ASSESSMENT REPORT

DATE: 1/19/2016

COURSE or PROGRAM: University Learning Outcome: Moral and Ethical Reasoning

PARTICIPANTS: IOAC members (Carol Gruber, Deb Schadler, Ron Bruce, Pam Lynn, Joe Coleman, Dawn Hayward, Jing Gao, Karl Horvath, Lorraine Quarles)

OBJECTIVES: Are our graduates developing their ethical and moral reasoning abilities?

METHOD AND PROCEDURE: Members of the IOAC collected evidence through 2 methods:

1. Members conducted focus groups at the time of graduation.
2. The nationally benchmarked DIT2 test was sent to a random sample of students enrolled in Capstone Courses in all disciplines.

RESULTS: (State the final outcome(s) of the assessment; summarize the results. Do the results support your course-level Student Learning Outcomes? In what way? Why or why not?)

Focus Groups Results:

Legend: Positive ↑ Caution ← Negative ↓

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Do you think the University faculty and staff treated you ethically during your time here?</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What does it meant to be a Distinctive Mercy graduate?</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. In what ways was ethics incorporated into your Gwynedd experience?</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Has your ethical perspective with regard to the “dignity and worth of individuals” changed during your time at Gwynedd? If so, in what ways?</td>
<td>←</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The results indicate that students do not fully understand the “DMG” phrase

*NOTE: The results indicate ethics imbedded primarily through coursework

*NOTE: Analysis of answers indicate that one possible explanation for an answer of “no” meant only “no
change” from high level in Freshman to high level in Senior year.

5. Has your ethical perspective with regard to the “environment” changed during your time at Gwynedd? If so, in what ways?  

*NOTE: Analysis of answers indicate that students did not perceive uniform discussion of “environment” issues

6. Has your ethical perspective with regard to the larger “global community” changed during your time at Gwynedd?  

*NOTE: Analysis of answers indicate that students did not perceive uniform discussion of “global community” issues

DIT2 Test Results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N=19</th>
<th>38.94</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GMercyUMean</td>
<td>38.94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nat’lMean for Seniors</td>
<td>35.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

N=19, Post Conventional (P Score)

CONCLUSION: Evidence supports the hypothesis that our graduates develop their ethical and moral reasoning skills at levels higher than national average. Evidence also exists to support the findings that students perceive that they were treated ethically by faculty and staff and that “ethics” was
incorporated in the majority of the academic programs. However, evidence indicates that the following dimensions of ethics/moral reasoning are not fully developed within the university: environmental and global.

**NEXT STEPS:** The IOAC will inform the community regarding the positive comparison data (DIT2) at the General Assembly in Spring 2017. The committee members will also inform the community regarding the mixed and/or not evident results regarding environmental and global outcomes.

The IOAC will incorporate these findings when revising the ULOs.

The IOAC recommends that the members of the General Education Committee continue with their attempts to clarify the components of the “Distinctive Mercy” so that we have a shared vision and incorporate the

The IOAC will ask Schools for guidance on whether or not the University needs to incorporate and/or emphasize more Environmental and Global issues within our courses and programs in order to more completely align and connect the program outcomes with these Core Values...

**NOTE:** The results of this assessment are to be used with caution. The results of the research study as described have several critical limitations: 1. The focus group results have not been confirmed to have provided a representative sample; 2. The data collection efforts from the focus group were not fully consistent.