

CTE Notebook

Newsletter of the Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence

Volume 4, Issue 4, Spring 2002

Ethics in Teaching: Teachers as Exemplars

Donna Werner, Program Coordinator
Ethics Across the Curriculum Program



When I was invited to share my thoughts on “ethics in teaching” for this newsletter, my first inclination was to go back and look at the Statement on Professional Ethics adopted by the American Association of University Professors (AAUP). This statement, originally adopted in 1966 and revised in 1987, identifies the following responsibilities for university professors in their role as teachers:

As teachers, professors en-

courage the free pursuit of learning in their students. They hold before them the best scholarly and ethical standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to ensure that their evaluations of students reflect each student’s true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom.

I want to focus my discussion on the responsibility to “hold before them the best scholarly

and **ethical** standards of their discipline” (emphasis added) because this is often not given the emphasis it deserves.

I am reminded of this responsibility each time I teach a session of “Business Ethics.” When I teach the module on Aristotle, I ask each student to write an essay identifying and describing a role model in his or her field or profession. For this assignment, students are asked to learn all they can about this person (via research or interview) and to provide a character sketch, including (at least) three key characteristics that they see in this person as well as a description of how this person’s actions demonstrate these characteristics. These essays are often quite wonderful, describing in exquisite detail the character traits of professionals whom my students admire and want to emulate. Quite often the role models identified and described are university

professors within their major fields. This past semester, for example, students identified faculty members in Communication, Sociology and Criminal Justice, Political Science, Accounting, and Computer Science. They described these role models as honest, fair, hard-working, dedicated, committed to excellence, passionate about learning in general and their disciplines in particular. These teachers are also human – they have a sense of humor, they struggle with balancing their professional and personal lives, they admit when they make mistakes. But most importantly these teachers exhibit to their students what it means to be a “professional” in their disciplines.

I point this out because it’s not clear to me that university professors realize their responsibility as models for their students. Certainly professors are expected to be knowledgeable and competent; they are required to treat students with respect; they are expected to grade fairly. But to be an “ethical” role model for their students? YES! You are an ethical exemplar – both as a person and as a professional.

As an “ethics teacher” I’m often confronted by students who take their ethics and values quite seriously in the context of their personal lives, but

believe that they may be forced to set these ethical responsibilities aside when they conflict with job requirements. “Oh, sure, that’s the ‘ethical’ thing to do. And that’s the answer I’d give in an ethics course,” one student commented recently. “But not as a business person, or in one of my business courses.” The implication, of course, is that ‘ethics’ places unrealistic or unreasonable demands on them and that ‘ethics’ is somehow separate and distinct from their lives as professionals.

But, of course, ethics is fundamental in all aspects of our lives, including our roles as professionals. Fortunately, as evidenced by the essays I’ve received, many Saint Louis University professors understand this, and more importantly, model it. These professors discuss ethical issues relevant to their disciplines with their students – both within their classrooms and in informal meetings. They acknowledge that ethics is an integral element of what it means to be a “professional.” They realize that they must take ethics seriously if they are to expect their students to take ethics seriously. And their students are paying attention.

One resource available to faculty is the Ethics Across the Curriculum (EAC) Program. Directed by John Kavanaugh, S.J., and guided by an advi-

sory committee of approximately 30 faculty members, the EAC program is an interdisciplinary, faculty development program that aims to provide the tools and resources faculty need to address ethical issues in their classrooms, laboratories, and other settings in which they teach. The program sponsors workshops, lectures, and conferences; monitors a listserv; maintains a web site at www.slu.edu/centers/ethics; and performs other activities to support faculty in this important endeavor. The program’s goal is to strengthen the ethical decision-making skills of our students by encouraging and assisting professors in addressing ethics in their specific disciplines.

If Saint Louis University is to achieve its vision as the “finest Catholic University in the United States,” the institution must continue to encourage university professors to be “ethical exemplars” by offering a supportive environment in which faculty can explore the ethical issues relevant to their disciplines and by building and sustaining a moral community of discourse among the faculty. And faculty must support one another in meeting our responsibility as exemplars of the ethical standards of our disciplines.

When Student Assessment Becomes Research

by Dr. James DuBois, Associate Professor, Center for Health Care Ethics

As teachers we have a responsibility to ensure that we are effective in promoting learning and development. Well-crafted assessment studies can provide data that is useful in evaluating effectiveness and improving important aspects of the educational enterprise. Nevertheless, educational assessment also poses a number of ethical challenges. Among other things, assessment raises many of the same issues that arise in human subjects research. In fact, some forms of assessment constitute human subjects research and accordingly require ethical review by Institutional Review Boards (IRBs).

This short essay aims (1) to clarify when assessment becomes research and requires IRB review, and (2) to examine when informed consent is necessary or appropriate.

IRBs and the Review of Educational Research

What counts as research?

The Code of Federal Regulations Title 45CFR46 – more commonly known as the Common Rule – provides the main regulatory framework for the review of human subjects research provided by Institutional Review Boards. The Common Rule defines research as “a systematic investigation, including research development, testing and evaluation, *designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge*” (45CFR46.101(b)(1),

emphasis added). Most useful assessment studies will meet the first criterion, that is, they will be systematic. The major point of debate typically is whether or not assessment studies are “designed to develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.” Neither the Common Rule nor the Office for Human Research Protections offers a clear-cut way of resolving this issue. But it seems that a standard of practice among IRBs is to ask whether or not the data will be shared in a public manner, e.g., in a publication or a conference presentation. If so, it is treated as research, even if the data might have been collected apart from the intention to share it publicly.

Who decides? Insofar as an assessment study constitutes research, it is subject to regulatory oversight. The U.S. Office for Human Research Protections (OHRP), requests that IRBs review *all* human subjects research, if only to determine whether or not a proposed project is exempt from the regulations and full IRB review. Educational research projects should be submitted to an IRB prior to gathering data. When in doubt about whether a study constitutes research, it is best to contact your local IRB.

What counts as “exempt” research? Some research may be deemed by an IRB to be exempt from the Common Rule and from full IRB review. The Common Rule identifies six

kinds of research that are exempt from the policy. The first of these is “Research conducted in established or commonly accepted educational settings involving normal educational practices such as (i) research on regular and special instructional strategies, or (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula or classroom management methods” (45CFR46.102 (d)). The vast majority of educational assessment studies clearly fall in this category. This means that the Common Rule does not require an IRB to review such research. But, as noted above, an IRB should determine whether or not the exemption applies and, as a matter of institutional policy, it may choose to review all research, including exempt research.

Why All the Fuss? This situation is frequently very frustrating to educational researchers. IRB review can delay the implementation of projects and may require changes in study design. In a recent public letter, the American Psychological Association criticized the way that minimal risk research is often reviewed by IRBs. Yet, while changes may be needed in the way that minimal risk research is regulated and reviewed in the United States, there remain sound reasons for providing competent and appropriate review of research within the educational

example, the teacher-researcher plays a *dual role* with possibly conflicting aims, namely, to educate and to generate new knowledge. Further, even exempt research may involve minor risks or fail to offer benefit to students, making it hard to justify mandatory participation in an educational setting. Thus, some form of ethical review of educational or assessment research may be appropriate, even when the Common Rule treats it as exempt.

When Is Informed Consent Appropriate in Educational Research Studies?

Obtaining informed consent is the norm in research. It is one way of showing respect to participants and it enables them to protect themselves from research harms by opting out. Yet informed consent has rarely been obtained in traditional educational assessment settings both because risks are minimal and because allowing students to opt out of assessment would interfere with maintaining the integrity of the educational process. Because the Common Rule and professional codes do not clearly resolve the tension between these two norms of practice, we need criteria to guide our evaluation of when informed consent is appropriate in educational assessment/research studies. In what follows, I propose five questions to guide this process. The process will be illustrated using a case. I have intention-

ally used a case with “gray areas” to emphasize the need for discussion and discretion.

Case: Bob teaches US History to about 200 undergraduates per year. He believes that his preference for a political party is deeply influenced by his understanding of US History. He wonders whether his students’ preferences for a political party is influenced by his course. And if so, he wonders whether it is the “facts of history” or rather his interpretation (offered wittingly or unwittingly) that affects changes in their views. He recruits a colleague of a different political persuasion, who also uses the same textbook, to conduct an assessment study of political party preference before and after their courses. They agree to co-author a paper for presentation at their professional society based on their findings.

The following questions can be used to guide the ethical review of all sorts of assessments studies, ranging from elementary reading assessments to studies such as Bob’s.

1. Does the study have scientific merit?

Scientifically flawed studies should not be allowed by IRBs or faculty mentors. They waste students’ time and, if published, they may lead others to base practice on unsubstantiated claims.

Case Comment: Being trained in history, Bob might

do well to recruit the help of a research methodologist to ensure that his assessment is valid and reliable. Among other things, this will involve controlling for other variables that might influence students’ preference for political parties.

2. Can consent be considered implied?

As the most recent draft of the APA’s Code of Ethics notes, consent to participate in assessment may be implied in certain contexts. For example, if specific kinds of assessment are mandated by law for all public schools, then enrolling a child in a public school implies consent.

Implied consent can never be a substitute for informed consent when informed consent is required by the Common Rule, but it may be relevant when reviewing research exempted from the Common Rule.

Case comment: If Bob is planning on requiring participation, he and his colleague should mention the assessment project in their course syllabus. Bob should also consider whether consent is implied to *publish* the data, or only to *collect* the assessment data. While no new risks are introduced at the level of publication (assuming only aggregated data is used), some IRBs and ethicists recommend considering the issue of consent to data collection separately from the issue of data use. If his assessment requires

honest and motivated students, he might even benefit from enlisting their consent at some level.

3. *Do students qua students benefit from the research?* There are different ways in which students may benefit educationally from research. They may benefit from living in a culture of assessment that allows them to learn using tools that have been proven effective. Sometimes the assessment process itself is educational (in offering practice on material or stimulating reflection).

Case comment: Bob needs to consider whether the students, as history students, really benefit from participation. If they do, he should make an effort to explain the value of participation. If not, he might ask them to participate voluntarily on their own time.

4. *How significant are the burdens and risks, and have steps been taken to minimize risks?* All exempt research is assumed to be of minimal risk. Nevertheless, burdens may include distress, embarrassment or lost time. Efforts should be made to minimize risks, e.g., to ensure that data is recorded anonymously or that confidentiality is protected. Risks may also arise from study design. For example, when there is good reason to believe that a randomized study will yield an inferior education for some, either an alternative design should be used or steps should be taken to follow

up with students who did not receive the optimal intervention.

Case comment: Students may feel uneasy about revealing their political preferences to a faculty member who has strong political feelings and who will be grading their performance in the course. A pre- and post-test design interferes with genuinely anonymous data collection. However, Bob could take measures to ensure that he only sees the data in blinded form. (He could, e.g., ensure that names only appear on a cover sheet that numerically corresponds to test sheets, and which is logged by a colleague and removed before Bob is given the test sheets.)

5. *Would obtaining informed consent harm the study?*

There are times when informed consent might improve the trustworthiness of a study. For example, if students need to be highly motivated, informed consent may be an asset. Nevertheless, there are times when informed consent threatens to undermine the validity of data. For example, by eliminating less-motivated students or students whose parents cannot or will not provide written informed consent, assessment data may be severely skewed.

Case comment: A one hundred percent participation rate would benefit most studies. But this consideration alone cannot be decisive, especially in an assessment study that is not

aimed above all at ensuring the quality of a program that is meant to benefit students in important ways (e.g., a reading assessment program with 2nd grade students).

The case of Bob illustrates how critically reviewing one's own project using the recommended questions can lead to improvements in an educational study. However, self-review is insufficient to ensure compliance with IRB regulations. Bob should present his study to an IRB and should be prepared to explain whether and why he believes it is exempt. Because his assessment study only peripherally relates to the ordinary objectives of a US History course, even if it does investigate the influence of different teachers' interpretation of material, some might question whether it is exempt under the first category (the "educational research" exemption). Nevertheless, it might be exempt under a different category (e.g., by treating it as a survey), especially if participation were made voluntary. This is the sort of decision that even IRB members may disagree about. But by presenting their research to IRBs, educators also have the opportunity to engage IRBs. And just as IRBs can and should shape the practice of educational research, so too educational researchers can and should shape the practice of IRBs.

The Technology Corner

by Dr. Mary Stephen,
Assistant Director and Coordinator of
Technology and Learning



I was recently the victim of computer crime when someone gained access to my credit card information and used that information to make unauthorized online purchases. What struck me as I worked to resolve the problem was the dual role technology played in all this and the ethical issues involved as tech-

nology increasingly impacts our personal lives and the society in which we live. While technology provided the convenience of being able to shop whenever, wherever I want, it also made it easy for someone to represent themselves as me and to use my information to make purchases without physically possessing my card.

This issue of our newsletter focuses on ethics. The inclusion of technology into the teaching and learning process raises a myriad of ethical issues, including information privacy, intellectual property questions, social justice issues, computer abuse (e.g. viruses, spamming, denial of service, electronic theft), and social impact. The basic issues are not unique to technology use, but the capabilities offered to us by technologies often seem to compound traditional ethical issues. Some users forget that the ethical norms they live by offline also apply to their online activities and interactions. In addition, technologies that allow new or enhanced human actions, e.g. cloning, production of nuclear weapons, have given rise to new ethical questions. The following online resources help raise awareness of issues related to the ethical use of computers.

Ten Commandments of Computer Ethics, created by the Computer Ethics Institute: <http://www.cpsr.org/program/ethics/cei.html>

The Tavani Bibliography of Computing, Ethics and Social Responsibility:

<http://cyberethics.cbi.msstate.edu/biblio/>

Ethics in Computing (North Carolina State University): http://www.eos.ncsu.edu/eos/info/computer_ethics/

Computer Ethics and Social Implications of Computing:

www.cs.wcupa.edu/~epstein/social.html

Realities of Teaching Social and Ethical Issues in Computing: http://www.southernct.edu/organizations/rccs/resources/teaching/teaching_mono/lidtke/lidtke_intro.html



*Fr. Vincent Hevern, S.J., Marchetti
Visiting Jesuit Lecturer presenting
“Academic Editing on the Web” in
the CTE lab.*

GRANT OPPORTUNITIES

International Reading Association--The Gertrude Whipple Professional Development Grant. This grant is awarded from time to time to assist a member with the planning and creation of professional development projects, with the production of high quality materials, with the marketing and scheduling of meetings and workshops, and with the logistic support for conducting them. The grant carries a monetary prize of up to US\$5,000. Award decisions, based on the quality of proposals and on the timeliness of the topic, are made as soon as the appropriate designated committee reviews proposals and recommends funding to the Association Board of Directors. For guidelines and application forms for the Gertrude Whipple Professional Development Grant, contact Gerald Casey, Professional Development Division, International Reading Association, 800 Barksdale Road, PO Box 8139, Newark, DE 19714-8139, USA. Phone: 302-731-1600, ext. 281; Fax: 302-731-1057. Web Site: <http://www.reading.org/awards/gertrude.html>.

National Collegiate Inventors and Innovators Alliance

(NCIIA)—Course and Program Grants. Through June of 2002, the NCIIA will award approximately \$2 million in grants to faculty and students of member institutions. The NCIIA will provide financial support for the creation and establishment of programs and courses that promote invention, innovation, and entrepreneurship and support the work of student/faculty. Individual grants ranging from \$2,000 to \$50,000 will be awarded to support the development, implementation, and institutionalization of new courses and programs in which student teams will develop innovative, entrepreneurial solutions to real-world problems. Funding can be used for course planning stipends (maximum of \$2000), supplies, equipment, or expenses directly related to project development. Deadline: May 15, 2002. NCIIA, 100 Venture Way, Hadley, MA 01035. Web Site: <http://www.nciia.org/grants/index.html>.

National Institute of Health—Grants for Research Ethics. The National Institutes of Health (NIH), the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), and the Agency for Health and Research Quality (AHRQ) invite

applications for grants to develop, conduct, evaluate, and disseminate short-term courses on ethical issues in research, particularly those involving human participants. Courses should improve the skills of biomedical, behavioral, nursing, social science, and public health researchers in identifying and addressing the ethical, legal, and social implications of their research, especially when human participants are involved. Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 1040, MSC 7710 Bethesda, MD 20892-7710. Web Site: <http://grants.nih.gov/grants/guide/pa-files/PAR-01-143.html>.

NEA Foundation—Grants for Teaching Excellence. The NEA Foundation Award for Teaching Excellence recognizes, rewards, and promotes professional practice, advocacy for the profession, community engagement, leadership in professional development, and attention to diversity. The NEA Foundation Award for Teaching Excellence includes \$25,000 cash, celebration at NFIE's annual gala event in Washington, D. C., and national recognition.

GRANT OPPORTUNITIES

Finalists for the national award will receive The Horace Mann–NEA Foundation Awards for Teaching Excellence, which include \$10,000 and expenses-paid travel to the gala. All NEA members, including teachers, education support professionals, and higher education faculty and staff are eligible. Further information is available from: Missouri NEA, Carol K. Schmooch, Assistant Executive Director, Tel. (573) 634-3202. E-mail cschmooch@nea.org. Web Site: <http://nfie.org/programs/teachexcel.htm>.

The Whitaker Foundation—Teaching Materials Program. The Whitaker Foundation is a private, nonprofit foundation dedicated to improving human health through the support of biomedical engineering. The Teaching Materials Program is designed to enhance the education of biomedical engineers through the development of high-quality teaching materials. Grants will be made for writing textbooks for core biomedical engineering courses at the undergraduate or early graduate levels and visionary, seminal books dealing with topics in the field. The maximum grant is \$85,000 for single authors or \$135,000 for multiple authors. The Whitaker Foundation, 1700 North Moore Street, Suite 2200 Arlington VA 22209. Web Site: <http://www.whitaker.org/grants/textbook.html>.



Thoughts on Education . . .

From Richard Felder's, "Speaking of Education." *Chem. Engr. Education*, 27:2 (Spring 1993): 128-129

"What all great teachers appear to have in common is love of their subject, an obvious satisfaction in arousing this love in their students, and an ability to convince them that what they are being taught is deadly serious."—Joseph Epstein

"The only rational way of educating is to be an example—if one can't help it, a warning example."—Albert Einstein

"Teaching is not a lost art, but the regard for it is a lost tradition."—Jacques Barzun

"If we desire . . . to form individuals capable of inventive thought and of helping the society of tomorrow to achieve progress, then it is clear that an education which is an active discovery of reality is superior to one that consists merely in providing the young with ready-made truths."
—Jean Piaget



Professional Development Opportunities in Pedagogy . . .

Upcoming National Conferences and Workshops

On May 20 and 21, 2002 the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning at the University of Notre Dame will offer its "Teaching Well Using Technology" workshop on campus. This planning workshop helps faculty decide which technologies to learn and try. It helps to re-examine what faculty are doing in the classroom: how faculty can enhance student learning and motivation, use in-class and out-of-class time, plan assignments and tests, and interact with students. It helps faculty choose technologies that will facilitate good learning and good use of time. This workshop views technology as the servant of learning. It is not a hands-on workshop. Instead it is a workshop to attend before learning how to use a technology.

The workshop is led by Barbara Walvoord, Director of the Kaneb Center for Teaching and Learning (on sabbatical 2001-2002), Tom Laughner, Acting Director, and Kevin Barry, Assistant Director. The registration fee is \$300.

For additional information on the Teaching Well Using Technology Workshop, please visit <http://www.nd.edu/~twut> and select "Faculty Workshop" or call us at 574-631-9148.

May 23-28, 2002, Wakonse Conference on College Teaching in Shelby, Michigan. For information, please visit the website: www.wakonse.org.

June 16 - 19, 2002, "Teaching for a Change: Transform the Now; Create the New" in Steamboat Springs, Colorado. For more information about registration, lodging and what "Teaching for a Change" has to offer, visit <http://www.teachingforachange.com> or call 720-859-3980.

June 24-28 or 26-28, 2002, Simon Fraser University Summer Institute on E-Learning in Higher Education in Vancouver, BC. For more information, please visit the following website: www.lidc.sfu.ca/tep/elearn/

Suggested reading for Graduate Students
http://www.unlv.edu/centers/tlc/GSPDP_readings.html

To show our appreciation for your support of the
Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence,
you are cordially invited to
attend our certificate award ceremony on
Friday May 3, 2002
3:30-5:00 p.m.
in Verhaegen Hall 119

Website Alert!
The Power of POD
Chris Crain, CTE Web Coordinator

Do you lay awake at night worrying over classroom conflict management? Does it incense you that students don't properly evaluate and validate their sources from the web? Do your teaching strategies seem as dry as a well in the Sahara Desert? Do your students believe critical thinking is being unfavorable towards you?

Although most of us fall somewhere in between, CTE has some help for those with pedagogical woes and intellectual stimulation for those with pedagogical wisdom. CTE has added a new feature to the "resources" section of our website—informative and innovative articles from the Professional and Organizational Development Network in Higher Education (POD). These articles are categorized under core pedagogical topics (e.g., assessing student learning, teaching philosophy, critical thinking, teaching portfolio, student-faculty relationships, and technology in teaching). Every semester CTE will receive new articles and add these to our growing database.

The articles are written by teachers in higher education for teachers in higher education. One of my favorites is "The Why of Teacher/Student Relationships" in which Richard G. Tiberius shows the various components of contextual learning. Often, students remember the way the professor relates before they remember what they learned. If the professor provides the right context—enthusiasm for the material, mutual respect and shared responsibility—students have a greater chance for learning. But what about motivating those who still aren't interested? That question is for another article to answer.

To access the POD articles go to <http://www.slu.edu/centers/cte/secure/pod.html>.

Congratulations to our Advisory Board Members Receiving Teaching Awards!

Debra Barbeau, CSB-Accounting, Who's Who Among America's Teachers 2002
Dr. Vincent Casaregola, English, Chauncey E. Finch Award for Mentoring Excellence
J.J. Mueller, S.J., Theological Studies, Helen Mandeville Award for Teaching Excellence in the
Humanities & SGA Faculty Excellence Award
Dr. John Pauly, Communication, SGA Faculty Excellence Award
Dr. Mike Shaner, CSB-Management, Beta Gamma Sigma Outstanding
Graduate Teacher Award
Theodore Vitali, C.P., Philosophy, SGA Faculty Excellence Award
Patrick Welch, CSB-Economics, Governor's Award for Excellence in Teaching
(awarded Fall 2001)

Engaging Students in Learning: Techniques and Impact SLU Conference on Monday, May 20, 2002

How can you turn your students into active learners?
How can you get students excited about your discipline?
How can you help students see the connections between your discipline and the world around them?

SLU2000 inquiry course faculty will offer answers to these questions at the May 20 conference, *Engaging Students in Learning: Techniques and Impact*.

Topics on the conference agenda include the following:

- Connecting Academic Ideas with the Real World
- Creating Community in the Classroom Through Collaborative Learning
- Fostering Student Ownership of Learning
- Writing Across the Disciplines

In addition, faculty will discuss the qualities of a SLU2000 course and the impact of the courses on faculty and students.

Faculty, academic advisors, and all others interested in improving teaching, learning, and service to students are invited to attend the conference from 8:30 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. on Monday, May 20 in the Anheuser Busch Auditorium located in John and Lucy Cook Hall.

Registration on-line at <http://slu2000conference.slu.edu>. For further information, contact Julie Weissman, Assistant Provost, at 977-2193 or at weissman@slu.edu.

Steering Committee Notes:

The five CTE steering committees (Mentoring, Research, Technology, Assessment and Programming) have been focusing on assessing CTE services and programs in preparation for the CTE Advisory Board Planning Retreat on April 18, 2002. The Board will conduct unit planning for the Center by forming strategies to carry out the Center's missions and goals in light of the University's four directions for strategic planning: expanding research integrated with teaching, learning and service; advancing community with diversity; fostering technology dedicated to student formation and the generation of knowledge; promoting continuous institutional learning and innovation. These institutional directions directly intersect with the Center's mission and its existing programs and services. The planning of the Advisory Board, representing faculty from across the University, will focus and clarify the Center's activities.

CTE EVENTS CALENDAR

May Friday, May 3rd
Reinert CTE Certificate Ceremony
3:30-5 p.m., Verhaegen 119
RSVP required

Monday, May 20th
Engaging Students in Learning—One-day Conference
Sponsored by Reinert CTE and the Provost Office and supported
by the Hewlett Foundation Grant (see announcement on page 11 of this issue).

June & July June 6, 13, 20, and 27; 1:00-2:30 p.m.
July 2, 9, 23, and 30; 10:00-11:30 a.m.
Technology and Collaboration—two four-week sessions
Sponsored by Reinert CTE and Academic Information Technology Services
Program & Registration @ <http://www.slu.edu/collaboration>

MERLOT

If you are looking for a site with high quality online resources for teaching and learning in higher education, check out www.merlot.org. The Multimedia Educational Resource for Learning and Online Teaching (MERLOT) provides links to thousands of learning materials, sample assignments that show how the materials could be used in the classroom, peer evaluations of the materials, and links to people with common interests in a discipline and teaching and learning. MERLOT is a free and open resource designed primarily for faculty and students in higher education.

Materials published on the MERLOT website must pass a rigorous peer review process modeled after peer review of scholarship and performed by members of the subject area editorial board. Peer reviewers rate materials on three different aspects: quality of content, potential effectiveness as a teaching-learning tool, and ease of use. Among the resources you will find on the site is material on Riemann Sums created by Mike May, S.J., chair of the department of Mathematics and Mathematical Computer Science. The Riemann Sum material is designed to help first year calculus students visualize key concepts in calculus. The Riemann Sum material can be accessed at www.slu.edu/classes/maymk/Riemann/Riemann.html and the peer reviews which gave this material the highest ratings can be found on the MERLOT website.

Most materials found on the MERLOT website are modular and intended to be integrated within the context of a larger course. For an overview of MERLOT, click on the “tasting room” on the opening page. The Jesuit Distance Education Network (JesuitNET) is an organizational member and active participant in MERLOT.

Dr. Mary Stephen

Nine Ethical Principles for College and University Teaching

1. CONTENT COMPETENCE.

A university teacher maintains a high level of subject matter knowledge and ensures that course content is current, accurate, representative, and appropriate to the position of the course within the student's program of studies.

2. PEDAGOGICAL COMPETENCE.

A pedagogically competent teacher communicates the objectives of the course to students, is aware of alternative instructional methods or strategies, and selects methods of instruction that, according to research evidence (including personal or self-reflective research), are effective in helping students to achieve the course objectives.

3. DEALING WITH SENSITIVE TOPICS.

Topics that students are likely to find sensitive or discomfiting are dealt with in an open, honest, and positive way.

4. STUDENT DEVELOPMENT.

The overriding responsibility of the teacher is to contribute to the intellectual development of the student, at least in the context of the teacher's own area of expertise, and to avoid actions such as exploitation and discrimination that detract from student development.

5. DUAL RELATIONSHIPS WITH STUDENTS.

To avoid conflict of interest, a teacher does not enter into dual-role relationships with students that are likely to detract from student development or lead to actual or perceived favoritism on the part of the teacher.

6. CONFIDENTIALITY.

Student grades, attendance records, and private communications are treated as confidential materials and are released only with student consent, for legitimate academic purposes, or if there are reasonable grounds for believing that releasing such information will be beneficial to the student or will prevent harm to others.

7. RESPECT FOR COLLEAGUES.

A university teacher respects the dignity of her or his colleagues and works cooperatively in the interest of fostering student development.

8. VALID ASSESSMENT OF STUDENTS.

Given the importance of assessment of student performance in university teaching and in students' lives and careers, instructors are responsible for taking adequate steps to ensure that assessment of students is valid, open, fair, and congruent with course objectives.

9. RESPECT FOR INSTITUTION.

In the interests of student development, a university teacher is aware of and respects the educational goals, policies, and standards of the institution in which he or she teaches.

Source: "Ethical Principles for College and University Teaching," by Harry Murray, Eileen Gillese, Madeline Lennon, Paul Mercer, and Marilyn Robinson, Chapter Eight (pp. 57-63) in *Ethical Dimensions of College and University Teaching*, Edited by Linc. Fisch (NDTL No. 66, Summer 1996, Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco).

Scenes from the Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence Advisory Board Retreat



Fr. Vincent Hevern, S.J. Marchetti Visiting Jesuit Lecturer



**The Reinert Center for
Teaching Excellence**

Ellen Harshman, Director

Steering Committee

James Korn,

Mentoring Chair

Psychology

Doris Rubio,

Research Chair

Research Methodology

Mary Stephen

Technology Chair

Reinert Center for

Teaching Excellence

Julie Weissman,

Assessment Chair

Office of Institutional Study

Steve Wernet,

Programming Chair

School of Social Service

Advisory Board

John Ashby

Educational Tech. Service

Debra Barbeau

Accounting

Vincent Casaregola

English

Cheryl Cavallo

Physical Therapy

Jan DeMasters

Nursing

Mary Domahidy

Public Policy Studies

James Dowdy

*Mathematics &
Computer Science*

Judith Durham

Chemistry

Louise Flick

School of Nursing

Michael Grady

Educational Studies

Mary Rose Grant

School for

Professional Studies

Patricia Gregory

Pius XII Memorial Library

Timothy Hickman

School of Medicine

Sharon Homan

Public Health

Teresa Johnson

Modern & Classical Lang.

Miriam Joseph

Pius XII Memorial Library

Elizabeth Kolmer

American Studies

Belden Lane

Theological Studies

Gerard Magill

Center for Health Care Ethics

Michael May

*Mathematics &
Computer Science*

John J. Mueller

Theological Studies

John Pauly

Communication

Steven Puro

Political Science

Michael Shaner

Management

Laura Stuetzer

Physician Assist. Education

Brian Till

Marketing

Theodore Vitali

Philosophy

Patrick Welch

Economics

Kathleen Wright

Public Health

Find us and this newsletter on
the Web at [http://www.slu.edu/
centers/cte/](http://www.slu.edu/centers/cte/) or call (314)977-
3944

CTE Notebook Designed and
Published by the Reinert Center
for Teaching Excellence staff.



SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY

Paul C. Reinert Center for Teaching Excellence

Verhaegen Hall, Room 314

3634 Lindell Blvd

St. Louis, MO 63108