Department: Human and Social Science   **Date:10/31/19**
General Education Committee has selected the following area for the 2018-2019 & 2019-2020 assessment cycles: **Analysis**: to recognize, understand, critically evaluate and synthesize the components of a topic using methods appropriate to the discipline.
General Education Committee: Background: What factors caused the committee to choose this particular assessment outcome? The committee selected this outcome based upon the emphasis on developing higher –order thinking in CUNE graduates.
Department: *What student outcome will the department assess that addresses: "The student will be able to demonstrate effective communication skills for personal, academic and professional purposes?*   The student will be able to analyze the components of an ethical dilemma and effectively argue in favor of an ethical choice.

Department: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.*
 	
 Question 1: What proportion of students across psychology, behavioral science, criminal justice, and DCE courses MEET the benchmark requirements for:
      1. recognizing an ethical issue;
      2. evaluating differing ethical perspectives or concepts;
      3. maintaining ethical self-awareness;
      4. applying ethical perspectives or concepts; and
      5. applying Biblical values, perspectives, or concepts?
 	
 Question 2: What proportion of students across psychology, behavioral science, criminal justice, and DCE courses EXCEED the benchmark requirements for:
      1. recognizing an ethical issue;
      2. evaluating differing ethical perspectives or concepts;
      3. maintaining ethical self-awareness;
      4. applying ethical perspectives or concepts; and
      5. applying Biblical values, perspectives, or concepts?

Methodology:
    1. *OBJECT* - What data (i.e. artifact, exam score, detailed description of assignment) will be collected?* Instructors will assign a written assignment for students to analyze an ethical case study. Each course will receive a discipline-appropriate case study. Students are asked to submit their typed responses regarding the ethical action they would take. In particular, students will be asked to identify the main conclusion, reasons in support of the conclusion, problematic assumptions, their own assessment of their bias within the social context, their ethical reasoning, and whether Biblical values conflict with or are in agreement with the main conclusion.
      a. *How does this data address the assessment question?* Students written responses will be analyzed according to the rubric used to score the assessment. Each benchmark requirement listed in the assessment questions is a separate cateogry of the rubric.
         i. *Include/attach a description/example of assessment tool to be used.*
    2. *How will data be collected?* Data will be collected in CEL 480, SW 201, CJ 400, and PSY 442. Instructors will ask students to submit either printed copies or Blackboard copies of their assignment. The instructors will, then, submit their assessment artifacts to the department for scoring. Names will be removed from the assessment prior to scoring.

Analysis of Artifacts: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* **-** Discuss :
    1) How the artifacts will be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used): A rubric will be used to assess students' written work (see attached). This rubric was taken from the Association of American Colleges & Universities and modified to suit the department's goals of assessing the extent to which students apply Biblical values, perspectives, or concepts. At least two independent raters (who did not teach the course) will be assigned to score assessment artifacts from each class. Raters will iteratively score artifacts until an interrater agreement meets at least 80%. Disagreements will be discussed until a final score has been decided for each student's work. All scoring will be tabulated in a spreadsheet and descriptive statistics (frequencies and percentages) will be calculated for each rubric category by course.
    2) How you will know if it is good (i.e. score required by % of students): If students do not meet the benchmark requirement, their work will be assigned a 0 in that category. Therefore, answering the first assessment question (i.e., meeting benchmark requirements) will require a score of 1 for that category. Answering the second assessment

question (i.e., exceeding benchmark requirements) will require a score of 2 or higher. Good performance on the assessment will be determined if 75% or more students meet or exceed the benchmark requirements.

Submitted by: Sara Brady Date: 11/04/19   Assessment Committee Reviewed (Date): 11/5/19
Department Chair notified of approval/or additional action needed: 11/5/19

CEL 280

Case Study: Pastoral Confidentiality

You are serving at a congregation when your senior pastor invites you into his office. He closes the door behind you and tells you that he has something confidential to share with you. He tells you that he is planning on leaving his position within a year and transition to an occupation as a full-time counselor. He believes that, if the congregation knew of his decision, they would be less responsive to the agenda that he has for the time he remains as senior pastor. You thank him for sharing and tell him that you will keep the information in confidence.

Two days later you are meeting with a key member of the congregation. The individual is very displeased with the pastor's performance and doesn't connect well with him on a personal level. He has taken his concerns directly to pastor numerous times without any response. He indicates that there are several other key members of the congregation who feel the same way (most of whom are very active and significant supporters of the church) and, in an effort to encourage the pastor to modify his behavior, they are planning on leaving the church as a group in two months. You know that such a departure will have a significant impact on the church's ministry capacity. You have encouraged the individual to speak directly to the pastor, but he is adamant that those efforts have failed in the past and this is the only option they are willing to consider. You know that information on pastor's planned move would diffuse the situation. Do you share the information you know with the individual?

Answer the following questions in writing:

1) Identify the conclusion that you reached

2) Identify reasons to support your conclusion

3) Identify problematic assumptions

4) Determine whether your reasons might not be true or acceptable within the social context

5) Determine whether your reasons support the main conclusion

6) Determine whether biblical values conflict with or are in agreement with your main conclusion

CJ 400

Case Study: Robin Hood Bank Robber

You are working on a bank robbery case and identify a suspect and have probably cause to make an arrest. You also find out that instead of keeping the money for himself, he donated it to a local orphanage. You know this orphanage has been struggling for funding, and this money will allow the children to receive proper food, clothing and medical care. Without the money, the orphanage will close. If you move with the case and arrest the man, the money will be taken away from the orphanage and given back to the bank.

What would you do?

In a written explanation:

- Based upon your core beliefs, state the ethical decision/path you would make, your reasons for making it, and how your decision relates to your core beliefs.
- Determine and describe whether Biblical values, as well as other ethical perspectives, conflict with or are in agreement with the ethical path you would take and state why.
- Based on your reading of the above Case Study, identify the main ethical decisions/paths that can be made/taken and the relationships between these different ethical decisions/paths.
- Apply Biblical ethics, as well as other ethical perspectives, to the above case study and describe the implications.
- Restate the ethical path/direction you would take and provide an explanation of the arguments that both support and oppose said path/direction.

Please read the case study below. In Social work, one of the competencies is to demonstrate Ethical and professional behavior. In social work this includes:

It includes reflection and self-regulation to manage personal values and maintain professionalism in practice situations.

It includes making ethical decisions, observing laws and regulations, ethical conduct and practice for this context.

Also, demonstrate professional demeanor in behavior, appearance, oral, written and electronic communication.

Use supervision and consultation to guide professional judgement and behavior.

1. In the scenario below, please identify all ethical issues present. Explain what they are.

2. Evaluate different ethical perspectives that may be present.

3. Identify in terms of your own personal and professional values what is or may be an ethical dilemma and why in terms of conduct, practice, possible laws and regulations in this situation.

Your personal and professional values are influenced by your Core Beliefs. Core beliefs are the fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training.

Jason Boyd, BWS, was working on paperwork at Oak Haven Nursing home, where he worked, when he heard a loud voice. He tried to ignore it at first. He suspected the voice belonged to Annie Shaw. Annie frequently turned on her call light and then yelled if help did not come quickly. The care staff, already busy with other residents, took time to respond. Sometimes Annie hit her call button by mistake because of her rheumatoid arthritis which frustrated staff when they found they were not needed. Jason decided to check on Annie himself. He found Annie flat on her back with her eyes closed, but crying out. Jason called to Annie loudly so she could hear him and because she was hard of hearing. Annie opened her eyes and she complained to Jason that "no one comes when I turn on my call light. I turned my light on over half an hour ago."

Jason said sincerely, "I'm really sorry Annie. The aides must be very busy today. What do you need?"

Annie stated she needed a pain pill. "My back is hurting something terrible today." Jason promised to let the nurses know and he left her room after reassuring Annie.

Jason talked to the charge nurse for Annie's floor and she told Jason that Annie has been requesting more pain medication lately. She suggested they may need to reevaluate her level of need. Jason suggested they talk about her pain medication at the next staff meeting.

Jason was in charge of organizing these meetings for all residents so he called Annie's county social worker, Helen Haines. He checked with the charge nurse and scheduled a time that worked for everyone. Helen Haines, BSW, worked for the Department of Human Services in the county where Annie Shaw was born. Helen served people with developmental disabilities. She

monitored the care they received. She needed to cultivate professional relationships with families, staff in various places and agencies and other social workers. Annie was an unusual case with no family left. Helen met with Jason Boyd at Oak Haven Nursing home more frequently because she was Annie's power of attorney. Annie was bedridden, but mentally sharp and needed socialization. Only social workers were available to check that Annie had sufficient clothing and personal toiletries. Helen took more time helping Annie than she had meaning she sometimes visited her on her own time. The county discouraged case managers from visiting unfunded clients by assigning large caseloads. Annie was considered unfunded. Helen knew she was going beyond the requirements of her job description by visiting Annie regularly. She also knew in some ways she had a dual relationship with Annie, a genuine closeness as well as a worker-client relationship yet she knew Annie was less depressed when she received regular visits and she needed someone to buy clothes and other personal items for her. The NASW code of ethics states that social workers need to promote the wellbeing of clients.

Suppes, Mary Ann & Wells, Carolyn Cressy. 2018. *The Social Work Experience: A Case-Based Introduction to Social Work and Social Welfare*, 7th edition. Pearson Education.

PSY 442

You the leader of the Children's Program at a church. After a Church event, a church member, and mother of a 4-year old boy, Eli, comes to you and reports her son is having a difficult time listening to directions and managing his temper at home. She asks if she and her husband can come and meet with you the next day to talk about discipline approaches with their son.

You meet with the couple the next day and their son Eli is also with them for the meeting. Both parents give examples of the Eli's "temper-tantrums" at home, as well as his general unwillingness to follow their directions and rules at home. You ask the parents what methods they are currently using to attempt to correct Eli at home, and the father states, "I give him a whipping, just the like the Bible says." He goes on to state that he has a wooden stick that is a small branch from a tree in their yard that he uses to "spank" Eli when he misbehaves. The mother interjects that she does not agree with the husband's disciplinary approach, and does not think the father should use a stick to "spank" Eli.

As the parents continue to share more of their approaches of discipline with Eli at home, Eli is playing with toys sitting on the floor. As Eli bends over to pick up a toy, the back of his shirt raises, and you can see a straight-line bruise on the lower part of Eli's back.

The parents begin to argue over whether Eli should be spanked by a stick by the father or if there should be another form of discipline used, and both parents ask you to side with his/her opinion. Additionally, they both use Scripture to defend their disciplinary approach.

1. Please identify the potential ethical dilemmas raised in the above vignette.
2. Please provide arguments for disparate ethical viewpoints in how a church leader "should" respond to the above vignette.
3. Please identify the potential legal issues raised in the above vignette and the role of church leaders in addressing legal matters.
4. Please describe how your own interpretation of Scriptures related to child discipline impacts the ethical choices you will make in your response
5. Please explain in a step-by-step process how you would respond

ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org

The VALUE rubrics were developed by teams of faculty experts representing colleges and universities across the United States through a process that examined many existing campus rubrics and related documents for each learning outcome and incorporated additional feedback from faculty. The rubrics articulate fundamental criteria for each learning outcome, with performance descriptors demonstrating progressively more sophisticated levels of attainment. The rubrics are intended for institutional-level use in evaluating and discussing student learning, not for grading. The core expectations articulated in all 15 of the VALUE rubrics can and should be translated into the language of individual campuses, disciplines, and even courses. The utility of the VALUE rubrics is to position learning at all undergraduate levels within a basic framework of expectations such that evidence of learning can by shared nationally through a common dialog and understanding of student success.

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.

Framing Language

This rubric is intended to help faculty evaluate work samples and collections of work that demonstrate student learning about ethics. Although the goal of a liberal 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 a 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.

Glossary

The definitions that follow were developed to clarify terms and concepts used in this rubric only.

- Core Beliefs: Those fundamental principles that consciously or unconsciously influence one's ethical conduct and ethical thinking. Even when unacknowledged, core beliefs shape one's responses. Core beliefs can reflect one's environment, religion, culture or training. A person may or may not choose to act on their core beliefs.
- Ethical Perspectives/concepts: The different theoretical means through which ethical issues are analyzed, such as ethical theories (e.g., utilitarian, natural law, virtue) or ethical concepts (e.g., rights, justice, duty).
- Complex, multi-layered (gray) context: The sub-parts or situational conditions of a scenario that bring two or more ethical dilemmas (issues) into the mix/problem/context/for student's identification.
- Cross-relationships among the issues: Obvious or subtle connections between/among the sub-parts or situational conditions of the issues present in a scenario (e.g., relationship of production of corn as part of climate change issue).

ETHICAL REASONING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.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.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

	Capstone	Milestones		Benchmark
	4	3	2	1
Ethical Self-Awareness	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs and discussion has greater depth and clarity.	Student discusses in detail/analyzes both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states both core beliefs and the origins of the core beliefs.	Student states either their core beliefs or articulates the origins of the core beliefs but not both.
Understanding ~~Different~~ *Biblical* Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student names the ~~theory or theories~~ *Biblical concept(s)*, can present the gist of said ~~theory or theories~~ *concept(s)*, and accurately explains the details of the ~~theory or theories~~ *Biblical concept(s)* used.	Student can name the major ~~theory or theories~~ *Biblical concept(s)* she/he uses, can present the gist of said ~~theory or theories~~ *concept(s)*, and attempts to explain the details of the ~~theory or theories~~ *Biblical concept(s)* used, but has some inaccuracies.	Student can name the major ~~theory~~ *Biblical concept* she/he uses, and is only able to present the gist of the named ~~theory~~ *Biblical concept.*	Student only names the major ~~theory~~ *Biblical concept* she/he uses.
Ethical Issue Recognition	Student can recognize ethical issues when presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (gray) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues and grasp (incompletely) the complexities or interrelationships among the issues.	Student can recognize basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or interrelationships.
Application of Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, and is able to consider full implications of the application.	Student can independently apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, accurately, but does not consider the specific implications of the application.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question, independently (to a new example) and the application is inaccurate.	Student can apply ethical perspectives/concepts to an ethical question with support (using examples, in a class, in a group, or a fixed-choice setting) but is unable to apply ethical perspectives/concepts independently (to a new example.).
Evaluation of Different Ethical Perspectives/Concepts	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.	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.	Student states a position and can state the objections to, assumptions and implications of different ethical perspectives/concepts but does not respond to them (and ultimately objections, assumptions, and implications are compartmentalized by student and do not affect student's position.)	Student states a position but cannot state the objections to and assumptions and limitations of the different perspectives/concepts.