student’s decision making include nationality, religion, gender, and personality (Ford & Richardson, 1994). A student’s ethical self-identity evolves as he or she practices ethical decision making skills and learns how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues (Bonde & Firenze, 2013). Various ethical learning and problem solving models exist and many are applicable to IHEs. Broadly speaking, ethical decision making is meant to help students identify the most important ethical considerations. A series of five questions can help guide students in ethical decision making. These questions are:

- What benefits and what harms will each action produce?
- Which alternative will lead to the best overall consequences?
- What moral rights do the affected parties have and which course of action best respects those rights?
- Which course of action treats everyone the same and does not show favoritism or discrimination?
- Which course of action advances the common good? (Velasquez, Andre, Shanks, & Meyer, n.d.).

Further exploration on the contexts of each of these five questions and other models of ethical decision making revealed that there are five innate steps in making ethical decisions. These steps are:

1. **Define the problem and collect the relevant facts.** What is the situation in which you believe there might be an ethical dilemma? Is there some aspect of the situation that “smells” bad? What are the facts and other factors related to the situation? Include both facts stated inside the problem as well as universal facts that are not specifically stated in the problem. Does the situation involve a profession in which there are professional codes of conduct? Are there constraints that could influence the ethical decision? Who are the stakeholders?

2. **Identify feasible options.** List the possible options in solving the ethical question. Be specific and provide details in your options. Do not say “yes, do it” or “no, do not do it.” What facts or relevant factors relate to each option? What would be the goal of each option?

3. **Assess the effect of each option on stakeholders.**
4. **Test each option.** Establish criteria for the selection of which tests are most appropriate in choosing the best option. Possible tests include:

a. **Harm or Consequences Test:** Identify the level of harm or the lack of harm in each option. Which option has the least amount of consequences?

b. **Publicity or Front Page Test:** If made known to the general public, what would be the general response from most people?

c. **Defensibility Test:** Would you be able to defend the option through a logical discussion?

d. **Reversibility or Role Model Test:** If the roles were reversed, would I still believe this option was a good option?

e. **Colleague or Advisory Group Test:** How would representatives of a society or organization respond to the option?

f. **Organization Test:** Does the organization or society have specified rules or laws related to the option?

g. **Virtue Test:** How would a moral or virtuous person respond to the option?

h. **Mirror or Reciprocity Test:** What do you see in yourself when thinking about the option?

i. **Universality Test:** Would the option be an appropriate standard for all people at all times?

j. **Rights of the Stakeholder or Common Good Test:** For those who have the most to lose (or gain), are the rights of these people being protected by this option? For these people, how does the option affect the quality of life?

k. **The Religion Test:** Based on a person’s religious beliefs, would the action be appropriate or acceptable?

l. **The Conscience Test:** Does my conscience indicate whether something is wrong?

m. **Test of Moral Traces:** Is the option more expedient compared to other options? Do I receive a benefit from my decision? Is this option the politically correct option?

n. **Business Ethics Test:** Does this option provide a balance between meeting the needs of the customer as well as meeting the needs of the company or organization?

o. **Legality Test:** Is the option legal?

5. **Select the best option.** Identify why you selected that option. Relate the discussion back to the results of the testing of the options and the effect on the stakeholders.

Training in critical thinking enables persons to compose accurate and valid questions like those above and to answer them in a satisfactory manner. Critical thinking refers to the use of cognitive skills or strategies that increase the probability of a desirable outcome (Fahim & Masouleh, 2012). It is reasonable, reflective thinking focused on deciding what to do or believe (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). Using critical thinking skills enables learners to be able to identify biases in their own judgments. Thomson (2011) states critical thinking also enables learners to uphold their moral principles even in conditions of uncertainty, time constraints, or information overload. Others have also defined critical thinking as the application of the scientific method to real world problems (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). As Meisel and Fearon (2006) stated, “Ethical intent will be supported, strengthened, and informed through the increased use of critical thinking in management education,” (p. 151).

One group of researchers noted that in higher education, the idea is that specific reasoning skills or strategies undergird the curriculum as a whole (Fahim & Masouleh, 2006). Allegretti and Frederick (1995), explained (as cited in Behar-Horenstein & Niu, 2011), using critical thinking helps students evaluate the arguments of others and their own, resolve conflicts, and come to well-reasoned resolutions to complex problems. Behar-Horenstein and Niu (2011), described critical thinking as being intellectually engaged. It is the skillful and responsible thinking that facilitates good judgment. They also stated that critical thinking skills require self-correction, monitoring to judge the reasonableness of thinking, and reflexivity (Behar-Horenstein & Niu, 2011).
Facilitating Ethical Decision Making

Professors without training in philosophy or psychology can benefit by studying the Kohlberg Model, which spans 25 years of research on ethical decision making (Welker & Berardino, 2013). The Kohlberg model approaches the development of a moral base from a psychological viewpoint and asserts that moral development occurs along a hierarchical ladder on how reasoning relates to judgment and the resulting behavior (Welker & Berardino, 2013). In addition, the model of integrative ethical decision making suggests on-going “good conversations” which can be facilitated in classroom interactions (Thomson, 2011). A six step method, this model has students use critical thinking skills, moral reasoning, and “good conversations” to transition towards an effective resolution (Thomson, 2011). According to Thomson (2011), the application of the Integrative Model of Ethical Decision Making contributed to the discussion of ethical dilemmas and the use of critical thinking skills, moral reasoning, and dialogical approaches to problem solving.

According to Meisel and Fearon (2006), either a specific course or courses throughout the curriculum can educate students to make ethically valid decisions. In addition, the Ethics Education Task Force also noted that administrators create a climate of ethical behavior throughout the institution with codes of conduct “encouraged to indicate the importance of proper behavior for administrators, faculty and students in their professionalism and personal actions” (as cited in Meisel & Fearon, 2006, p. 150). Templin and Christensen (2009) used a combination of lecture, cases, and course specific vignettes to generate discussions in order to improve students’ awareness of ethical issues. Further, self-reflective essays and stories of moral exemplars were used to help students increase their resolve to have the moral courage to make ethical choices. However, Welker and Berardino (2013) cautioned that raising ethical awareness among students should not be interpreted as passing judgment on the ethical decisions made by students.

Rather than prescribing a set model for critical thinking, several researchers instead provided a set of guidelines. For example, Sternberg (as cited in Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011) gave general guidelines for developing or selecting a curriculum that will foster critical thinking. Chief among his recommendations (as cited in Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011) is that instructors focus on students’ “instructional components, performance components, and knowledge-acquisition strategies” (p. 26). The researchers also cited Lipman in their explanation of how to facilitate critical thinking. Lipman (as cited in Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011) did not specify a how-to approach, but he distinguished between ordinary and critical thinking. According to Lipman (as cited in Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011), ordinary thinking is too simplistic as it does not rely upon the use of standards or criteria. Rather, critical thinking is a complex process of self-correcting and based on standards of objectivity that requires evidence.

To facilitate the development of critical thinking skills in the classroom, Lipman’s recommendations (as cited in Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011) included professors model for students how to define and clarify information, ask appropriate questions, clarify or challenge statements or beliefs, judge the credibility of sources, and to solve problems by predicting probable outcomes through logical deduction. Further, Behar-Hortonstein and Niu (2011) recommended a general instructional approach, not specific to course subject matter. In this manner, educators can teach critical thinking regardless of the subject matter (Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011). The researchers also noted the importance of knowing specifically how the instructor introduces and presents materials, facilitates learning, and uses formative and summative assessments of learning (Behar-Hortonstein & Niu, 2011). Critical thinking tools would enable students to dismantle and resolve ethical problems under controlled conditions.

Similarly, this idea is reinforced by Fahim and Masouleh (2012). To help students develop strong critical thinking skills, the researchers recommended a set of strategies which can be implemented across
the curriculum. First, students should be taught how to annotate a text; then, students should preview the text. Finally, students should contextualize the text (Fahim & Masouleh, 2012). Also, it was found helpful for instructors to use the Socratic Method to help students voice their words. Specifically, Fahim and Masouleh (2012) cited the Socratic questions of getting students to clarify their thinking, challenging students about assumptions, getting students to consider alternative viewpoints or perspectives, and finally helping students to question the question as the most important Socratic question.

Assessing Ethical Decision Making

In order for an IHE to assess the growth of a student’s ethical decision making, the student must first gain an awareness of ethical dilemmas. Students must be able to recognize that ethical dilemmas do arise in their personal and professional lives and must be addressed (Newton, 2001). Then, students must be equipped with the reasoning and reflective skills to know how to analyze information into components and to apply whatever system of ethics they may have learned to its resolution (Newton, 2001).

In one study, researchers used a pre- and post-essay design to assess the level of development regarding students’ ethical decision making (Newton, 2001). Essays were judged on the basis of maturity, objectivity, and prudence on the basis of arguments chosen and phrased by the students (Newton, 2001). Another institution used exit interviews with graduating seniors to infuse qualitative analysis (Templin & Christensen, 2009). In addition, the institution used the Defining Issues Test (Version 2). It measures an individual’s level of ethical judgment, then, based on the answers, categorizes a respondent into one of Kohlberg’s three levels. Students were given a pre- and post-test (freshman and senior year) in specific courses (Templin & Christensen, 2009). Results of the pre- and post-tests were analyzed using a paired t-test with an alpha of .05 (Templin & Christensen, 2009).

Given the importance of critical thinking to making valid ethical decisions, some measurement of student skill in critical thinking is suggested. Testing services provide a number of usable tests. In a review of studies teaching critical thinking skills in post-secondary institutions, Behar-Horenstein and Niu (2011) reported three major critical thinking test measures, the Cornell Critical Thinking Test, the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal-FS and the California Critical Thinking Skills Test. The researchers stated that the most commonly cited reason for using these standardized tests is that they were widely used and that experts had established their reliability and validity (Behar-Horenstein & Niu, 2011). Similarly, the Proficiency Profile Test (PPT), administered by the Educational Testing Service (ETS, n.d.), is a widely-used assessment instrument and it assesses four core skill areas: Critical Thinking, Reading, Writing, and Mathematics. The studies reviewed by Behar-Horenstein and Niu (2011) demonstrated the importance of using more than one measure, both qualitative and quantitative, to assess changes in students’ critical thinking. Increasingly, colleges and universities are using standardized assessment outcomes to evaluate student learning. A critical issue faced by many IHEs is the ability to provide evidence of student learning that is comparable across institutions (Liu, 2011). The PPT provides such assessment evidence.

Peach, Mukherjee, and Hornyak (2007), researchers at the University of West Florida, implemented an assessment system designed to assess critical thinking as one of their student learning outcomes in the university’s college of business. Kurfiss (as cited in Peach et al., 2007), stated that critical thinking was necessary for solving “unstructured problems” with no single correct answer. Further, the researchers explained that this is precisely what a case analysis entails. The written responses of students were assessed using a common rubric, and the researchers reported that faculty standardization in applying the rubric was satisfactory (Peach et al., 2007). In the development of the rubric, the researchers reported that while books and consultants are available, it is best for the instructors who will use the rubric to develop one that captures their learning outcomes in a way that is most useful and meaningful to them (Peach et al., 2007).
Conclusion

Ethical decision making requires students to think critically because the objectivity of critical thinking will inevitably require the thinkers to make judgments costly to themselves. The discipline requires the thinker to keep his or her own needs and obligations in the moral equation, and a person can find him or herself morally in debt. Dispassionate critical thought will demand payment regardless of personal interest. Typically, an ethical decision does not necessarily arise with a sense of urgency.

Meisel and Fearon (2006) explained that there is usually time available to consider alternate actions and possible consequences. Further, this is where critical thinking adds to, and informs, a person’s ethical analysis (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). Specifically, Meisel and Fearon (2006) explained why ethical decision making must include critical thinking. A decision to act in an ethical manner is best made when paired with reasonable, reflective thinking focused on deciding what to believe or do (critical thinking) (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). Again, it is important for graduates from IHEs to have these skills because of the perceived (and sometimes actual) gap between the values espoused in education and the behavior of those who are graduates of IHEs (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). Strengthening a student’s critical thinking skills relates to higher education’s goal of building responsible citizens. As Behar-Horenstein and Niu (2006) stated, “An increasingly complex society requires individuals to base their judgment and decisions on careful evaluation of evidence” (p. 25). By helping students develop this skillset, while engaged in academic learning, they are able to engage in purposeful, self-regulatory judgment (Behar-Horenstein & Niu, 2006). In addition, the rigor of academic work in IHEs requires students to use higher order thinking such as the ability to apply critical evaluation and give evidence for their opinions (Fahim & Masouleh, 2012). Specifically, Fahim and Masouleh (2012) explained that the ability to think critically is a quality sought by employers of university graduates.

Moreover, Meisel and Fearon (2006) said that recent events in corporate America suggest that some executives lack some of the skills and dispositions of critical thinking. The researchers noted the almost equal concern that corporate America often accepts this behavior as normal or even as good business (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). This additional and equal concern also suggests a lack of skill in ethical decision making. These real world examples further reinforce the necessity for IHEs to educate their students in both ethical decision making and critical thinking. According to these researchers, most business decisions are complex and not a matter of just one choice over another: students often need complex thinking to resolve their ethical decisions (Meisel & Fearon, 2006). The situations our students will face in the corporate world will be similar—complex and multidimensional—and will thus require strong critical thinking and ethical decision making skills. As Meisel and Fearon (2011) stated, “The pairing of ethical training and critical thinking is one path to this goal [authenticity of action]” (p. 162).
Section VI: Implementation Plan

Webber’s implementation plan of the QEP was guided by the literature in the selection of strategies to facilitate acquisition and development of ethical decision making and the assessment of the QEP’s outcomes. In particular, curricular activities will be implemented in QEP-designated courses. These courses consist of several general education courses and at least two courses for every major offered at each of the Webber campuses. Co-curricular activities are also planned to serve as the “lab” for the students, enabling them to supplement what they are learning in the classroom with student life-related activities, where they can apply further their ethical decision making skills.

To ensure appropriate execution of the plan, two teams/committees will be organized. The QEP Leadership Team will be charged with the overall implementation of the plan, whereas the QEP Curriculum Committee will be in charge of providing faculty training and guidance in instructional design and assessments, in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research. Use of this committee/team structure will also facilitate cross-campus collaboration and problem-solving throughout the QEP implementation process.

With a target implementation timeline of fall 2016, both the curricular and co-curricular components of the plan will be pre-empted by a Pre-QEP Implementation Period (spring-summer 2016). This period will be used to further disseminate the QEP’s implementation plan throughout the university, involving students in the process. In addition, other logistics considerations are planned to be put in place and finalized during this period.

The planned activities for the curricular and o-curricular components of the QEP are outlined below.

Curricular Activities Plan

Spring Semester 2016 / Pre-QEP Implementation Period

1) The University’s leadership team will identify the chair and the members of the QEP Leadership Team to oversee the implementation of the QEP and to provide support throughout the QEP.

2) The University’s leadership team, in conjunction with the faculty and staff, will identify the lead and members of the QEP Curriculum Committee. The members will be faculty and/or staff from both campuses who possess skills and experience in teaching ethical decision making, background in curricular and instructional design, and good written communications skills.

3) The QEP Leadership Team will implement the QEP Dissemination Plan (see Appendix T), which is aimed at communicating to the faculty, staff, and students at both campuses the QEP topic and its implementation process, including timelines.

4) As part of the dissemination plan, a university-wide QEP Kick-off Event will be held involving faculty, staff, and students at both WIU campuses. The event will include a student-driven “branding” competition for the QEP. The winning logo in the competition will be incorporated in the succeeding components of the QEP Dissemination Plan, and throughout the 5-year implementation of the plan.

5) At the middle of the semester, the QEP Leadership Team will ask faculty of the QEP-designated courses to assess the content of the courses that s/he teaches. When a course is taught by more than one professor, those professors will consult with each other to conduct the assessment. The faculty
will ascertain if the course(s) include relevant topics of discussion on ethical decision making. In addition, instructional and learning assessment activities will also be assessed to ascertain that the QEP-designated courses are aligned with the QEP goals and objectives. The following objective will also be added to the course’s objectives:

“In support of the QEP, the student will develop or enhance skills in the process of ethical decision making and apply those skills in formulating a feasible solution to an ethical dilemma.”

6) The QEP Leadership Team, in collaboration with the QEP Curriculum Committee, will schedule a training session for the QEP faculty. During the training, the faculty will be issued the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. They will be instructed on the appropriate use of the rubric and in the selection of the best student artifacts that can be assessed using the rubric.

7) The QEP Leadership Team will assign the responsibility for the development of a Microsoft Access database for the storage, management, and analysis of the data collected in the QEP. The individual’s responsibilities will include:

a) Design and build the following tables for the storage of the QEP and related data:
   i) Basic student information required for the QEP
   ii) Results of the Ethical decision making pre- and post-test. The database must provide an easy indication as to whether the results are pre- or post-test data. The data will also include both the test term and date.
   iii) Students’ scores from the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. Because several of the measureable outcomes are based on individual areas within the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, the scores received by students in each indicator areas must be stored – not just the total score. The data will also include the term, date of data collection, and the type of artifact used to assess the students.

b) When data can be digitally transferred from another source, build the processes and procedures to import the data.

c) When data cannot be digitally transferred from another source, design and build forms to provide efficient and effective entry of the data.

d) Design and build queries and reports to analyze the results of the QEP data and report the results.

e) Develop the steps of instruction on how to use the database program, and provide training to the individual who will be doing data entry on its use.

8) The QEP Curriculum Committee members will:

a) Attend a workshop or conference on ethics to gather ideas pertaining to appropriate instructional strategies in facilitating acquisition and development of ethical decision making skills

b) Organize a workshop, led by an expert in the field of ethics, offered to participating faculty from both campuses. The workshop will be hosted in the Florida campus.

c) Develop a Student Training Manual on Ethical Decision Making that describes the steps of ethical decision making, review of the different evaluation areas of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, and sample responses representing each level of proficiency in the rubric. Committee members will also provide training to the faculty teaching the QEP-designated courses or those who wish to use the Student Training Manual on Ethical Decision Making and/or build an ethical decision making test item for their courses.
9) The QEP Leadership Team will edit the catalog at both institutions to include a description of the QEP.

10) The QEP Leadership Team will supervise the process of developing a letter or packet that will be provided to all new incoming students describing the QEP and how it relates to the new student. The title for the packet will be *The New Student and the QEP*.

11) The pre-test is not critical to be administered during the orientation week in the Florida Campus. However, in the North Carolina Campus, the orientation week is the best time to administer the pre-test due to scheduling and student participation issues in activities that they have encountered in the past. The QEP Leadership Team will schedule a time on both campuses to administer the pre-test during the fall and spring semesters. In addition, the QEP Leadership Team/Person will identify those who will administer the pre-test.

QEP Year 1: 2016-2017 Academic Year

1) During orientation, the QEP Leadership Team will distribute *The New Student and the QEP* document to each new incoming student and discuss the relevance of the QEP to the student’s educational experience at WIU.

2) Ethical Decision Making Pre-test: Defining Issues Test-2 (DIT-2) Administration

   a) On a specified day (during the second week of the semester for Florida and first week of orientation for North Carolina), all new freshman students will take the DIT-2 pre-test. The QEP Leadership Team will identify those who will administer and proctor the test.

   b) The Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research will coordinate the gathering of participants’ pre-test scores and provide them to the QEP Leadership Team. The scores will be recorded into the QEP database. The QEP Leadership Team will verify that the scores are properly entered.

3) All courses identified in Appendix S as a freshman-level course, will include an instructional activity on ethical decision-making. The faculty will assess the students’ understanding of the concepts discussed in class using the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. Students’ work (i.e., writing assignment, discussion board postings, presentations, etc.) will be rated using the rubric. The “final” rubrics that would be used to assess the students’ ethical decision making skill will be collected at the end of the semester and turned in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research. Students’ scores will be entered in the database for analysis and reporting.

4) The QEP Curriculum Committee will analyze the results and determine whether changes are required to the measurable objectives, the evaluation rubric, instructional strategies, or faculty support/training.

5) No post-test will be administered during this year.

6) During one of the designated faculty meetings (one in the fall and one in the spring semester), the QEP Leadership Team will participate in the agenda to facilitate a forum or “sharing” from QEP faculty members on some of the “best practices” that they had discovered and/or implemented in their courses as part of the QEP in Year 1. In addition, “lessons learned” from Year 1 and faculty suggestions on how QEP-related instructions can be improved will be a part of these forums/discussions and will inform the implementation plan and any needed modifications for Year
2.

7) In setting up the next year’s academic calendar, the QEP Leadership Team will schedule times on both campuses during the designated weeks of the fall and spring semesters for the students to take the DIT-2 pre-test.

**QEP Year 2: 2017-2018 Academic Year**

1) Activities 1 through 4, as outlined in Year 1, will be implemented.

2) The QEP Leadership Team will invite a speaker on the topic of ethical decision making. The event will be made available to faculty, staff, and students of both campuses and will be hosted in the North Carolina campus.

3) No post-test will be administered during this year.

4) During one of the designated faculty meetings (one in the fall and one in the spring semester), the QEP Leadership Team will participate in the agenda to facilitate a forum or “sharing” from QEP faculty members on some of the “best practices” that they had discovered and/or implemented in their courses as part of the QEP in Year 2. In addition, “lessons learned” from Year 2 and faculty suggestions on how QEP-related instructions can be improved will be a part of these forums/discussions and will inform the implementation plan and any needed modifications for Year 3.

**QEP Year 3: 2018-2019 Academic Year**

1) Activities 1 and 2, as outlined in Year 1, will be implemented.

2) All courses identified in Appendix S will include an instructional activity on ethical decision-making. Faculty who teach a capstone course will create a list of several possible ethical dilemmas or situations that are contextualized within the student’s major. The QEP Curriculum Committee will assist the capstone faculty in creating scenarios and aligning the assessments of students’ performance with the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric indicators.

3) The faculty will assess the students’ understanding of the concepts discussed in class using the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. Students’ work (i.e., writing assignment, discussion board postings, presentations, etc.) will be rated using the rubric. The “final” rubrics that would be used to assess the students’ ethical decision making skill will be collected at the end of the semester and turned in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research. Students’ scores will be entered in the database for analysis and reporting.

4) The QEP Curriculum Committee will analyze the results and determine whether changes are required to the measurable objectives, the evaluation rubric, instructional strategies, or faculty support/training.

5) The QEP Curriculum Committee will participate in a conference or workshop on ethics/ethical decision-making. Information gained from the workshop will be shared with faculty and staff via in-service formats in both campuses.
6) No post-test will be administered during this year. However, in setting up the next year’s academic calendar, the **QEP Leadership Team** will schedule times on both campuses during the spring semester for the graduating students to take the DIT-2 post-test.

7) During one of the designated faculty meetings (one in the fall and one in the spring semester), the **QEP Leadership Team** will participate in the agenda to facilitate a forum or “sharing” from QEP faculty members on some of the “best practices” that they had discovered and/or implemented in their courses as part of the QEP in Year 2. In addition, “lessons learned” from Year 3 and faculty suggestions on how QEP-related instructions can be improved will be a part of these forums/discussions and will inform the implementation plan and any needed modifications for Year 4.

**QEP Year 4: 2019-2020 Academic Year**

1) Activities 1 and 2, as outlined in Year 1, will be implemented.

2) All courses identified in Appendix S will include an instructional activity on ethical decision-making. Faculty who teach a capstone course will create a list of several possible ethical dilemmas or situations that are contextualized within the student’s major. Those capstone course faculty who participated in Year 3 will continue refining their scenarios and assessment strategies, based on results from the previous cycle. The **QEP Curriculum Committee** will assist the capstone faculty in creating scenarios, refining them, and aligning the assessments of students’ performance with the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric indicators.

3) The faculty will assess the students’ understanding of the concepts discussed in class using the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. Students’ work (i.e., writing assignment, discussion board postings, presentations, etc.) will be rated using the rubric. The “final” rubrics that would be used to assess the students’ ethical decision making skill will be collected at the end of the semester and turned in the **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research**. Students’ scores will be entered in the database for analysis and reporting.

4) Ethical Decision Making Post-test: Defining Issues Test-2 (DIT-2) Administration

   a) On a specified day (during the Spring semester), graduating students who were admitted in the fall term of the 2016-2017 Academic Year will take the DIT-2 post-test. **The QEP Leadership Team** will identify those who will administer and proctor the test.

   b) The **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research** will coordinate the gathering of participants’ post-test scores and provide them to the **QEP Leadership Team**. The scores will be recorded into the QEP database. **The QEP Leadership Team** will verify that the scores are properly entered.

   c) The **QEP Leadership Team**, in collaboration with the **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research** will analyze the results of the post-test to determine level of achievement of Objective 2.1. A comparison of the students’ pre- and post-test scores will be made to determine if the changes in their scores, if any are significant.

5) From the gathered rubrics and post-test results, the **QEP Curriculum Committee** will study the data and determine whether changes are required to the measurable objectives, the evaluation rubric, instructional strategies, or faculty support/training.
6) In setting up the next year’s academic calendar, the **QEP Leadership Team** will schedule times on both campuses during the Spring semester for the graduating students to take the DIT-2 post-test.

**QEP Year 5: 2020-2021 Academic Year**

1) Activities 1 and 2, as outlined in Year 1, will be implemented.

2) All courses identified in Appendix S will include an instructional activity on ethical decision-making. Faculty who teach a capstone course will create a list of several possible ethical dilemmas or situations that are contextualized within the student’s major. Those capstone course faculty members who participated in Year 3 and Year 4 will continue refining (or revise) their scenarios and assessment strategies, based on results from the previous cycles. The **QEP Curriculum Committee** will assist the capstone faculty in creating/revising scenarios, refining them, and aligning the assessments of students’ performance with the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric indicators.

3) The faculty will assess the students’ understanding of the concepts discussed in class using the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric. Students’ work (i.e., writing assignment, discussion board postings, presentations, etc.) will be rated using the rubric. The “final” rubrics that would be used to assess the students’ ethical decision making skill will be collected at the end of the semester and turned in the **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research**. Students’ scores will be entered in the database for analysis and reporting.

4) Ethical Decision Making Post-test: Defining Issues Test-2 (DIT-2) Administration
   
a. On a specified day (during the Spring semester), graduating students who were admitted in the fall term of the 2017-2018 Academic Year will take the DIT-2 post-test. The **QEP Leadership Team** will identify those who will administer and proctor the test.

b. The **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research** will coordinate the gathering of participants’ post-test scores and provide them to the **QEP Leadership Team**. The scores will be recorded into the QEP database. The **QEP Leadership Team** will verify that the scores are properly entered.

c. The **QEP Leadership Team**, in collaboration with the **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research**, will analyze the results of the post-test to determine level of achievement of Objective 2.1. A comparison of the students’ pre- and post-test scores will be made to determine if the changes in their scores, if any are significant.

5) From the gathered rubrics and results of data analysis over the 5-year period, pre-test results from Year 1 and Year 2, and post-test data from Year 4 and Year 5, the **QEP Leadership Team**, in collaboration with the **Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research**, will prepare and complete the institution’s 5th year Impact Report. Pre-test data from Years 3, 4, and 5 will not be included in the reported and analyzed data for the impact report as post-test data for these cohorts will be collected beyond the 5-year timeframe of the QEP’s Impact Report.

**Co-Curricular Activities Plan**

Working with the **QEP Leadership Team**, the key individuals who will oversee the implementation of the co-curricular components of the QEP in each campus will be the student life/activities coordinators.
Spring Semester 2016 / Pre-QEP Implementation Period

January 2016: In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop a plan to communicate to the faculty and staff at both campuses about the role of co-curricular activities in the QEP. In addition, the key individuals will:

a) Develop a survey to be used on both campuses for evaluation of co-curricular activities specific to the QEP. Survey questions will use a Likert scale and will also include reflective questions to elicit qualitative student responses from participants.

b) Purchase a thumb print scanner for each campus. Attendance at co-curricular QEP events will be tracked using the scanner. Attendance reports will be generated and provided to the QEP Leadership Team for entry in the database.

February 2016: In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop a Freshman Ethical Decision Making Seminar to be conducted during orientation of freshman students, and a Student Training Manual on Ethical Decision Making that describes the steps for ethical decision making.

1. Identify faculty and staff members who will conduct the seminar. Sessions will be conducted using the Student Training Manual on Ethical Decision Making.
2. Develop outline/format/materials for seminars. Seminar topics will include: Plagiarism and Academic Honesty, Honesty and Respect in the Residence Halls, and Integrity in the Athletics Arena.

March 2016: In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop an Ethical Decision Making Seminar Series for all students, offered during the fall and spring semesters. The plan is to offer three seminars in the fall semester (one seminar for each of the following months: September, October, November) and three seminars during the spring semesters (one seminar for each of the following months: February, March and April).

a. Identify staff and faculty to conduct different seminars.
b. Identify specific topics that will be offered for planning and development for each campus.

April 2016: In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop an Ethical Decision Making Film Series schedule with plans of showing one film in September, October, November, February, March and April of an academic year. Suggested titles for selection are: My Sister’s Keeper, Blood Diamond, Any Given Sunday, Wall Street, Boiler Room, Hackers, The Insider, The Whistleblower, The Perfect Score, Hotel Rwanda, An Inconvenient Truth, Lone Survivor, Fire in the Blood, and The Fifth Estate.

QEP Year 1: 2016-2017 Academic Year

1. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate implementation of the Freshman Ethical Decision Making Seminar during orientation.
a. Topics to cover: Plagiarism and Academic Honesty, Honesty and Respect in the Residence Halls, and Integrity in the Athletics Arena.
b. Attendance to this event is mandatory.
c. Students will complete a survey at the end of the event.
d. The Office of Student Affairs is responsible for submitting copies of the surveys to the QEP Leadership Team for entry into the database.
e. At the end of the academic year, the key individuals responsible for the seminars will meet virtually to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the programming, as well as to review the survey results for each campus.
f. Assessment results will be used to inform future topics and modifications to the seminar.

2. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate an Ethical Decision Making Seminar for all students for each of the following months: September, October, November, February, March and April.

   a. Students will be required to attend at least one of the seminar sessions offered during each semester.
   b. Suggested topics for the seminar series are:

      i. How much am I going to study/party?
      ii. My dad wants me to be a ____________. Do I have an obligation to be a ____________?
      iii. My friend passed out after a night of drinking. Should I call for help and risk getting in trouble?
      iv. What is my responsibility for the feelings of the person with whom I’m having an intimate relationship?
      v. Should I cheat on a paper or an exam?
      vi. Should I take Adderall to make it through exam week?
      vii. How will I respond to people who are different from me?
         (*inspired by http://www.scu.edu/scunews/ourstories/ethics.cfrm)

   c. After each seminar attended, students will complete a survey. The Office of Student Affairs is responsible for submitting copies of the surveys to the QEP Leadership Team for entry into the database.
   d. At the end of the academic year, the key individuals responsible for the seminars will meet virtually to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the programming, as well as to review the survey results for each campus.
   e. Assessment results will be used to inform future topics and modifications to the seminar.

3. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will conduct a Film Series on ethical decision making during each semester.

   a. One film will be shown in the months of September, October, November, February, March and April.
   b. Students are required to attend one film showing per semester.
c. After each film event, students will complete a survey. The **Office of Student Affairs** is responsible for submitting copies of the surveys to the **QEP Leadership Team** for entry into the database.

d. At the end of the academic year, the key individuals responsible for the event will meet virtually to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the programming, as well as to review the survey results for each campus.

e. Assessment results will be used to inform future topics and modifications to the event.

4. In conjunction with the **QEP Leadership Team**, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop plans for an Alternative Spring Break (ASB) Trip for Spring 2017. ASB Trips are sponsored by United Way and are focused on facilitating students to work with other students on community service projects. Both the Florida and North Carolina Campuses will collaboratively plan a spring break trip each year to begin in March 2017.

   a. Identify faculty and staff members to lead the trip.
   b. Logistical considerations:

      i. Trip will not be longer than a week
      ii. All sites are in the domestic US
      iii. Cost is not to exceed $395 per participant
      iv. Cost to include: Local transportation, housing, meals (3x/day), materials, team building and reflection activities, and free time at area attractions

   c. Attendance to this event is not mandatory.
   d. Students will complete a survey at the end of the event.
   e. The **Office of Student Affairs** is responsible for submitting copies of the surveys to the **QEP Leadership Team** for entry into the database.
   f. At the end of the academic year, the key individuals responsible for the trip will meet virtually to discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the programming, as well as to review the survey results for each campus.
   g. Assessment results will be used to inform future topics and modifications to the event.

**QEP Year 2: 2017-2018 Academic Year**

1. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate implementation of the Freshman Ethical Decision Making Seminar during orientation.

   a. Topics to cover: Plagiarism and Academic Honesty, Honesty and Respect in the Residence Halls, and Integrity in the Athletics Arena.
   b. Attendance to this event is mandatory.
   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

2. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate an Ethical Decision Making Seminar for all students for each of the following months: September, October, November, February, March and April.
3. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will conduct a Film Series on ethical decision making during each semester. One film will be shown in the months of September, October, November, February, March and April (selected titles shall be different from the previous academic year). The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

4. In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop plans for an Alternative Spring Break (ASB) Trip for spring 2018. The same planning and logistical considerations, as well as assessment activities, conducted in Year 1, will be implemented for this activity.

QEP Year 3: 2018-2019 Academic Year

1. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate implementation of the Freshman Ethical Decision Making Seminar during orientation.
   a. Topics to cover: Plagiarism and Academic Honesty, Honesty and Respect in the Residence Halls, Integrity in the Athletics Arena.
   b. Attendance to this event is mandatory.
   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

2. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate an Ethical Decision Making Seminar for all students for each of the following months: September, October, November, February, March and April.
   a. Students will be required to attend at least one of the seminar sessions offered during each semester.
   b. Suggested topics for the seminar series are: Plagiarism, Dating, Community Service Work, Winning at all Costs, Performance Enhancement Drugs, and Discrimination.
   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

3. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will conduct a Film Series on ethical decision making during each semester. One film will be shown in the months of September, October, November, February, March and April (selected titles shall be different from the previous academic year). The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

4. In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop plans for an Alternative Spring Break (ASB) Trip for spring 2019. The same planning and
logistical considerations, as well as assessment activities, conducted in Year 1, will be implemented for this activity.

**QEP Year 4: 2019-2020 Academic Year**

1. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate implementation of the Freshman Ethical Decision Making Seminar during orientation.
   
   a. Topics to cover: Plagiarism and Academic Honesty, Honesty and Respect in the Residence Halls, Integrity in the Athletics Arena.
   
   b. Attendance to this event is mandatory.
   
   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

2. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate an Ethical Decision Making Seminar for all students for each of the following months: September, October, November, February, March and April.

   a. Students will be required to attend at least one of the seminar sessions offered during each semester.
   
   b. Suggested topics for the seminar series are: Cheating & Providing False Information, Conduct on Spring Break, Social Media, Mentorship Obligations of Coaches, Teammate Responsibilities in Athletics, and Sexual Assault.
   
   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

3. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will conduct a Film Series on ethical decision making during each semester. One film will be shown in the months of September, October, November, February, March and April (selected titles shall be different from the previous academic year). The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

4. In conjunction with the QEP Leadership Team, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop plans for an Alternative Spring Break (ASB) Trip for spring 2020. The same planning and logistical considerations, as well as assessment activities, conducted in Year 1, will be implemented for this activity.

**QEP Year 5: 2020-2021 Academic Year**

1. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate implementation of the Freshman Ethical Decision Making Seminar during orientation.

   a. Topics to cover: Plagiarism and Academic Honesty, Honesty and Respect in the Residence Halls, and Integrity in the Athletics Arena.
   
   b. Attendance to this event is mandatory.
   
   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.
2. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will facilitate an Ethical Decision Making Seminar for all students for each of the following months: September, October, November, February, March and April.

   a. Students will be required to attend at least one of the seminar sessions offered during each semester.
   b. Suggested topics for the seminar series are:

      i. How much am I going to study/party?
      ii. My dad wants me to be a ____________. Do I have an obligation to be a _______________?
      iii. My friend passed out after a night of drinking. Should I call for help and risk getting in trouble?
      iv. What is my responsibility for the feelings of the person with whom I’m having an intimate relationship?
      v. Should I cheat on a paper or an exam?
      vi. Should I take Adderall to make it through exam week?
      vii. How will I respond to people who are different from me? (*inspired by [http://www.scu.edu/scunews/ourstories/ethics.cfrm](http://www.scu.edu/scunews/ourstories/ethics.cfrm))

   c. The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity

3. Key individuals for the co-curricular activities will conduct a Film Series on ethical decision making during each semester. One film will be shown in the months of September, October, November, February, March and April (selected titles shall be different from the previous academic year). The same assessment mechanism implemented in Year 1 will be conducted for this activity.

4. In conjunction with the **QEP Leadership Team**, key individuals for the co-curricular activities will develop plans for an Alternative Spring Break (ASB) Trip for spring 2021. The same planning and logistical considerations, as well as assessment activities, conducted in Year 1, will be implemented for this activity.
Section VII: Resources

The QEP’s budget, based on expense categories drawn from the implementation plan is presented below, for each academic year, including the budget for the Pre-implementation period. A 10% contingency budget will be allocated for each academic year. With the contingency budget, the total budget for the 5-year implementation of Webber’s QEP is $85,110. Details are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

Table 5: Budget Descriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Item</th>
<th>Implementation Cycle and Description of Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-implementation: Spring 2015-2016</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compensation</td>
<td>Database creation Freshman seminar development and implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Database entry Freshman seminar implementation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Fees</td>
<td>Ethics workshop attendance Guest speaker fee Alternative Spring Break Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative Spring Break Registration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>QEP Kick-off event QEP dissemination plan activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>Training sessions for QEP faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty development activity: Best practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-curricular activities: Equipment, food, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Charges</td>
<td>Defining Issues Test administration (pre-test)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense</td>
<td>Travel expenses to conference Alternative Spring Break travel fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Printing Expense</td>
<td>Copying Costs: Manuals Scanners Films/DVDs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details are presented in Tables 5 and 6.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employee Compensation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>17,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference Fees</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Events</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Development</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>8,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Charges</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>4,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Expense</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>22,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplies/Printing Expense</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>5,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Contingency</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td>7,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>13,860</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>13,650</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>15,150</td>
<td>85,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section VIII: Assessment Plan

As described in Section IV, there are multiple assessment measures for the QEP. A combination of quantitative and qualitative data will be collected to gather information regarding students’ performance and components of the implementation plan. These data will provide formative and summative assessment measures for the QEP, with the formative measures informing any changes or modifications that may be needed for the following year, thus allowing appropriate use of results from previous year to improve outcomes for the succeeding year of the QEP.

The instruments/assessment measures that will be used for the QEP are as follows:

I. Formative Assessment Measures:

   A. Quantitative Data Sources

      1. Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric (see Appendix U): Published by the American Association of Colleges and Universities (AACU, 2010), the rubric was 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. The rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of education should be to help students turn what they’ve learned in the classroom into action, pragmatically it would be difficult, if not impossible, to judge whether or not students would act ethically when faced with real ethical situations. What can be evaluated using this rubric is whether students have the intellectual tools to make ethical choices.

         The rubric focuses on five elements: Ethical Self Awareness, Ethical Issue Recognition, Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts, Application of Ethical Principles, and Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts. Students’ Ethical Self Identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues. Presumably, they will choose ethical actions when faced with ethical issues.

         The rubric will be used to monitor and assess achievement of Objectives 1.1-1.5 (under Goal 1) every semester and analyzed on an annual basis.

      2. National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE): The NSSE survey (2014 version), assesses the extent to which students engage in educational practices associated with high levels of learning and development. The questionnaire collects information in five categories:

         a) participation in dozens of educationally purposeful activities
         b) institutional requirements and the challenging nature of coursework
         c) perceptions of the college environment
         d) estimates of educational and personal growth since starting college
         e) background and demographic information.

         For the QEP, four NSSE indicators for students’ engagement under Reflective and Integrative Learning will be used to monitor and assess the extent students perceive that they are learning and integrating ethical decision making skills in the QEP general education and academic discipline courses. This assessment will address Item #2 of the QEP Implementation and Monitoring Evaluation.
The NSSE indicators that will be used for this assessment component are:

i. **Item 2b:** Connected your learning to social problems or issues

ii. **Item 2c:** Included diverse perspectives (political, religious, racial/ethnic, gender, etc.) in course discussions or assignments

iii. **Item 2d:** Examined the strengths and weaknesses of your own views on a topic or issue

iv. **Item 2e:** Tried to better understand someone else’s views by imagining how an issue looks from his or her perspective

The NSSE survey will be administered annually during the spring semester on both campuses. Data will be analyzed annually.

3. **Co-curricular Activities Survey:** The survey will be an institution-developed survey and will consist of two parts: Quantitative and qualitative measures. Using a 5-point Likert scale, the quantitative set of questions will monitor the quality and effectiveness of the co-curricular events attended by the students. The survey is planned to be administered after every event. The instrument will be used to monitor and assess achievement of **Objective 2.3 (under Goal 2):** Sixty-five (65%) of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events will express that the events are effective in facilitating their understanding of ethical decision making. In addition, data collected from this assessment strategy will enable the co-curricular activities facilitators to monitor and document “best practices” that may emerge among the co-curricular activities and suggestions that participants may have for improving the QEP-related co-curricular activities.

**B. Qualitative Data Sources**

1. **Co-curricular Activities Survey:** As mentioned previously, the survey will be an institution-developed survey and will consist of two parts: Quantitative and qualitative measures. The qualitative component of the survey will monitor the students’ ability to reflect self-awareness, based on different ethical perspectives presented during a co-curricular activity. The survey is planned to be administered after every event. The instrument will be used to monitor and assess achievement of **Objective 2.2 (under Goal 2)** which focuses on the students’ ability to reflect self-awareness in their evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts.

2. **QEP Course Material Analysis:** To monitor and assess the extent to which the QEP courses in general education and the academic disciplines support the achievement of the QEP student learning outcomes, an expert review of the course materials by members of the QEP Test and Manual Development Committee will be conducted prior to the implementation of the QEP. The review will ensure that the QEP-designated course syllabi include the QEP course objective, incorporate QEP-related instructions, and identify assessments that facilitate students’ acquisition of ethical decision making skills. Course materials will be reviewed prior to the start of the QEP’s implementation every semester that a QEP-designated course gets offered for the first time, whenever a QEP-designated course goes through a revision, and whenever a faculty who teaches a non-QEP designated course wishes to incorporate the topic of ethical decision-making in his/her course(s). This strategy will address the assessment for **Item #1 of the QEP Implementation and Monitoring Evaluation.**

3. **Faculty Forums:** At least once every semester, the Chief Academic Officer will facilitate a forum or in-service session during a faculty meeting for both campuses in which faculty teaching
QEP-designated courses share some of the “best practices” that they had discovered and/or implemented in their courses as part of the QEP. In addition, faculty inputs or suggestions on how QEP-related instructions can be improved will be gathered during these forums/discussions. A log of these reported “best practices” will be maintained by the Chief Academic Officer to collect the needed data for Item #3 of the QEP Implementation and Monitoring Evaluation, to be included in the 5th Year QEP Impact Report.

II. Summative Assessment Measure: Defining Issues Test (Version 2)

The Defining Issues Test, Version 2 (DIT-2), developed by the Center for the Study of Ethical Development (2003), is a measure of moral judgment derived from Kohlberg’s model of moral development (Kohlberg, 1984). The DIT-2 (see Appendix V for a sample version of the DIT-2) focuses on five hypothetical moral dilemmas, each followed by 12 issues that could be involved in making a decision about the dilemmas. Participants rate each issue and choose the first, second, third, and fourth most important issues for each of the five dilemmas. Participants are also asked what decision they would make in each moral dilemma. These responses are scored to find which moral schema students follow in making their ethical decision. Presumably, these are the schemas that structure and guide the subject’s thinking in decision making beyond the test situation. These schemas are:

1. **Personal Interests Schema**: Considering what will benefit me and help others to like me
2. **Maintaining Norms Schema**: Considering what will maintain the law and social order
3. **Post-conventional Schema**: Considering human rights and other moral principles

The results of the DIT-2 are analyzed based on several scores that are generated from the students’ responses (Center for the Study of Ethical Development, 2003). Table 7 summarizes these scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 7. Dit-2 Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2 and Stage 3 Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 4P Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>P Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N2 Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hum/Lib Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cancer10 Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Score</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Validity for the DIT has been assessed in terms of seven criteria cited in over 400 published articles (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999; Thoma, 2002; Thoma, 2006). These validity studies revealed the following conclusions about the DIT:

1. Differentiation of various age/education groups: Studies of large composite samples (thousands of subjects) show that 30% to 50% of the variance of DIT scores is attributable to level of education in samples ranging from junior-high education to Ph.D.’s.

2. Longitudinal gains: A 10-year longitudinal study shows significant gains of men and women, of college-attenders and non-college subjects, and people from diverse walks of life. A review of a dozen studies of freshman to senior college students (n=755) shows effect sizes of .80 (“large” gains). DIT gains are one of the most dramatic longitudinal gains in college of any measured developmental variable.

3. DIT scores are significantly related to cognitive capacity measures of Moral Comprehension (r = .60), to the recall and reconstruction of post-conventional moral arguments, to Kohlberg’s measure, and (to a lesser degree) to other cognitive-developmental measures.

4. DIT scores are sensitive to moral education interventions: One review of over 50 intervention studies reports an effect size for dilemma discussion interventions to be .40 (moderate gains) while the effect size for comparison groups was only .09 (small gains).

5. DIT scores are significantly linked to many prosocial behaviors and to desired professional decision making. One review reports that 37 out of 47 measures were statistically significant (see also Rest & Narvaez, 1994, for a discussion of professional decision making).
6. DIT scores are significantly linked to political attitudes and political choices. In a review of several dozen correlates with political attitudes, DIT scores typically correlate in the range of \( r = .40 \) to .65. When combined in multiple regression with measures of cultural ideology, the combination predicts up to two-thirds of the variance of controversial public policy issues (such as abortion, religion in the public schools, women’s roles, rights of the accused, rights of homosexuals, free speech issues).

7. Reliability–Cronbach’s alpha is in the upper .70s / low .80s. Test-retest reliability is about the same.

In addition, DIT scores have been found to show discriminant validity from verbal ability/general intelligence and from Conservative/Liberal political attitudes. According to Thoma, Narvaez, Rest & Derryberry (1999), information in a DIT score predicts to the seven validity criteria above and beyond that accounted for verbal ability/general intelligence or political attitudes. In terms of gender bias, the DIT was found to be equally valid for males and females (Rest, Narvaez, Bebeau, & Thoma, 1999).

For the QEP, an online DIT-2 pre-test will be administered to all freshman students admitted beginning in fall 2016, with the online DIT-2 post-tests to be administered in four years, prior to their graduation. Pre-test results of freshman students whose anticipated graduation will be beyond the 5-year implementation of the QEP will not be included in the pre- and post-test data analysis but their in-course performance will be monitored and included in the data analysis that will be presented in the 5th year Impact Report.

Potential patterns in scores by demographic variables will be analyzed. In addition, pre- and post-test score comparisons as two independent samples, and pre- and post-test score comparisons as matched-pairs will be conducted to determine score changes among the students.

Table 8 provides a matrix of the assessment plan for the QEP for each goal and set of expected learning outcomes. The plan also establishes the timelines for data collection and analysis and how the collected data will be analyzed and presented.
### Table 8. Assessment Plan Summary Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected QEP Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Data Analysis Plan</th>
<th>Data Collection Period</th>
<th>Persons/Office Responsible</th>
<th>Data Presentation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goal 1:** Students will use ethical knowledge and concepts in resolving an ethical dilemma | **Objective 1.1:** Students will demonstrate ethical self-awareness as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Ethical Self-Awareness indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric | Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, Indicator #1 | Calculate % of students receiving a score of “3” or higher for Indicator #1 of the rubric | Fall 2016-spring 2021: Once every semester | **Data Collection:** Faculty and QEP Leadership Team  
**Data Analysis:** Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research  
**Tables and bar graphs/pie charts** |
| **Objective 1.2:** Students will demonstrate understanding of different ethical perspectives/concepts as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric | Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, Indicator #2 | Calculate % of students receiving a score of “3” or higher for Indicator #2 of the rubric | Fall 2016-spring 2021: Once every semester | **Data Collection:** Faculty and QEP Leadership Team  
**Data Analysis:** Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research  
**Tables and bar graphs/pie charts** |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Assessment Component</th>
<th>Objectives/Assessment Item</th>
<th>Assessment Measures</th>
<th>Data Analysis Plan</th>
<th>Data Collection Period</th>
<th>Persons/Office Responsible</th>
<th>Data Presentation Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.3:</strong> Students will recognize ethical issues as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Ethical Issue Recognition indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, Indicator #3</td>
<td>Calculate % of students receiving a score of “3” or higher for Indicator #3 of the rubric</td>
<td>Fall 2016-spring 2021: Once every semester</td>
<td>Data Collection: Faculty and QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Data Analysis: Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td>Tables and bar graphs/pie charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.4:</strong> Students will apply ethical perspectives/concepts as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, Indicator #4</td>
<td>Calculate % of students receiving a score of “3” or higher for Indicator #4 of the rubric</td>
<td>Fall 2016-spring 2021: Once every semester</td>
<td>Data Collection: Faculty and QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Data Analysis: Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td>Tables and bar graphs/pie charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 1.5:</strong> Students will evaluate different ethical perspective/concepts as indicated by a rating of at least a “3” in the Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts indicator of the Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric, Indicator #5</td>
<td>Calculate % of students receiving a score of “3” or higher for Indicator #5 of the rubric</td>
<td>Fall 2016-spring 2021: Once every semester</td>
<td>Data Collection: Faculty and QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Data Analysis: Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td>Tables and bar graphs/pie charts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected QEP Outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment Measures</td>
<td>Data Analysis Plan</td>
<td>Data Collection Period</td>
<td>Persons/Office Responsible for Data Collection</td>
<td>Data Presentation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goal 2:</strong> Students will demonstrate improvements in their ability to use their ethical decision-making skills to address ethical dilemmas</td>
<td><strong>Objective 2.1:</strong> Seventy percent (70%) of students will demonstrate improvements in their ethical decision making as indicated by their pre- and post-test scores comparisons</td>
<td>Defining Issues Test (Version 2)</td>
<td>Pre-tests: Every fall and spring semesters, starting fall 2016</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection:</strong> QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Tables and bar graphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objective 2.2:</strong> Seventy percent (70%) of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events will reflect self-awareness in their evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts.</td>
<td>Co-curricular Activities Survey</td>
<td>Calculate % of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events that will reflect self-awareness in their evaluation of different ethical perspectives/concepts via their narratives</td>
<td>Fall 2016- spring 2021: After every event in each semester</td>
<td><strong>Data Collection:</strong> Co-curricular activities facilitators</td>
<td>Tables and bar graphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected QEP Outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment Measures</td>
<td>Data Analysis Plan</td>
<td>Data Collection Period</td>
<td>Persons/Office Responsible for Data Collection</td>
<td>Data Presentation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals/Assessment Component</strong></td>
<td><strong>Objectives/Assessment Item</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Objective 2.3:</strong> Seventy percent (70%) of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events will express that the events are effective in facilitating their understanding of ethical decision making.</td>
<td>Co-curricular Activities Survey, Quantitative question items</td>
<td>Calculate % of students participating in the QEP’s co-curricular events that will rate the event at a “≥3”</td>
<td>Fall 2016- spring 2021: After every event in each semester</td>
<td>Data Collection: Co-curricular activities facilitators Data Analysis: QEP Leadership Team, co-curricular activities facilitators, and Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>QEP Implementation and Monitoring Evaluation</strong></td>
<td>Qualitative measures: Review of QEP course materials</td>
<td>Identify artifacts from reviewed course materials that will indicate support of the QEP</td>
<td>Pre-QEP: Spring 2016; Every semester: QEP courses offered the first time or revised; non-QEP courses that may be included in</td>
<td>Data Collection: Faculty, Academic Affairs, QEP Leadership Team, and QEP Curriculum Committee Data Analysis: QEP Leadership Team, QEP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Item #1:</strong> To what extent do the QEP courses in general education and the academic disciplines support the achievement of the QEP student learning outcomes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables and bar graphs</td>
<td>Narrative reports and tables</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected QEP Outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment Measures</td>
<td>Data Analysis Plan</td>
<td>Data Collection Period</td>
<td>Persons/Office Responsible for Data Collection</td>
<td>Data Presentation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Assessment Component</td>
<td>Objectives/Assessment Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>the QEP Curriculum Committee, and Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item #2:</strong> To what extent do students perceive that they are learning and integrating ethical decision making skills in the QEP general education and academic discipline courses?</td>
<td>NSSE Survey: Items 2b, 2c, 2d, and 2e; expectation is for WIU students to be comparable in their perception with students from NSSE cohort institutions</td>
<td>Compare % of WIU students’ responses to the NSSE survey items with similar institutions (cohort institutions)</td>
<td>Every spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tables and cats-and whiskers plots</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Item #3:</strong> What “best practices” have emerged from the QEP faculty and co-curricular activities and what suggestions do they have for improving the QEP-related instructions and co-curricular</td>
<td>● Qualitative Measure: Faculty forum/in-service information on “best practices”</td>
<td>● Identify themes on “best practices” reported by faculty during the forums/in-services</td>
<td>-Faculty “best practices”: Fall 2016-spring 2021, at least once every semester</td>
<td>Data Collection: Faculty, Academic Affairs, and QEP Leadership Team</td>
<td>Narrative reports and tables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected QEP Outcomes</td>
<td>Assessment Measures</td>
<td>Data Analysis Plan</td>
<td>Data Collection Period</td>
<td>Persons/Office Responsible for Data Collection</td>
<td>Data Presentation Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goals/Assessment Component</td>
<td>Objectives/Assessment Item</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities?</td>
<td>• Quantitative and Qualitative Measures: Co-curricular Activities Survey</td>
<td>• Identify the highest rated co-curricular activities and themes from feedbacks about the events provided by the students</td>
<td>-Co-curricular Activities “best practices”: Fall 2016-spring 2021, at least once every semester</td>
<td>Data Analysis: QEP Leadership Team, QEP Curriculum Committee, and Office of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section IX: Appendices

Appendix A: Dr. Wade’s Initial E-mail to Initiate the QEP Development Process

From: Wade HK
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 1:44 PM
To: WIU Coaches; WIU_Faculty_All; WIU Staff
Subject: Please plan to attend (and, more importantly, participate in) an important meeting

Please Plan to Attend (and, more importantly, participate in) An Important Meeting

Thursday, November 13, 2014, 3:15 – 5:00pm, the Yentes Conference Center
As you should know, Webber International University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC). As you will soon know, since it is a comprehensive evaluation which will involve us all, we are coming up for our 10 year reaffirmation. As you might or might not know, one element of this, the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) is not a rating of how we’ve done, but rather a plan for how we’ll do better. And, even if you're doing great things, you can always do better.

And that’s exciting!

We’ll talk a lot more about this, but here are some things you need to know before Thursday.
SACSCOC requires the QEP to demonstrably impact student learning and be related to our mission.
Other schools have tried to get QEP's for new parking lots or program expansions unrelated to the current mission approved, with predictable results.

SACSCOC requires broad-based involvement in the development of the QEP. Full time employees are expected to be at this meeting (absences for truly extraordinary reasons need to be approved by my office in advance). Part time employees and adjuncts are strongly encouraged to attend this meeting. It is extraordinarily important that our invited students attend! While some of us will ultimately more involved in the QEP than others, it's important we all come together to begin discussing topics.
SACSCOC requires the capability to initiate, implement, and complete the QEP. In short, it has to be something we can afford to do. While Webber is about half the cost of the average private college, and while most of our students leave with about as much debt as if they purchased a low end new car (and most kindergarteners could tell you which of those investments has the better ROI!), we do need to be conscious of costs, cognizant of who pays the bills, and come up, therefore, with something we can afford to do.

This is a participative meeting! There will be more information coming over the next couple of days, but please give some thought to what we do well and what we do not so well. And, please give some thought to what, if we all put our minds to it and all become united in achieving a goal, we ought to be doing to produce better educated, more employable, more competitive graduates.

Many thanks,

Keith Wade,
President & CEO
Appendix B: Dr. Wade’s Follow-up E-mail to Initiate the QEP Development Process

From: Wade HK  
Sent: Wednesday, November 12, 2014 7:16 AM  
To: Huyler KrystalA; Schumm Sabrina; Slater SydneyA; Friedman PhillipA; Land LydiaN; McGlynn CaitlinA; Snedden Stuart; LeZotte DanielE; Crawley VerityF; Fredrick RachelM; Brooks MalikD; Rivera Eric; Magnoni Stefano; Stoll AmandaL; Colak Mislav; Schat AlidaG; Sanchez RamonA; Morgan ColeL; Woods LamarA; Dilks JohnD; Yu Ziyin; Jack AleemaN; Fisher SavanaT; Reed ChandlerN; Archer DelainaK; Fernandez Ruby; Hester JessikaM; Miller ChristinaL; WIU Coaches; WIU_Faculty_All; WIU Staff  
Cc: Dancy GerlindeL  
Subject: Helpful Information for Thursday’s Meeting

Good morning.

I know that many of you have some questions about the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), and about Thursday. For those who have forgotten, the QEP is a big multi-year, cross-campus project that somehow directly improves student learning. We’re required to have one for our upcoming reaffirmation (and required to report on it a few years thereafter).

Here’s what I have in mind for Thursday (Yentes Center, 3:15pm).

First, I will do a quick overview for you regarding SACSCOC accreditation in general, and the QEP in particular. Sure, it’s kind of a boring topic, but our accreditation is our single most valuable asset, so it’s an important thing to know at least a little about.

Second, we will do some brainstorming (interesting trivia fact… Roger Babson invented brainstorming – or at least identified it and gave it a name – in this very spot). The idea will be to get some thoughts and ideas down on paper.

Third and finally, we will narrow our thoughts down to a few choices.

Then the big work begins. But, that’s for another day. For Thursday, our goals are (1) to get a better idea about what’s going on; and (2) to generate some QEP ideas which might work.

First, a reminder about the rules… First, it’s got to directly and measurably impact student learning (so, much as we might want an outdoor basketball court for pick-up games, this does not qualify as a QEP). Second, it’s got to be within the mission… a nursing program might be a great idea, but because it doesn’t fit within our mission, it’s not a QEP. Third, as Goldilocks might say, it has to be just right… adding a SCUBA course might be a neat idea, but it’s not big enough to warrant a QEP; a project which takes 20 years to bear fruit isn’t going to bode so well for us when our 5th year success report is due. And, finally, we have to be able to do it… I’ve seen lots of QEP’s, some of them really good, which require millions of dollars and/or dozens of staff; we’ve got to come up with something we can actually make work for us.

And, now, perhaps, a few ideas to get the creative juices flowing. Our VP of Institutional Effectiveness, Dr. Bill Loftus, combed through all the recent QEPs and made us a list of ones schools like ours (i.e., smaller, carefully focused schools) have done recently.

Writing - Your Path to Success  
Ethical Reasoning in Action  
Faith Learning and You Discovering Global Citizenship:

50
Undergraduate Research
Applied Learning
Fostering and Applying Critical Thinking Skills
Civic Engagement
Nurturing a Culture of Inquiry
Living in Balance: Physical Activity
Critically Appraising Relevant Evidence
Methods for Mastering Math
Service Learning
Teaching and Learning through Academic Advising
Changing the Way You Read
Ethical Decision Making
Enhancing Learning through Community Engagement
Transforming the First Year Experience
Developing Intercultural Competence
Preparing Students to Become Effective Team Members
Strengthening Foundational Mathematics
Communicating the Values of Civility and Responsibility
Christian Servant Leadership
Improving the Scholastic Performance of Student Athletes
Improving Students’ Information Literacy Skills
Enhancing Student Learning through Technology Readiness
Improving Student Learning Outcomes in Gateway Courses
Enhancing Critical Reading Skills
Enhancing Academic Support Services
A Project for the Enhancement of the Humanities
Improvement of Student Performance through Faculty/Staff Development
Strengthening the Science Foundation
Strengthening the Fundamental Skills for Academic Excellence
Enhancement of Student Learning in Distance Education Classes
Enhancement of Student Learning in Developmental Studies
Teaching and Learning through Academic Advising

Best regards,
Keith Wade, President & CEO
Appendix C: List of QEP Topics Generated from Florida QEP Summit

**Summit Finalists (in order of preference)**
- Refurbish classrooms to improve school retention, pride in school, morale, etc.
- Improve Online Program - increase numbers - retrain faculty and have more interesting and informative online presence
- Improve internal behavior/habits FRED FACTOR
- Develop career development center so we have more connections to employers - state wide & nation wide
- Enhancement of the Humanities - creating a new degree that falls perfectly into our curriculum and mission.
- Adopt a reading and multi-cultural global enhancement with a critical thinking focus
- Everyone should take a networking course allowing them to meet employers and received mentors
- First year experience for incoming freshman
- Foundations of Management and Entrepreneurship - Two dedicated faculty members teach ins and outs of entrepreneurship
- Dress business casual one day a week
- Freshman seminar with topics on financial aid literacy, study tips, survey what student didn't like first year here

**Summit Semi-Finalists (in no particular order)**
- Quantitative studies major
- Everyone on campus should wear business attire
- Reading is fundamental - Improve student reading speed and comprehension
- Basic arithmetic testing - go/no go with retest
- Redoing classrooms by redecorating, painting, new carpeting, lighting, etc. (x3)
- Larger variety of useful electives - MBA program offered online
- Expand development of a study abroad program, publicize the exchange program
- Counseling Center - Students who are healthier mentally will perform better (x4)
- Tailor majors to current trends in technology/business environment
- Teaching and learning through academic advising
- Increase technology resources around campus
- 100 non-athletic students - 5 years by new recruiting effort, majors for more academic students (x3)
- Social Media Management Major
- Using applied learning to enhance the student experience
- Counselors to assist students with general issues (x3)
- Foreign language classes to help student enter a global economy
- Increase MBA enrollment by SBM degree online more online degrees
- Refurbish classrooms (x3)

**Other Ideas (in no particular order)**
- Make campus physically & electronically accessible per ADA
- Provide access to more online journals for research and writing
Each major should have students be a part of a professional association
Improvement of student performance through faculty/staff development
Joint campus online degree program
Add sports that bring in top achieving students
Restructure/reorganize/refocus entry level ed support
Develop personal financial management skills
Go/no go testing for freshman on writing composition
International trip
Improve students technology skills
Integration of economics into our campus
Offer courses year round to make a 3 year program
Offer low residency programs
Improve critical thinking opportunities
Volunteer tutors from outside of Webber
Intramural sports
More math requirements
Writing skills improvement
Allow students to choose a QEP from the list
ESL courses for international students
Higher academic requirements for admission
Scholar athletes
Put most classes online
International students who do score high enough on Webber English language exam must take first year composition as an ESL course
Community services impacts student learning
Outside basketball court
Track & field track for students
Bowling lane
Fun Zumba classes
Add an international student office to enhance international student learning, understanding
Add a testing center for proctors, ppt tests, supplemental learning, makeup work, tutoring (x3)
Improve our tutoring program
Counseling center (x4)
Cleaner environment clean hallways and restrooms
Each student should take an international trip to learn about other systems
Testing center (x3)
Counseling center (x4)
More clubs for students, organizations they can get involved in on campus (x3)
Self-defense class
CPR class
Swim team
Additional clubs/organizations (x4)
Testing Center (x3)
Add a study abroad program
Have actual tutors instead of just students tutors (x3)
Adding programs to help students with their careers/ becoming a certified personal trainer
Have more career fairs
Make the campus green - gardens, animals we eat, let students work garden and farm
Remove online course fee for elementary education majors
Get working computers/wifi
Upgrade learning resource center to 21st century
Tutorial lab with non student tutors or online professional tutors (x3)
Enhancement of student learning by restructuring PASS center and including a testing center
More online majors
Distance learning across university using online textbook resources
Create an undergraduate practicum for each year
Collapse classroom structure to online meetings
Make area between Babson Center and classrooms a courtyard
Repaint the school
Repave roads
Communication degree to be offered at WIU
Upgrade of athletic facilities
Sport Media Management degree
Upgrade the IT department and system so that there are no delays and students can get more work done in a timely manner
Faith learning
Real Estate courses
More majors to attract female students
AIB courses
More student activities (x4)
JAVA script programming
Dress code (x3)
Replace Grace Dorm
Better dress code for students (x3)
Step team groups
Dance team for games
New security systems
Required health and hygiene course
Trimester with a concentration/ 3 week course between fall and winter terms
Improve email access IT is critical for students
Agricultural Business
Enhance student learning by adding programs such as hospital administration management and ag business
Add more MBA programs online for adult students (x5)
Restructuring of the MBA program tailored for businesses (x5)
Enhance student learning by using ipads for the classrooms
Enhancing student learning by enhancing technology capabilities in classrooms
Provide better resources in the library
Improve tutoring resources in the PASS center include professional tutors (x3)
Increase student involvement on campus more clubs (x4)
Campus wide focus on personal attention to the students
Older teachers changing learning strategies eg. Less textbook work
Undergraduate research papers, interpersonal skills, cultural differences
Implement freshman success program
Turf football baseball softball fields
Training facilities
Sports facility - football baseball and softball
We want artificial filed to increase play surface for students
Area for students to hang out basketball courts enclosed area for students
Have a game plan to get traditional students up to 100 (x3)
Try to increase regular students by 25 per year and increased to 100 over 4 years (x3)
More majors
Online sport management MBA (x5)
Undergraduate practicum
Start a NASCAR Marketing degree
Increase online MBA degree program (x5)
Entice more academic students
More online MBA degrees (x5)
Create a student government
Shorter class semesters
Webber apps - email-notifications, security, warnings (x2)
Improving student learning through business technology
Build a strong leadership training program
Make an app for email and scores, updates for school (x2)
Girls lacrosse team
First year seminar
Critical writing for college level students
Student union refurbish
Enhancing student learning technology readiness
Intercultural communications
ESL buddy mentoring programs
Academic advising
Senior led seminars
Online learning degree
Appendix D: Instructions to Solicit QEP Ideas in North Carolina Campus

Quality Enhancement Plan Suggestions November 2014

1. Please circle one:  F-T Faculty  P-T Faculty  Staff

2. Please fill out the form, and return it to the Academic Affairs Office.

As part of the regular decennial reaffirmation of accreditation process, all institutions that are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges (SACSCOC) must develop and implement a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP).

CR 2.12: “The institution has developed an acceptable Quality Enhancement Plan that includes an institutional process for identifying key issues emerging from institutional assessment and focuses on learning outcomes and/or the environment supporting student learning and accomplishing the mission of the institution.” (Principles of Accreditation)

A Selection of Approved QEP Topics from 2004 through 2014
For a complete list, go to: sacscoc.org > Institutional Resources > Quality Enhancement Plans

Instructions

Please (1) check your top 5 preferences for the type of QEP you think would be most beneficial from the list below that is drawn from SACSCOC-approved topics covering the years 2004 through 2014; and/or (2) write in your preferences in the spaces provided at the end. The actual final topic would not necessarily be the same as any item below. These are just topic indicators.

Not more than 5 suggestions per sheet, including both checks and write-ins.

☐ Writing - Your Path to Success
☐ Ethical Reasoning in Action
☐ Faith Learning and You
☐ Discovering Global Citizenship:
☐ Undergraduate Research
☐ Applied Learning
☐ Fostering and Applying Critical Thinking Skills
☐ Civic Engagement
☐ Nurturing a Culture of Inquiry
☐ Living in Balance: Physical Activity
☐ Critically Appraising Relevant Evidence
☐ Methods for Mastering Math
☐ Service Learning
☐ Teaching and Learning through Academic Advising
☐ Changing the Way You Read
☐ Ethical Decision Making
☐ Enhancing Learning through Community Engagement
☐ Transforming the First Year Experience
☐ Developing Intercultural Competence
☐ Preparing Students to Become Effective Team Members
☐ Strengthening Foundational Mathematics
☐ Communicating the Values of Civility and Responsibility
☐ Christian Servant Leadership
☐ Improving the Scholastic Performance of Student Athletes
☐ Improving Students’ Information Literacy Skills
☐ Enhancing Student Learning through Technology Readiness
☐ Improving Student Learning Outcomes in Gateway Courses
☐ Enhancing Critical Reading Skills
☐ Enhancing Academic Support Services
☐ A Project for the Enhancement of the Humanities
☐ Improvement of Student Performance through Faculty/Staff Development
☐ Strengthening the Science Foundation
☐ Strengthening the Fundamental Skills for Academic Excellence
☐ Enhancement of Student Learning in Distance Education Classes
☐ Enhancement of Student Learning in Developmental Studies
☐ Teaching and Learning through Academic Advising
## Appendix E: QEP Topic Selections from North Carolina Campus

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>1 QEP Suggestions Outcome - 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F-T Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of Responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Key Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transforming the First Year Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Undergraduate Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ethical Reasoning in Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Fostering and Applying Critical Thinking Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ethical Decision Making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Writing - Your Path to Success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Service Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Preparing Students to Become Effective Team Members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Communicating the Values of Civility and Responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Nurturing a Culture of Inquiry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Improving the Scholastic Performance of Student Athletes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Enhancing Critical Reading Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Civic Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Living in Balance: Physical Activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Changing the Way You Read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Enhancing Learning through Community Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Applied Learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Discovering Global Citizenship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Improvement of Student Performance through Faculty/Staff Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Developing Intercultural Competence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Christian Servant Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Critically Appraising Relevant Evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Teaching and Learning through Academic Advising</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>A Project for the Enhancement of the Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Strengthening the Science Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Strengthening the Fundamental Skills for Academic Excellence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Improving Students’ Information Literacy Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Enhancing Student Learning through Technology Readiness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Enhancing Academic Support Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F: Concept of Disappearing Task Force and Instructions to Task Force Members

From: Wade HK
Sent: Sunday, March 08, 2015 1:59 PM
To: Fening FredA; gianicojl@sapc.edu; GlassDW@sapc.edu; hernandezse@sapc.edu; johnsonab@sapc.edu; Leone StephanieS; Patterson ChristinaM; Rassel StephenE; Schreiber JeremyM; Wunker CharlesT; Shieh CharlesS; Arbona CynthiaA; demyankr@sapc.edu; Bill Loftus
Cc: Wilson KathyA; Jordon Chris; Heath WilliamL; Picard RyanP; Mueller JenniferJ; Baldasare, Paul; hopkinsb@sapc.edu; laugtherth@sapc.edu; battengl@sapc.edu
Subject: Welcome to the QEP Disappearing Task Force!

Dear QEP Plan Disappearing Task Force:

First, from the bottom of my heart, thank you for accepting the call to participate in this extraordinarily important disappearing task force. Your work will impact us for at least most of the next decade, and you will shape, to some degree or another, thousands of lives. Thank you for accepting the responsibility for this important work. I am especially grateful as I am well aware that each of you already had plenty to do. Second, I actually think you made a good choice. We’re small enough, and it’s an imperfect enough world, that everyone is going to be called upon to assist in the effort somehow. That’s just the nature of how we have to do things here. Having been through a reaffirmation (at the time acting both as Dean and Accreditation Liaison), I’m pretty familiar with the various pieces of the puzzle. The vast majority of the reaffirmation project is providing evidence that we have done something or are doing something. In every single standard except 2.12 (the QEP), “we’re going to///” or "our plan is..." gets you a big fat “not in compliance”. But the QEP is different. The idea was to focus attention and resources on doing something better in the future. And, at least for me, that’s a lot more fun than trudging out evidence of what we’ve done in the past. I hope it is for you as well. While we have to be careful to commit ourselves to doing only that which we can actually do, as anyone who has ever spent any time at the front of a classroom can attest, sometimes our secret loftier dreams do indeed manifest themselves in our students.

Third and finally, it is time to get to work. So, with that in mind, I would like to ask you to:

1. By Tuesday, March 10, review the attached contact sheet and send me a short biography (if you want to use the one on the web that’s fine… but, sometimes these things change). I’ll put these together and send it back as a little booklet, which ought to help everyone know at least a little more about each other.
2. Review, as soon as possible, the attached reaffirmation timeline.
4. Review, as soon as possible, the section of the SACSCOC reaffirmation manual dealing with the QEP (pages 39-50) http://www.sacscoc.org/pdf/081705/Handbook%20for%20Institutions%20seeking%20reaffirmation.pdf
5. With all this background, take stock of your strengths, experiences, interests, and be prepared to discuss roles at an organizational meeting in a few days.

Again, many thanks for your assistance with this very, very important project.

Keith

What’s a “disappearing task force”? Many folks, I believe, that the bad reputation of “committees” – often seen as time wasters which don’t accomplish a lot – is fairly well deserved. My friend Les Purce
actually eliminated all the committees at Evergreen State College. They have a few disappearing task forces – groups of folks who come together, do the task at hand, and then disband – but nary a committee. Hopefully the deliberately temporary nature of your time commitment – another disappearing task force will need to implement it – will make you feel even better about having made it.

Dr. H. Keith Wade, CMA, CFM, CNA

President and CEO
# Appendix G: QEP Development Disappearing Task Force Roster

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Campus</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Office Phone</th>
<th>Cell Phone</th>
<th>Skype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Fred Fening</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Associate Professor of Management</td>
<td><a href="mailto:feningfa@webber.edu">feningfa@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2917</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Jennifer Gianico</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Psychology</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gianicojl@sapc.edu">gianicojl@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Douglas Glass</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Marketing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:GlassDW@sapc.edu">GlassDW@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td>910-277-5502</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Hernandez, M.A.</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Visiting Faculty in Writing</td>
<td><a href="mailto:hernandezse@sapc.edu">hernandezse@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td>910-277-5271</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brooke Johnson, M.A.</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Head Women’s Basketball Coach</td>
<td><a href="mailto:johnsonab@sapc.edu">johnsonab@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td>910-277-2074</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephanie Leone, MBA</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Director of Career Services and Community Outreach</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leoness@webber.edu">leoness@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2964</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McDonald, M.L.S.</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Director of DeTamble Library</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhm@sapc.edu">mhm@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td>910-277-5023</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Patterson, M. Div.</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Dean of Student Life</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PattersonCM@webber.edu">PattersonCM@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2914</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Rassel, MBA</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Head Strength and Conditioning Coach, and Retention Czar</td>
<td><a href="mailto:RasselSE@webber.edu">RasselSE@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2961</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeremy Schreiber, MBA</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Associate Head Men’s Basketball Coach</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schreiberjm@webber.edu">schreiberjm@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2987</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles Wunker</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Professor of Computer Information Systems and Chair of General Education</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wunkerct@webber.edu">wunkerct@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2916</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Campus</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Office Phone</th>
<th>Cell Phone</th>
<th>Skype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles Shieh (Project Manager)</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shiehcs@webber.edu">shiehcs@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2795</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cynthia Arbona (Campus Accreditation Coordinator)</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the Chief Academic Officer</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ArbonaCA@webber.edu">ArbonaCA@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2971</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kay Demyan (Campus Accreditation Coordinator)</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Executive Assistant to the Campus President</td>
<td><a href="mailto:demyankr@sapc.edu">demyankr@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

# Ex-Officio Members (because ultimately we have to sign the submission)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Home Campus</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Office Phone</th>
<th>Cell Phone</th>
<th>Skype</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Bill Loftus</td>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Accreditation Liaison</td>
<td><a href="mailto:WJL@sapc.edu">WJL@sapc.edu</a></td>
<td>910-277-2085</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Keith Wade</td>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>President &amp; CEO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:wadehk@webber.edu">wadehk@webber.edu</a></td>
<td>863-638-2940</td>
<td>863-521-3759</td>
<td>HKeithWade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H: QEP Development Disappearing Task Force Spring 2015 Agenda

QEP Development
Disappearing Task Force
Joint Institutional Planning Committee
Webber International University
Task Force Organization Meeting
March 24, 2015

Agenda

Introduction
Review of QEP Guidelines
Review of Suggested Steps for QEP Development: Steps 2-4
Discussions
  • Title of QEP based on the suggested QEP topic
  • Review and revise the suggested QEP rationale
  • QEP Development Step 2: Defining the student learning outcomes
  • QEP Development Step 3: Researching the topic
  • QEP Development Step 4: Identifying the actions to be implemented
  • Feedback for JIPC
Action Assignments
  • QEP leadership and organizational structure in place – Draft by Shieh by March 27
  • Refined title and rationale for QEP – Draft by ________________
  • List of existing, supportive foundations compiled – Draft by ________________
  • Projected student learning outcomes (SLOs) for QEP established – Draft by _________
  • Components of the QEP assessment strategy are outlined – Draft by ________________
  • Feedback for JIPC – Draft by Shieh by March 27

Adjourn

DTF Members
Florida Campus
Fred Fening
Stephanie Leone
Christina Patterson
Steve Rassel
Jeremy Schreiber
Charles Wunker
North Carolina Campus
Jennifer Gianico
Douglas Glass
Elizabeth Hernandez
Brooke Johnson
Mary McDonald

Project Coordinator
Florida Campus
Cynthia Diaz-Arbona
North Carolina Campus
Kay Demyan

Project Manager
Charles Shieh
QEP Development
Disappearing Task Force
Joint Institutional Planning Committee
Webber International University

Task Force Meeting
April 7, 2015

Agenda

QEP: Ethical Decision Making through Critical Thinking

Note: SACSCOC defines student learning as changes in knowledge, skills, behaviors or values.

Discussions
QEP Development Step 4: Identifying the actions to be implemented
QEP Development Step 5: Establishing the timeline for implementation

Curricular: Assess student changes in knowledge or values in ethical decision making
- Identify existing courses having ethics in curriculum
- Adding ethical thinking to selected courses that do not have ethics in curriculum
- Assessment methods
- Timeline for implementation

Co-Curricular: Assess student changes in skills or behaviors in ethical decision making
- Existing activities on and off campus
- New activities?
- Assessment methods
- Timeline for implementation

Action Assignments
- Curricular component of the QEP –
- Co-Curricular component of the QEP –

DTF Members
Florida Campus                      North Carolina Campus
Fred Fening                        Jennifer Gianico
Stephanie Leone                    Douglas Glass
Christina Patterson                Elizabeth Hernandez
Steve Rassel                       Brooke Johnson
Jeremy Schreiber                  Mary McDonald
Charles Wunker

Project Coordinator
Florida Campus                      North Carolina Campus
Cynthia Diaz-Arbona                Kay Demyan

Project Manager
Charles Shieh
Appendix I: QEP Development Process Flowchart
Appendix J: Consideration for Inclusion of Critical Thinking in the QEP

----- Original Message -----
Received: 04:56 PM EDT, 03/30/2015
From: Shieh CharlesS <ShiehCS@webber.edu>
To: Wade HK <WadeHK@webber.edu>, "Baldasar@sapc.edu" <Baldasar@sapc.edu>, "hopkinsB@sapc.edu" <hopkinsB@sapc.edu>, "WJL@sapc.edu" <WJL@sapc.edu>, "Batten, Glenn (battengt@sapc.edu)" <battengt@sapc.edu>, "Laughter, Terry H. (laughterth@sapc.edu)" <laughterth@sapc.edu>, Wilson KathyA <WilsonKA@webber.edu>, Jordon Chris <JordonCM@webber.edu>, Mueller JenniferJ <MuellerJJ@webber.edu>, Heath WilliamL <HeathWL@webber.edu>, Picard RyanP <PicardRP@webber.edu>
Subject: QEP title

Dear JIPC Colleagues,

The QEP Disappearing Task Force (DTF) conducted its first meeting through Skype on Tuesday, March 24. Every DTF member attended the meeting. The group was able to discuss the following issues at the meeting to bring QEP development up to speed:

- Title of QEP based on the suggested QEP topic
- Review and revise the suggested QEP rationale
- QEP Development Step 2: Defining the student learning outcomes
- QEP Development Step 3: Researching the topic

The DTF suggested the following changes for JIPC approval:
1) Add “critical thinking” to the Ethics topic;
2) Do not include “global” or “international” in the program;
3) Focus on two areas in the assessment program: Curricular (i.e., academics) and Co-Curricular (including student activities and volunteerism)

A draft title “Developing Life Skills through Development of Critical Thinking and Ethical Decision Making” was proposed. It has not been fully discussed by DTF members yet since it was just presented to me this morning. It seems to me that the proposed title may shift the focus of QEP from “ethics” to “life skills,” and “critical thinking” would be at the same level of the effort as that for “ethical thinking.”

Another title was proposed: “Developing Critical Thinking Skills in the Ethical Decision Making Process.” It will add “critical thinking” to the effort, yet, still keep “ethics” as the focus of the QEP topic decided by JIPC.

The title will determine the direction of QEP development. If JIPC can make the decision tomorrow morning on the QEP title, the DTF will be able to move forward on developing the QEP.

Thanks,
Charles
Appendix K: Excerpt from Board Meeting Minutes, Spring 2015

Dr. Keith Wade and Mr. Paul Baldasare discussed the giving reports.

The SACSCOC reaffirmation timeline was presented and discussed.

The Board had been provided with a written report regarding the University’s athletics programs. Discussion regarding athletics, including the evolution of the St. Andrews campus into a NAIA contender, ensued.

Deans Shiel and Hopkins reported that faculty have identified student learning outcomes appropriate to the majors; they are regularly assessing the degree to which the student learning outcomes are being achieved; they are then using the results of assessment for the improvement of student learning; and the process is being documented in annual assessment reports. Mr. Baldasare discussed the school housed at St. Andrews having achieved an “A” rating, as well as the long running and much acclaimed Science Olympiad being held at St. Andrews the coming weekend.

A brief discussion regarding conflict of interest ensued, and conflict of interest forms, previously distributed to the Board, were collected.

Dr. Lofus led a brief educational session regarding the Board’s duty to protect the institution from undue outside influence.

The Trustees briefly discussed the evolving QEP topic, as well as the QEP process. Mr. Ed Peddie asked if he could be provided a list of clubs on each campus. Dr. Wade promised to get him this list.

Chairman Strickler reminded the Trustees that the next meeting was scheduled for Friday, September 18th, 2015.

Chairman Strickler reminded the Trustees of Graduation plans: Babson Park: Friday, May 1st, 6pm; Laurinburg: Baccalaureate: Saturday, May 2nd, 4pm; Commencement: Sunday, May 3rd, 9am. He strongly commended these activities to the Trustees. He noted, and Dr. Wade reiterated, that if one needs lodging, reservations need to be made at once.

There was no further business to come before the Trustees.

Mr. John Royal moved adjournment. Mr. Fred McCoy seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:30 with harmony prevailing.
# Appendix L: QEP Final Version Disappearing Task Force Members

## QEP Final Version DTF

*Charge: Revise the QEP to a state acceptable to the Institutional Leadership Committee and Deliverable to SACSCOC*

*Deliverable: QEP*

*Disbands: Upon acceptance by Institutional Leadership Committee of QEP*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member</th>
<th>Role, Department</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Nelson Marquez, Chair</td>
<td>Associate Vice President of Institutional Effectiveness and Research</td>
<td>Babson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Fred Fening</td>
<td>Leslie D. Reagan Professor of Strategic Management</td>
<td>Babson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Betsy Dendy</td>
<td>Instructor in English</td>
<td>Laurinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Gianico</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of Biology</td>
<td>Laurinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Dan Hurst</td>
<td>Associate Professor of English</td>
<td>Babson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Kathleen Hardesty</td>
<td>Assistant Professor of English</td>
<td>Babson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Liz Hernandez</td>
<td>Assistant Dean of Students</td>
<td>Laurinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Mary McDonald</td>
<td>Director of DeTamble Library</td>
<td>Laurinburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Christina Patterson</td>
<td>Dean of Student Life, Florida Campus</td>
<td>Babson Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Charles Wunker</td>
<td>Professor of Computer Information Systems and Chair of the General Education Department, Florida Campus</td>
<td>Babson Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix M: Excerpts from JIPC Meeting and QEP Final Version Disappearing Task Force Meeting Minutes

Joint Institutional Planning Committee Meeting Minutes

Attending: Keith Wade, President and CEO

**Florida Campus**
- Kathy Wilson, VP of Student Record Services
- Ryan Picard, Director for Admissions
- Bill Heath, Director for Athletics
- Nelson Marquez, AVP for Institutional Effectiveness
- Jennifer Mueller, Director for Institutional Advancement
- Christina Patterson, Dean for Student Life
- Charles Shieh, Chief Academic Officer, Academic Dean
- Chris Jordan, VP of Finance

**North Carolina Campus**
- Terry Laughter, VP for Business and Finance
- Bob Hopkins, Academic Dean
- Paul Baldasare, Campus President
- Glenn Batten, VP for Admin., AD, Dean of Students
- Dawn Medley, Director for Enrollment Management
- Charles Shieh, Chief Academic Officer, Academic Dean
- Chris Jordan, VP of Finance

Date/Time: 11/17/2015 @ 9:30 a.m.
Recorder: Nelson Marquez

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Discussion</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. QEP Documentation</td>
<td>• In progress; DTF prompted to narrow the focus of the QEP without eliminating the critical thinking component in the strategies; Nelson mentioned the possibility of anchoring the strategies to the “Integrative Model of Ethical Decision-making,” which combines critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and problem-solving in instructions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topic</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nelson and Betsy suggested using the Value Rubric for Ethical Reasoning to assess the students’ performance in the courses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Dissemination activities:</strong> Ms. Hardesty consulted with Nelson on expectations and timeline for the dissemination plan/activities. The plan will have to be carried out prior to the QEP’s implementation start in fall 2016. Nelson suggested involving students and other non-academic staff as part of the dissemination plan to allow for a broader staff participation in the QEP.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a) <strong>Issues that need to be addressed:</strong> Nelson shared with the team a JIPC recommendation for the DTF to narrow the focus of the QEP to ethical decision making but without eliminating the critical thinking component as part of the strategy. The narrowed focus will assist in sustaining the QEP over 5 years with consideration for the university’s capacity and available resources. The change will have an impact on the literature review and assessment design for the QEP. As for pre-and post-test assessment strategies, the team discussed looking for a validated set of questions in order to “fast-track” the QEP pre-implementation process, which could become lengthy due to the need to validate the questions and the rubric that will be used for the pre- and post-test, including training of evaluators.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Chapter 4 Forum
#### Business of Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39.68%</td>
<td>3.17%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>73.02%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>20.63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 10 Forum
#### Academic Integrity Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23.81%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.38%</td>
<td>36.51%</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 7 Forum
#### Racial Issues in Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
<td>4.76%</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>60.32%</td>
<td>12.70%</td>
<td>26.98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 11
#### Deviant Behavior in Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.16%</td>
<td>6.35%</td>
<td>9.52%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.75%</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>20.63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>61.90%</td>
<td>7.94%</td>
<td>30.16%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=63*
Percentage of Students By Competency Level in Ethical Decision Making Per Topic Area (2014)

### Chapter 4 Forum

#### Business of Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>14.89%</td>
<td>8.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
<td>12.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>51.06%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 10 Forum

#### Academic Integrity Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>38.30%</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>61.70%</td>
<td>10.64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 7 Forum

#### Racial Issues in Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
<td>6.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>34.04%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>51.06%</td>
<td>27.66%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 11

#### Deviant Behavior in Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>23.40%</td>
<td>4.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>36.17%</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>59.57%</td>
<td>21.28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=47*
Percentage of Students By Competency Level in Ethical Decision Making Per Topic Area (2013)

### Chapter 4 Forum

#### Business of Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.19%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>62.79%</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
<td>11.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 10 Forum

#### Academic Integrity Case Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.51%</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>65.12%</td>
<td>16.28%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 7 Forum

#### Racial Issues in Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>46.51%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>60.47%</td>
<td>13.95%</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Chapter 11

#### Deviant Behavior in Sport

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mastery</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Section 1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>44.19%</td>
<td>4.65%</td>
<td>20.93%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.60%</td>
<td>2.33%</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>&lt;--Total Students</td>
<td>62.79%</td>
<td>6.98%</td>
<td>30.23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n=43*
Appendix O: Graduate Survey

Graduates Survey

Graduates

Below is a list of various competencies that employees may be required to possess in order to perform their jobs well. Please rate your perception of the level of importance of each competency on a 5-point scale, where:

5= Extremely important
4= Very important
3= Somewhat important
2= Not very important
1= Not at all important

1. Ability to work in a team structure and influence others

2. Ability to create and/or edit written reports

3. Ability to communicate verbally with people inside and outside an organization

4. Ability to plan strategically, organize, and prioritize work to achieve strategic goals

5. Ability to obtain and process information

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/J9X9NHC

12/13/2015
6. Ability to make ethical decisions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

7. Technical knowledge related to the job

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

8. Proficiency with computer software programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

9. Ability to solve problems based on quantitative and qualitative data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

10. Ability to adapt to varying situations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Done
Appendix P: Graduates’ Perceptions of the Level of Importance of Job Competencies  
(Florida & North Carolina Campuses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a team structure and influence others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create and/or edit written reports</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate verbally with people inside and outside an organization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to plan strategically, organize, and prioritize work to achieve strategic goals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to obtain and process information</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make ethical decisions</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical knowledge related to the job</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency with computer software programs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to solve problems based on quantitative and qualitative data</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt to varying situations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key:  
N=45  
Florida (n) = 14  
North Carolina (n) = 31
Appendix Q: Business Representative/Employer Survey

Employers

Below is a list of various competencies that employees may be required to possess in order to perform their jobs well. Please rate your perception of the level of importance of each competency on a 5-point scale, where:

5 = Extremely important
4 = Very Important
3 = Somewhat important
2 = Not very important
1 = Not at all important

1. Ability to work in a team structure and influence others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Ability to create and/or edit written reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Ability to communicate verbally with people inside and outside an organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Ability to plan strategically, organize, and prioritize work to achieve strategic goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Ability to obtain and process information

https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/CHNSYQB
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. Ability to make ethical decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Technical knowledge related to the job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Proficiency with computer software programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Ability to solve problems based on quantitative and qualitative data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Ability to adapt to varying situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Done
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Appendix R: Business Representatives/Employers’ Perceptions of the Level of Importance of Job Competencies (Florida & North Carolina Campuses)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competencies</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
<th>FL</th>
<th>NC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability to work in a team structure and influence others</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to create and/or edit written reports</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to communicate verbally with people inside and outside an organization</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to plan strategically, organize, and prioritize work to achieve strategic goals</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to obtain and process information</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to make ethical decisions</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical knowledge related to the job</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficiency with computer software programs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to solve problems based on quantitative and qualitative data</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to adapt to varying situations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key:**
N=25
Florida (n) = 13
North Carolina (n) = 12
Appendix S: Selected Courses for QEP Implementation

Florida Campus

TWO GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENG 111</td>
<td>ENGLISH COMPOSITION I</td>
<td>The basic purpose of this course is to enhance the student’s thinking and writing skills, particularly with regard to argumentative prose. The goal is to prepare the student not only for success in academic writing but also for effective participation in and critical understanding of the public and professional discourses of the “real” world beyond school. Students will analyze audience and situations to craft appropriately effective prose. The class involves frequent intensive practice, meaningful discussion, and purposeful writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENG 330</td>
<td>WRITING PROFESSIONALLY</td>
<td>In this course students study and practice the various types of writing typically found in professional and administrative applications. Using problem solving approaches and strategies, students analyze case problems and design responses that meet the needs of the audiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TWO BUSINESS CORE COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 250</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>An introduction to traditional and contemporary concerns of management. The course studies the fundamentals of management theory with emphasis on mid-management problems of enterprises. It includes history of management; planning, organizing, and controlling; decision-making fundamentals; information systems; motivation, communications, and leadership; international management and social responsibilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MKT 250</td>
<td>PRINCIPLES OF MARKETING</td>
<td>This course examines the nature and significance of marketing, its functions, and its institutions. Promotional activities studied include target marketing, the role of advertising, advertising media, distribution, pricing, product policies and the role of marketing as a productive system within our economy. Examples emphasizing the increasingly important role of ethics in the business environment will be discussed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TWO COURSES IN EVERY MAJOR

ACCOUNTING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACC 312</td>
<td>ACCOUNTING INFORMATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>A study of the overall composition of accounting information systems, including basic accounting system concepts, system design and implementation, accounting applications and controls, and current developments in the field impacting the design accounting information systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT 499</td>
<td>POLICY &amp; STRATEGY</td>
<td>Business Policy and Strategy is a course designed to introduce the student to the concepts and tools of strategic management and to strategic decision making. It will help you understand the role of the strategic management process in shaping the character, direction, and performance of business firms. The course is designed to examine in detail the analytical, behavioral, and creative aspects of the formation and execution of business decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSE</th>
<th>TITLE</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CIS 340</td>
<td></td>
<td>This course is designed to cover major topics in creating web pages and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Code</td>
<td>Course Title</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEB DESIGN FOR E-COMMERCE</td>
<td>This course covers major topics in creating web pages and managing a website on the Intranet or Internet. The student will develop skills in understanding and writing HTML code and developing basic JavaScript routines. Web design techniques stress web marketing and E-commerce. Individual projects are stressed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS 499 SEMINAR IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS</td>
<td>This course is the capstone for the computer information systems major. Discussions will include the process of systems analysis and design, and other topics relevant to today’s information systems environment. The student will apply skills developed in other information systems courses by designing and developing realistic system (databases, network, website, etc.) using the process systems analysis and design, or by completing several programming applications. Approval of the systems project by the professor is required.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS 340 WEB DESIGN FOR E-COMMERCE</td>
<td>The capstone course integrates the student’s academic experience, directs it toward a comprehensive analysis of the corporate communication field, and demonstrates their skills through various to research and present a variety of topics in the field and demonstrate their skills through various case studies and projects.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIMINAL JUSTICE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>This course will provide an in-depth examination of the crimes and the actions most encountered by the private industry and the public law enforcement officer. We will also examine recent court decisions. Students will become acquainted with concepts of search and seizure, individual restraint, and limitations of personal freedom and expression.</td>
<td>This course is designed to examine the rules of evidence applied in criminal investigation and criminal court with a discussion of relevant issues and legal standards. The course further provides and introduction to criminal procedures such as arrest search, and seizure, use of force and handling evidence. Topics include the legal use and degree of force, rights of suspects and arrested persons, types of evidence, admissibility, proof and competence of evidence as related to criminal law and recent course decisions. The course also includes the discussion of relevant issues and legal standards.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
management process in shaping the character, direction, and performance of business firms. The course is designed to examine in detail the analytical, behavioral, and creative aspects of the formation and execution of business decisions.

**HOSPITALITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTM 300</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN THE HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INDUSTRY</td>
<td>This course focuses on the job of recruiting, training, and retaining the most valuable asset of the hospitality and tourism industry: its human resources. The hospitality and tourism industry is heavily dependent on service and employs the largest number of people of any other industry, and its future success relies heavily on having trained and qualified persons to deliver their product. Students will look at the different theories and methods used in training and will have an opportunity to visit training facilities at major hospitality establishments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HTM 475</td>
<td>OPERATIONS ANALYSIS IN HOSPITALITY AND TOURISM INDUSTRY</td>
<td>This course will examine financial statements, which are specific to the hospitality and tourism industry. Students will investigate an analysis of how hotels determine room rates and restaurant menu prices to achieve profitability. This course will also look at the volatility of this industry regarding the risks and the ratios used to measure risk will be covered. Some emphasis will be placed on managerial decision making in the hospitality industry.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MANAGEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 321</td>
<td>BUSINESS ETHICS</td>
<td>The course studies the ethical environment of business by isolating major current issues confronting decision makers. Students contend with decisions complicated by issues of legality, fairness and social responsibility, as well as personal conscience and consequential or duty based ethical issues. The course relies on discussion, reading research, and case analysis to achieve the goal of relating ethics to decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 499</td>
<td>POLICY &amp; STRATEGY</td>
<td>Business Policy and Strategy is a course designed to introduce the student to the concepts and tools of strategic management and to strategic decision making. It will help you understand the role of the strategic management process in shaping the character, direction, and performance of business firms. The course is designed to examine in detail the analytical, behavioral, and creative aspects of the formation and execution of business decisions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**MARKETING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKT 340</td>
<td>CONSUMER BEHAVIOR</td>
<td>This course examines individual and group decision making processes and purchasing behavior in public, private, and non-private sectors. Modern comprehensive models provide a framework for the student to explore intra and inter personal variables, the market environment, consumer research, choice and attitude, market segmentation and consumerism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MKT 480</td>
<td>INTERNATIONAL MARKETING</td>
<td>The capstone course introduces the student to high level marketing decisions. Case studies are utilized and frequently applied marketing strategies are studied. Planning frameworks as used in problem analysis are examined. Focus is on management problems including several strategic business units involved in the decision. Competitive behavior is studied. Long-term advantages are emphasized, and financial considerations are examined. <em>(Spring)</em> Pre-requisite: Senior standing or instructor approval</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### SPORTS BUSINESS MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SBM 260</td>
<td>ETHICS AND ISSUES IN SPORT BUSINESS MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>The purpose of this course is to: (a) promote critical self-evaluation of one’s own ethics and beliefs, (b) examine one’s philosophy, clarify values and refine any moral or ethical reasoning skills, and (c) examine ethical situations and issues within the sport environment. Through class discussions, projects, and debates, ethical issues and situations that affect sport managers are addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBM 460</td>
<td>SPORT ADMINISTRATION</td>
<td>This course serves as a “Capstone” course in the Sport Business Management concentration. It strives to integrate all of previous courses as students work individually and in teams on group projects requiring the application and integration of knowledge and experience from previous SBM courses.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL BUSINESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGT 321</td>
<td>BUSINESS ETHICS</td>
<td>The course studies the ethical environment of business by isolating major current issues confronting decision makers. Students contend with decisions complicated by issues of legality, fairness and social responsibility, as well as personal conscience and consequential or duty based ethical issues. The course relies on discussion, reading research, and case analysis to achieve the goal of relating ethics to decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGT 312</td>
<td>HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT</td>
<td>Managing human capital in the new economy is a challenge all business professionals face. This course addresses that challenge by retaining its unique orientation to overall practicality and real-world application incorporating technology, teams and virtual learning methods. Practical tips and suggestions provide effective ways of dealing with problems in communication, leadership, discipline, performance appraisal, labor relations, and compensation administration.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL EDUCATION COURSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WRT 110</td>
<td>COMPOSITION I: INQUIRY THROUGH WRITING</td>
<td>This course introduces students to academic writing. Through exposure to different genres in reading and writing, students develop an appreciation of the writing process, conventions and rhetorical approaches. The course emphasizes critical thinking and effective communication. Through writing, reading, and effective reasoning we challenge students to begin to develop habits of intellectual inquiry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRT 120</td>
<td>COMPOSITION II: REASONING THROUGH WRITING</td>
<td>This course continues the development of critical thinking and effective written communication. The course emphasizes argumentative writing, focusing on the ability to construct and defend a thesis using supporting evidence from properly documented academic research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE 230</td>
<td>HUMAN CULTURE AND THOUGHT I</td>
<td>This course begins an interdisciplinary survey of Western civilization in its global context. We will examine the variety of ways literate humans have grasped the human tasks of governance, moral obligation, artistic expression, and relationship to transcendence from our beginnings to the medieval period. Our purpose will be to appreciate the commonality and diversity among various cultures in their own terms and to respond critically to them. Communication and critical thinking skills continue to be emphasized: formal writing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SAGE 240</td>
<td>HUMAN CULTURE AND THOUGHT II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This course continues the interdisciplinary survey of Western civilization in its global context. We will examine shifts in science and technology, governance, aesthetics, and concepts of authority from the Renaissance period through modernity. Our objective will be to understand the intellectual, social, and religious foundations of modern Western civilization. Rhetorical skills continue to be developed, including the ability to analyze and evaluate arguments rationally and to frame thoughtful and persuasive responses.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAGE 450</th>
<th>GLOBAL ISSUES &amp; ETHICAL RESPONSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This course challenges class members to investigate a topic of global significance and develop a response as servant leaders. Topics or issues will vary depending upon class composition and interest. Guided by a faculty convener, students will work to understand historical and ideological roots of this issue, to collect cross-disciplinary data, to explore political and social dimensions, and to formulate an ethically sensitive response. The path of inquiry will be particularly informed by the students’ disciplinary studies. The class will work collaboratively on a culminating project and presentation. Students will write substantial essays that synthesize their learning in the context of the seminar and their broader academic experience. (Currently under renovation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TWO COURSES FOR EVERY MAJOR**

**PSYCHOLOGY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSY 101</th>
<th>INTRODUCTION TO PSYCHOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An introduction to the basic concepts, methods, issues, and theories of psychology, including such topics as the biological bases of behavior, perception, learning and memory, human development, motivation, personality, social influences, and pathological behavior.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PSY 445</th>
<th>PSYCHOLOGY: HISTORY &amp; SYSTEMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A consideration of the philosophical and empirical foundations of psychology and the contribution of the various systems of psychology to understanding human and animal behavior. A synthesis of knowledge and skills expected of the undergraduate psychology major is emphasized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**FORENSIC SCIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIO 201</th>
<th>INTRODUCTION TO BIOLOGY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A concept-oriented course in biology that introduces students to rudimentary principles of biological building blocks and macromolecules, cellular organization and reproduction, evolution, Mendelian Genetics. (Three hours of laboratory and three hours of lecture per week.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FOR 402</th>
<th>MICROANALYSIS OF TRACE EVIDENCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advanced course in the identification and analysis of physical evidence previously recovered from a crime scene. Students will learn what types of analysis is best suited to specific forms of evidence. The class will cover: 1) the importance of maintaining a chain of custody and proper documentation, 2) how the different major types of analysis are performed and how to choose the proper technique for the evidence, 3) the theory behind the techniques, and 4) how to discuss the accuracy and precision of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A technique in relationship to such information as population statistics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIOLOGY BS &amp; BA</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO 201</strong></td>
<td><strong>CONCEPTS IN BIOLOGY I</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BIO 466 BIOLOGY SENIOR SEMINAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHILOSOPHY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHI 100</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION TO PHILOSOPHY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHI 340</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOPICS IN APPLIED PHILOSOPHY</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RELIGIOUS STUDIES</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>RST 232</strong></td>
<td><strong>TOPICS IN BIBLICAL STUDIES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RST 340</strong></td>
<td><strong>HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN THOUGHT</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COMMUNICATIONS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>COM 101</strong></td>
<td><strong>INTRODUCTION TO MASS COMMUNICATIONS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COM 454 COMMUNICATIONS PRACTICUM</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUINE STUDIES – THERAPEUTIC HORSEMANSHIP</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TH 246</strong></td>
<td><strong>THERAPEUTIC HORSEMANSHIP PRINCIPLES AND</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CONCEPTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TH 465 THERAPEUTIC HORSEMANSHIP ISSUES &amp; ETHICS</td>
<td>This course will survey a variety of current issues and topics within the national and international fields of therapeutic horsemanship. The students will review and discuss ethics in therapeutic horsemanship. Problem solving, research, and critical thinking will be emphasized to provide students with skills to make sound judgments concerning issues and ethics in therapeutic horsemanship.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SPORTS & RECREATIONAL STUDIES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SS 231 FOUNDATIONS &amp; PRINCIPLES OF PE &amp; SPORT</td>
<td>This course focuses on the foundations and principles relating to the history, philosophy, profession, and discipline of physical education and sport in the United States. Career opportunities in physical education and sport are explored.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRS 385 GOVERNANCE &amp; ETHICS IN SPORT &amp; RECREATION</td>
<td>This course provides an overview of the major amateur and professional sport governance and recreational structures in the United States and internationally. This course introduces students to the major topics, trends, problems and issues involved in athletics, sport and recreation management. It is designed to assist students to examine their values, moral reasoning skills and develop a personal philosophical approach to ethics in sport and recreation. Major moral/ethical issues within sport and recreation are researched and discussed. Students experience the ethical decision-making process through opportunities for critical thinking by drawing upon their philosophical bases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BUSINESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ECON 202 MICROECONOMICS</td>
<td>The course is an introduction to macroeconomic theory. The course identifies the primary social and economic goals for a society, including income, employment, and stability of prices. The methods and sources of the variables (economic indicators) used to measure those goals are described. The course presents the major theories on the cause and effect relationships between the variables, and explains the human behaviors that underlie those relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUS 335 BUSINESS ETHICS</td>
<td>This course uses a managerial framework to identify, analyze, and understand how business people make ethical decisions and deal with ethical issues. It covers the theoretical concepts of ethical reasoning as well as the organizational environment that influences ethical decision-making. Case analysis, readings, and research are used to achieve the learning outcomes for the course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix T: Pre-QEP Implementation Dissemination Plan

The QEP goals and steps must be communicated to a variety of stakeholders in the Webber academic community, including instructors, students, staff, student leadership groups, academic leadership, institutional policymakers, and course and program directors.

To meet this obligation, the Dissemination Plan sub-task force of the QEP Final Version DTF has identified opportunities to disseminate information about the QEP and its objectives. The following tables provide an overview of these strategies, divided by events and tasks.

Table 9. Pre-QEP Dissemination Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Target Audience</th>
<th>Proposed Leadership</th>
<th>Timeline (Spring 2016)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QEP Kick-off Event and Student Competition: QEP logo and branding</td>
<td>Webber and St. Andrews</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Marketing faculty, student life</td>
<td>Jan.-Feb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP add-on event to Super Bowl Viewing Party</td>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Student life</td>
<td>Feb. 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP add-on event to Dodgeball Tournament</td>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Student life</td>
<td>Mar. 21-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Weekend QEP event</td>
<td>St. Andrews</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Student life</td>
<td>Apr. 15-17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP add-on event to Bon Fire and Cook-Out beside the Lake</td>
<td>Webber</td>
<td>All students</td>
<td>Student life</td>
<td>Feb. 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QEP Promotional Give-away</td>
<td>Webber</td>
<td>All stakeholders</td>
<td>Student life</td>
<td>Mar. 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10. QEP Dissemination Media and Tasks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Media</th>
<th>Tasks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Print</td>
<td>• Print banners (both campuses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop posters/flyers for classrooms and bathroom doors (both campuses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop inserts for cafeteria napkin holders or alternative item for “inserts” (both campuses)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Run QEP article in <em>The Warrior</em> (Babson Park campus)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Online                          | Add QEP page and branding to website (both campuses)  
|                               | Develop QEP-themed screen savers for campus computers (both campuses)  
|                               | Add a QEP-related story to the Webber blog  
|                               | Integrate QEP posts into Webber social media pages  
| Email                         | Send university-wide QEP email announcement (both campuses)  
| Handouts                      | Distribute QEP-themed pens, sticky notes, and other trinkets to all faculty and staff (both campuses)  
|                               | Distribute QEP-themed t-shirts, lanyards, and other items typically distributed to students through student life (both campuses)  

## Appendix U: Ethical Reasoning VALUE Rubric

**ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC**

*for more information, please contact value@aaacu.org*

### Definition

Ethical Reasoning is reasoning about right and wrong human conduct. It requires students to be able to assess their own ethical values and the social context of problems, recognize ethical issues in a variety of settings, think about how different ethical perspectives might be applied to ethical dilemmas, and consider the ramifications of alternative actions. Students' ethical self-identity evolves as they practice ethical decision-making skills and learn how to describe and analyze positions on ethical issues.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capstone</th>
<th>Milestones</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Self-Awareness</th>
<th>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.</th>
<th>Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</th>
<th>Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understanding Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td>Student names the theory or theories, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and accurately explains the details of the theory or theories used.</td>
<td>Student can name the major theory or theories she/he uses, can present the gist of said theory or theories, and attempts to explain the details of the theory or theories used, but has some inaccuracies.</td>
<td>Student can name the major theory she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named theory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Issue Recognition</td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.</td>
<td>Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.</td>
<td>Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.</td>
<td>Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts</td>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of and can reasonably defend against the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, and the student's defense is adequate and effective.</td>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of, and respond to the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts, but the student's response is inadequate.</td>
<td>Student states a position and can state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix V: Sample Version of the DIT-2

Instructions

This questionnaire is concerned with how you define the issues in a social problem. Several stories about social problems will be described. After each story, there will be a list of questions. The questions that follow each story represent different issues that might be raised by the problem. In other words, the questions/issues raise different ways of judging what is important in making a decision about the social problem. You will be asked to rate and rank the questions in terms of how important each one seems to you.

This questionnaire is in two parts: one part contains the INSTRUCTIONS (this part) and the stories presenting the social problems; the other part contains the questions/issues and the ANSWER SHEET on which to write your responses.

Here is an example of the task:

Presidential Election

Imagine that you are about to vote for a candidate for the Presidency of the United States. Imagine that before you vote, you are given several questions, and asked which issue is the most important to you in making up your mind about which candidate to vote for. In this example, 5 items are given. On a rating scale of 1 to 5 (1=Great, 2=Much, 3=Some, 4=Little, 5=No) please rate the importance of the item (issue) by filling in with a pencil one of the bubbles on the answer sheet by each item.
Assume that you thought that item #1 (below) was of great importance, item #2 had some importance, item #3 had no importance, item #4 had much importance, and item #5 had much importance. Then you would fill in the bubbles on the answer sheet as shown below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GREAT</th>
<th>MUCH</th>
<th>SOME</th>
<th>LITTLE</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)**

- 1. Financially are you personally better off now than you were four years ago?
- 2. Does one candidate have a superior moral character?
- 3. Which candidate stands the tallest?
- 4. Which candidate would make the best world leader?
- 5. Which candidate has the best ideas for our country's internal problems, like crime and health care?

Further, the questionnaire will ask you to rank the questions in terms of importance. In the space below, the numbers 1 through 12, represent the item number. From top to bottom, you are asked to fill in the bubble that represents the item in first importance (of those given you to choose from), then second most important, third most important, and fourth most important. Please indicate your top four choices. You might fill out this part, as follows:

**Rank which issue is the most important (item number).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Most important item</th>
<th>Third most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Second most important</th>
<th>Fourth most important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note that some of the items may seem irrelevant to you (as in item #3) or not make sense to you—in that case, rate the item as “No” importance and do not rank the item. Note that in the stories that follow, there will be 12 items for each story, not five. Please make sure to consider all 12 items (questions) that are printed after each story.

In addition you will be asked to state your preference for what action to take in the story. After the story, you will be asked to indicate the action you favor on a three-point scale (1 = strongly favor some action, 2 = can't decide, 3 = strongly oppose that action).

In short, read the story from this booklet, then fill out your answers on the answer sheet. Please use a #2 pencil. If you change your mind about a response, erase the pencil mark cleanly and enter your new response.

[Notice the second part of this questionnaire, the Answer Sheet. The Identification Number at the top of the answer sheet may already be filled in when you receive your materials. If not, you will receive instructions about how to fill in the number. If you have questions about the procedure, please ask now.

Please turn now to the Answer Sheet.]
Famine—(Story #1)

The small village in northern India has experienced shortages of food before, but this year’s famine is worse than ever. Some families are even trying to feed themselves by making soup from tree bark. Mustaq Singh’s family is near starvation. He has heard that a rich man in his village has supplies of food stored away and is hoarding food while its price goes higher so that he can sell the food later at a huge profit. Mustaq is desperate and thinks about stealing some food from the rich man’s warehouse. The small amount of food that he needs for his family probably wouldn’t even be missed.

[If at any time you would like to reread a story or the instructions, feel free to do so. Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues and rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Reporter—(Story #2)

Molly Dayton has been a news reporter for the Gazette newspaper for over a decade. Almost by accident, she learned that one of the candidates for Lieutenant Governor for her state, Grover Thompson, had been arrested for shoplifting 20 years earlier. Reporter Dayton found out that early in his life, Candidate Thompson had undergone a confused period and done things he later regretted, actions which would be very out-of-character now. His shoplifting had been a minor offense and charges had been dropped by the department store. Thompson has not only straightened himself out since then, but built a distinguished record in helping many people and in leading constructive community projects. Now, Reporter Dayton regards Thompson as the best candidate in the field and likely to go on to important leadership positions in the state. Reporter Dayton wonders whether or not she should write the story about Thompson’s earlier troubles because in the upcoming close and heated election, she fears that such a news story could wreck Thompson’s chance to win.

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]
School Board—(Story #3)

Mr. Grant has been elected to the School Board District 190 and was chosen to be Chairman. The district is bitterly divided over the closing of one of the high schools. One of the high schools has to be closed for financial reasons, but there is no agreement over which school to close. During his election to the school board, Mr. Grant had proposed a series of “Open Meetings” in which members of the community could voice their opinions. He hoped that dialogue would make the community realize the necessity of closing one high school. Also he hoped that through open discussion, the difficulty of the decision would be appreciated, and that the community would ultimately support the school board decision. The first Open Meeting was a disaster. Passionate speeches dominated the microphones and threatened violence. The meeting barely closed without fist-fights. Later in the week, school board members received threatening phone calls. Mr. Grant wonders if he ought to call off the next Open Meeting.

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Cancer—(Story #4)

Mrs. Bennett is 62 years old, and in the last phases of colon cancer. She is in terrible pain and asks the doctor to give her more pain-killer medicine. The doctor has given her the maximum safe dose already and is reluctant to increase the dosage because it would probably hasten her death. In a clear and rational mental state, Mrs. Bennett says that she realizes this; but she wants to end her suffering even if it means ending her life. Should the doctor give her an increased dosage?

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]

Demonstration—(Story #5)

Political and economic instability in a South American country prompted the President of the United States to send troops to “police” the area. Students at many campuses in the U.S.A. have protested that the United States is using its military might for economic advantage. There is widespread suspicion that big oil multinational companies are pressuring the President to safeguard a cheap oil supply even if it means loss of life. Students at one campus took to the streets, in demonstrations, tying up traffic and stopping regular business in the town. The president of the university demanded that the students stop their illegal demonstrations. Students then took over the college’s administration building, completely paralyzing the college. Are the students right to demonstrate in these ways?

[Now turn to the Answer Sheet, go to the 12 issues for this story, rate and rank them in terms of how important each issue seems to you.]
Famine -- (Story #1)

What should Mustaq Singh do? Do you favor the action of taking the food? (Mark one.)

Q. Should take the food  Q. Can't decide  Q. Should not take the food

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Is Mustaq Singh courageous enough to risk getting caught for stealing?
2. Isn't it only natural for a loving father to care so much for his family that he would steal?
3. Shouldn't the community's laws be upheld?
4. Does Mustaq Singh know a good recipe for preparing soup from tree bark?
5. Does the rich man have any legal right to store food when other people are starving?
6. Is the motive of Mustaq Singh to steal for himself or to steal for his family?
7. What values are going to be the basis for social cooperation?
8. Is the epitome of eating reconcilable with the culpability of stealing?
9. Does the rich man deserve to be robbed for being so greedy?
10. Isn't private property an institution to enable the rich to exploit the poor?
11. Would stealing bring about more total good for everybody concerned or wouldn't it?
12. Are laws getting in the way of the most basic claim of any member of a society?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most Important item: [Mark an item number]  Second most important [Mark an item number]  Third most important [Mark an item number]  Fourth most important [Mark an item number]

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

Report -- (Story #2)

Do you favor the action of reporting the story? (Mark one.)

Q. Should report the story  Q. Can't decide  Q. Should not report the story

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Doesn't the public have a right to know all the facts about all the candidates for office?
2. Would publishing the story help Reporter Dayton's reputation for investigative reporting?
3. If Dayton doesn't publish the story wouldn't another reporter get the story anyway and get the credit for investigative reporting?
4. Since voting is such a joke anyway, does it make any difference what reporter Dayton does?
5. Hasn't Thompson shown in the past 20 years that he is a better person than his earlier days as a shop-lifter?
6. What would best serve society?
7. If the story is true, how can it be wrong to report it?
8. How could reporter Dayton be so cruel and heartless as to report the damaging story about candidate Thompson?
9. Does the right of "habeas corpus" apply in this case?
10. Would the election process be more fair with or without reporting the story?
11. Should reporter Dayton treat all candidates for office in the same way by reporting everything she learns about them, good and bad?
12. Isn't it a reporter's duty to report all the news regardless of the circumstances?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most Important item: [Mark an item number]  Second most important [Mark an item number]  Third most important [Mark an item number]  Fourth most important [Mark an item number]

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.
School Board -- (Story #3)

Do you favor calling off the next Open Meeting?

1. Should call off the next open meeting
2. Can't decide
3. Should have the next open meeting

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Is Mr. Grant required by law to have Open Meetings on major school board decisions?
2. Would Mr. Grant be breaking his election campaign promises to the community by discontinuing the Open Meetings?
3. Would the community be even angrier with Mr. Grant if he stopped the Open Meetings?
4. Would the change in plans prevent scientific assessment?
5. If the school board is threatened, does the chairman have the legal authority to protect the Board by making decisions in closed meetings?
6. Would the community regard Mr. Grant as a coward if he stopped the open meetings?
7. Does Mr. Grant have another procedure in mind for ensuring that divergent views are heard?
8. Does Mr. Grant have the authority to expel troublemakers from the meetings or prevent them from making long speeches?
9. Are some people deliberately undermining the school board process by playing some sort of power game?
10. What effect would stopping the discussion here on the community's ability to handle controversial issues in the future?
11. Is the trouble coming from only a few hotheads, and is the community in general really fair-minded and democratic?
12. What is the likelihood that a good decision could be made without open discussion from the community?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item

Third most important

Fourth most important

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.

Cancer -- (Story #4)

Do you favor the action of giving more medicine?

1. Should give Mrs. Bennett an increased dosage to make her die
2. Can't decide
3. Should not give her an increased dosage

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Isn't the doctor obligated by the same laws as everybody else if giving an overdose would be the same as killing her?
2. Wouldn't society be better off without so many laws about what doctors can and cannot do?
3. If Mrs. Bennett dies, would the doctor be legally responsible for malpractice?
4. Does the family of Mrs. Bennett agree that she should get more painkiller medicine?
5. Is the painkiller medicine an active heliotropic drug?
6. Does the state have the right to force continued existence on those who don't want to live?
7. Is helping to end another's life ever a responsible act of cooperation?
8. Would the doctor show more sympathy for Mrs. Bennett by giving the medicine or not?
9. Wouldn't the doctor feel guilty from giving Mrs. Bennett so much drug that she died?
10. Should only God decide when a person's life should end?
11. Shouldn't society protect everyone against being killed?
12. Where should society draw the line between protecting life and allowing someone to die if the person wants to?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item

Third most important

Fourth most important

Now please return to the Instructions booklet for the next story.
Demonstration -- (Story #5)
Do you favor the actions of demonstrating in this way?

1. Should continue demonstrating in these ways
2. Can't decide
3. Should not continue demonstrating in these ways

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. Do the students have any right to take over property that doesn't belong to them?
2. Do the students realize that they might be arrested and fined, and even expelled from school?
3. Are the students serious about their cause or are they doing it just for fun?
4. If the university president is soft on students this time, will it lead to more disorder?
5. Will the public blame all students for the actions of a few student demonstrators?
6. Are the authorities to blame by giving in to the greed of the multinational oil companies?
7. Why should a few people like Presidents and business leaders have more power than ordinary people?
8. Does this student demonstration bring about more or less good in the long run to all people?
9. Can the students justify their civil disobedience?
10. Shouldn't the authorities be respected by students?
11. Is taking over a building consistent with principles of justice?
12. Isn't it everyone's duty to obey the law, whether one likes it or not?

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Second most important: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Third most important: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Fourth most important: [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Please provide the following information about yourself:

1. Age in years:

2. Sex (mark one): [ ] Male [ ] Female

3. Level of Education (mark highest level of formal education attained, if you are currently working at that level [e.g., Freshman in college] or if you have completed that level [e.g., if you finished your Freshman year but have gone on no further]):
   [ ] Grade 1 to 6
   [ ] Grade 7, 8, 9
   [ ] Grade 10, 11, 12
   [ ] Vocational/technical school (without a bachelor's degree) (e.g., Auto mechanic, beauty school, real estate, secretary, 2-year nursing program).
   [ ] Junior college (e.g., 2-year college, community college, Associate Arts degree)
   [ ] Freshman in college in bachelor degree program.
   [ ] Sophomore in college in bachelor degree program.
   [ ] Junior in college in bachelor degree program.
   [ ] Senior in college in bachelor degree program.
   [ ] Professional degree (Practitioner degree beyond bachelor's degree) (e.g., M.D., M.B.A., Bachelor of Divinity, D.D.S. in Dentistry, J.D. in law, Masters of Arts in teaching, Masters of Education in teaching, Doctor of Psychology, Nursing degree along with 4-year Bachelor's degree)
   [ ] Masters degree (in academic graduate school).
   [ ] Doctoral degree (in academic graduate school, e.g., Ph.D. or Ed.D.)
   [ ] Other Formal Education. (Please describe:)

4. In terms of your political views, how would you characterize yourself (mark one)?
   [ ] Very Liberal
   [ ] Somewhat Liberal
   [ ] Neither Liberal nor Conservative
   [ ] Somewhat Conservative
   [ ] Very Conservative

5. Are you a citizen of the U.S.A.?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

6. Is English your primary language?
   [ ] Yes [ ] No

Thank You.

PLEASE DO NOT WRITE IN THIS AREA
Dilemma #6
Do you favor the action?

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12.

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item Second most important

Dilemma #7
Do you favor the action?

Rate the following 12 issues in terms of importance (1-5)

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 11. 12.

Rank which issue is the most important (item number).

Most important item Second most important
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