Ethical and Social Responsibility was assessed in GE 1000 using the Defining Issues Test (DIT2) – an instrument designed to measure moral decision making. For information on the DIT2 test, please visit: http://www.centerforthestudyofethicaldevelopment.net/Instruments,%20Services,%20and%20Materials.htm

927 students were administered the online assessment, 561 data sets were valid and usable for analysis.

**Table 1: Kean University Mean Scores Compared to National Mean Scores**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal Interest (Stage 2/3)</th>
<th>Maintain Norms (Stage 4)</th>
<th>Post Conventional (P Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kean University Mean</td>
<td>38.84</td>
<td>33.04</td>
<td>16.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Mean</td>
<td>26.52</td>
<td>34.29</td>
<td>34.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Discussion/Findings:

A higher Post Conventional Score (P-Score) is representative of a higher level of moral development. The students in this cohort scored lower to students of a congruent population (freshmen) at the national level (on average). The Kean University cohort has a mean P-score of 16.44 compared to the national average, 34.11 (almost double).

This cohort also showed disparity with Personal Interest scores compared to the National Average. The mean score of the cohort for Personal Interest was 38.84 compared to that of the National Average, 26.52. It is suggested by way of the historical research that someone who is more morally developed, which would also equate to a high Post Conventional (P) score, would have a low(er) Personal Interest score.

Where this cohort does align to a degree with the national average is the Maintaining Norms component. KU students averaged 33.04 and the national freshman population averaged 34.29.

This cohort has an overall high Personal Interest score and a low Post Conventional score which based on the assessment suggests that we need to re-examine how we are teaching ethical values.

Actions/Closing the Loop:

When reviewing the findings it should be noted that the course (GE 1000) in which the students completed the assessment/test did not place a particular emphasis on ethical and moral development by way of course assignments and projects. GE1000 was originally envisaged to be about personal development, but over the years it has been added to by various teachers and leaders until it has become (rather typically) a depository for every faculty’s hopes and dreams for their students – from
the writing of thesis statements through to starting their co-curricular transcript. For instance, though one of the course objectives is to address ethical responsibility, it had become enacted as teaching ethical behaviour through discussing plagiarism and academic integrity. What was more of a particular focus in GE 1000 was civic engagement by way of students’ required out of class community service participation. It is likely that the courses taken simultaneously with GE 1000 (typically first semester freshman year) also did not have a particular emphasis on moral development. We have now written a new GE 1000 which takes the course back to roots in a modern manner.

Within the “new” GE 1000 course (implemented spring 2014) students will continue to participate in civic based out of class activities and reflect in writing about them. In the newly revised course students will also have more of an opportunity to cultivate their moral development. The new course focuses on a personal development that embraces the enrichment potential of certain values and an appreciation for diversity, a personal development which also extends beyond the self and speaks to how individuals treat one another. Students will engage in conversation about values and ethics as they respond orally and in writing through journal assignments to selected readings that speak to these areas. Students will confront ethical ideas through these active approaches to learning.