

Ad Hoc Committee for a Course on Respect and Responsibility
Final Committee Report Submitted March 14, 2011
(The body of the Report follows Provost Aprille's Response)

Provost Aprille's Response to the Report

General Response

Thanks to the members of this hard-working committee for the time spent in reading sources, deliberating, and then writing the report. I especially appreciate the balanced view provided by the Dissenting Opinion in Appendix F.

I read the report carefully, compared it to my original charge, and took time to look at some of the sources that were cited. I agree that there is a need for students to have a safe place to discuss the serious issues in campus life that sometimes seem to fly in the face of what we promote as core values at W&L. I also appreciate the reasons given in the dissenting report for the opinion that a required course is not necessarily the best means to accomplish that aim. Ultimately it will be up to the faculty at large to decide on a course in the way that curriculum changes are normally decided.

The next step in the process for considering the course that the report recommends is to put the report on the agenda of a faculty meeting in the fall of 2011. I offer here some comments on the substance of the report, in the spirit of helping the committee members prepare for questions likely to arise when the report is formally discussed by the faculty.

Specific Comments

The report asserts that W&L is one of few schools that does not offer a "first year seminar". This assertion is puzzling, because we do have both required first-year orientation (non-credit) and first-year topical seminars (for academic credit). Moreover, we know that the purpose of first-year seminars at other schools varies widely. Those that "ease the transition to college life" usually feature time-management, study skills, writing, and class participation, and are less often about behavior and ethical reasoning. My charge requested, but I did not see, examples in your report of required courses at other schools that have proven to be effective for the purposes of the new course you proposed. Perhaps there are none, at least among the HEDS consortium schools queried by the Office of Institutional Research on behalf of the Committee.

The report states the opinion that Greek Life is the root cause of a student culture that is inconsistent with W&L core values. I read the study cited but did not see results that support the statement that Greek Life is causal. Saying first that preservation of the Greek system in the 1980s has caused current problems with student behavior and moral judgment, and then therefore that W&L has an obligation to address those problems with your proposed course, may be a stalking horse that diverts your readers from the stronger points the report makes. The review cited in your report concludes that simply going to college is sufficient to improve moral reasoning as measured by the Defined Issues Test (DIT) for moral reasoning, even when age and entry-level scores are controlled. The cited studies also reveal that liberal arts colleges are more effective in fostering the development of moral reasoning than other higher education venues. Perhaps we could capitalize on those known advantages, rather than on negatives which are more speculative.

You might want to prepare to address the purpose of the course in terms of learning outcomes more specifically when the report is discussed by the faculty. On the one hand the report states that the course is not intended to change student culture. But one premise, including that the Greek system is a major factor, suggests that there is something wrong with student culture that the course will help to fix. Student perception will also be important; your summary states that “some” or “many” of the students believe that the course would help to transform campus culture. On the other hand, the research cited in your report relies on the DIT to study the effect of variables in culture, age, course and program interventions, etc. Courses on ethical reasoning alone did not improve the DIT, but courses that included additional co-curricular activities, such as a service-learning component were more effective in bringing about a measureable improvement. If the faculty do adopt your recommendation for a new course, those precedents might be useful in designing the syllabus depending on what the specific learning objectives and outcomes are.

Logistics and Cost

Although my original charge asked for a cost-neutral proposal, I can see how your premises would make that difficult. It is alarming to note that offering 32 sections of a new course would require the equivalent of at least 2 full-time faculty lines. Even if that were possible (it is not at this time), added faculty lines would have to be in one department or another ... yet the teaching would best be done by faculty from many departments, so two new full-time lines would not be a practical means of providing the needed coverage of 32 sections.

The alternative of asking for volunteers to teach, even as overloads, may not be practical either for several reasons. We would need a pool of faculty large enough to cover

sabbaticals. In the initial offering the course would require a great deal more faculty work than one credit might suggest. If there were a sufficient number of faculty who were willing and able to teach 32 sections of the course, their departments might have to give up some other course(s). Otherwise, the total cost of 32 sections a year as overloads would be prohibitive even at a reduced cost of \$5000 per section. More importantly, whereas W&L has worked hard to decrease teaching loads in recent years in order to allow better teaching and time for scholarly work, routinely allowing overloads seems like a step backward.

The question of finding sufficient classroom space for 16 new sections each long term will require more detailed consideration than is possible here. Presumably this is solvable. At present there is not one single course required of all students at Washington and Lee, so this new required course would be a major departure from current philosophy and practice that the faculty should consider carefully. As the dissenting opinion notes, there is a risk that the course becomes a simple check-off without effect, or even that some students would come to resent it.

Upping the total credits required for graduation to specifically include this course for academic credit would mean a long process of review and approval through SACS. We probably should wait until we have shown that the course meets its intended outcomes before considering an amendment to the number of credits required for graduation.

Conclusion and Suggestion:

The idea of providing a formal venue for students to discuss these important issues is laudable. According to the dissenting opinion, a required course for academic credit may not be practical. If the motion fails as is, one or more of the committee members might instead plan the course as a pilot, get it approved by C&D, and offer it as a trial with appropriate assessment to determine whether the format is effective for the learning objectives intended. Meanwhile, it is important that the institution as a whole speaks with a unified and strong voice on the cultural issues that your report highlights. Perhaps some of the alternative strategies considered in the Appendix could be undertaken as part of a university-wide one-to-two year theme focus on “respect and responsibility”.

Ad Hoc Committee for a Course on Respect and Responsibility Report and Recommendations

Committee Members: Melina Bell, chair; Mike Anderson; Paul Gregory; Dan Kramer; Dave Leonard; Shana Levine; Toni Locy; Angie Smith; Julie Woodzicka; and student members elected by the faculty members: Eric Gehman and Alex Shabo.

Summary of Report:

*“Honor is not a coat you put on when entering the class and take off upon leaving the class.”
--W&L student, February 2011 focus group*

The committee recommends that Washington and Lee University implement Honor 100, a multidisciplinary discussion-format seminar required of all first-year students to engage in critical reflection on and discussion of W&L’s core institutional values. Its main purpose is to consider what it means when we say that W&L is a community of respect, integrity, civility, and honor. Honor 100 would be:

- A required course for all first-year students during the fall or winter terms of their first year
- A one-credit course that meets for 90 minutes per week over a 12-week term, with 90 minutes of homework assigned each week
- A small class of about 15 students per section (this would require W&L to offer 16 sections per long term)
- A course that addresses the four core institutional values of respect, integrity, civility, and honor, although approaches and readings for each section may vary by professor

The course’s design should include:

- **A theory component:** rigorous multidisciplinary consideration of the core values through books, articles, works of art, or other discipline-specific texts and methods
- **An applied component:** reflection on and discussion of actual “real world” cases relevant to the specific value—this may include (but is not restricted to) newspaper articles, television news reports, film, books, internet resources, works of art
- **An emphasis on relevant W&L policies:** education in and critical discussion of W&L policies that bear on core institutional values

By implementing such a course, W&L would join the overwhelming majority of colleges and universities that recognize the need for a seminar to help students make the transition to college life from high school. Nearly 85% of 968 colleges and universities surveyed offer seminars for first-year students to achieve such a goal, according to the 2006 National Survey on First-Year Seminars. Of those offering seminars, more than half—53.8% of the schools—take a more intellectually rigorous approach to the issue by offering an academic seminar for first-year students; 46% percent require first-year students to take the seminar. Furthermore, academic seminars with variable content across sections were more prevalent at highly selective

institutions—at 60.7%. The objectives for these first-year seminars include: developing academic and study skills; honing critical thinking; strengthening faculty-student relationships; providing a common first-year experience; and orienting students to campus resources and services. Faculty members teach 90% of the first-year seminars at the institutions cited in the 2006 survey; 64.4% teach it as part of their regular teaching load. At 31.9% of responding institutions, academic advisors teach their advisees in the first-year seminar.

At W&L, part of our stated mission is to “provide a liberal arts education that develops students’ capacity to think freely, critically, and humanely and to conduct themselves with honor, integrity, and civility.” In focus groups conducted by the committee, students repeatedly said they do not believe that W&L is living up to this aspiration. It is, therefore, incongruent with W&L’s professed values and stated mission that the university does not offer a required first-year academic seminar that addresses tenets that are reflected time and again in the university’s mission statement, admissions policies, and fundraising efforts.

The main educational objective of Honor 100 is to engage in and promote sustained intellectual discussion and investigation of W&L’s core institutional values, inside and outside of class. Other objectives include providing students with: opportunities to reflect critically on and discuss the values that are important to their personal identities, character development, and aspirations; common resources for engaging in intellectual discussion with other first-year students, both in their section and in other sections of the course; and additional opportunities for mentoring to complement W&L’s advising program.

Honor 100 also would make clear that faculty and administrators take seriously the culture on campus and that they are dedicated to engaging students in rigorous and extended consideration of W&L’s core institutional values. The course also would send a message that faculty and administrators take student self-governance seriously and want to facilitate both individual and collective self-governance through critical reflection on W&L’s commitment to respect, integrity, civility, and honor, as well as reflection on how individuals and groups interpret and enact these values.

We recognize that Honor 100 is likely to require W&L to expend resources for its implementation and support. Many students and faculty believe that W&L has an obligation to expend resources to help address campus climate, given that W&L itself is responsible for contributing significantly to the existing environment. In the 1970s when so many colleges and universities were banning fraternities and sororities from campus and investing to create a more vibrant intellectual campus culture, W&L made the decision to incorporate Greek Life into its operational model by using Greek housing to provide student housing and meals instead of building residence halls and dining facilities to meet these needs. W&L has incorporated Greek Life into the very structure of student conduct adjudication, through Panhellenic and Interfraternity Councils, which are charged with regulation of student conduct within Greek Life. Patricia M. King and Matthew J. Mayhew, in a *Journal of Moral Education* article, cite two studies that examine the influence of Greek membership on moral development. They found that independents receive significantly higher scores than fraternity members on a test designed to measure moral judgment. W&L has, therefore, played a central role in creating the situation that

our students are now asking faculty and administration to help them mitigate, and we have a responsibility to them to do so. This duty includes the prudent expenditure of necessary resources.

In focus groups conducted by the committee, students responded positively to the idea of Honor 100. Many reported that they believe a liberal arts college should require such a course as Honor 100. Students reported that providing an in-class theoretical framework and helping students think about these issues on a deeper level could foster a greater level of intellectual engagement outside the classroom. Some students said they chose W&L because they wanted to belong to a culture of civility and honor and a community of trust, but they were disappointed to discover that, in their view, W&L did not live up to its professed values. They said Honor 100 could help students transform W&L into the culture of honor and civility and the community of trust that they want it to be.

Please see Appendix F of this report, where two committee members offer their dissent from the following recommendations.

Summary of Recommendations:

The committee moves that the faculty proceed toward a Fall 2013 implementation of Honor 100 by charging the Provost to gather information necessary to begin implementing the course, and to report back to the faculty regarding the findings no later than the April 2012 faculty meeting. The Provost shall:

1. Estimate the cost of such a course in terms of faculty staffing and other expenses
2. Determine the amount of classroom space necessary to accommodate section meetings for an entire first-year class
3. Determine whether the class can be staffed without hiring additional faculty, and if so, how—if additional faculty are required, determine how much additional expense for faculty coverage would be incurred to implement this course
4. Determine the impact of adding one additional credit to graduation requirements
5. Determine what sources of funding might be obtained or are already available to meet expenses of implementing Honor 100
6. Appoint a multidisciplinary committee of faculty to further develop a curriculum for the course

<u>Contents of Full Report</u>	<u>Page</u>
Part I: Background, the Committee's Charge, and Sources Consulted	5
Part II: Program Design	14
Part III: Curriculum	21
Part IV: Program Structure	25
 Appendices	
A. Provost's Charge	29
B. Sources Consulted	31
C. Sample Syllabus	34
D. Student Focus Group Questionnaire	42
E. Student Responses	43
F. Dissent from the Proposal	55

PART I: Background, the Committee's Charge, and Sources Consulted

A. Background Regarding the Establishment of the Committee and Provost's Charge

Washington and Lee University strives to distinguish itself from other liberal arts colleges with its emphasis on a long tradition of adherence to the principles of honor, respect, integrity and civility. In recent years disappointed and concerned faculty and students have begun to sound the alarm over the widening gap between the reality of campus life and the ideals that students, faculty, administrators and alumni cherish so deeply.

There is no doubt that many colleges and universities across the nation are struggling to cope with problems of alcohol and substance abuse, racism, bullying on the basis of sexual orientation, strained gender relations, sexual misconduct (including sexual assault and rape), and the growing sense of entitlement among students. But these national problems have exhibited themselves on campus in uniquely W&L ways: From the Mock Convention's Idaho float T-shirt to the Bracket to the List to postings on the College ACB website to the Annual Derby Days Week, students have engaged in expressions of insensitivity and disdain toward minorities, women, and LGBTQ students.¹

Although W&L began admitting women more than 25 years ago, faculty and students continue to navigate a campus dominated by young men who control on- and off-campus activities through fraternities and a majority male student government. Excessive alcohol consumption and this generation's "hooking up" culture dominate the student social scene, contributing to a sexual

¹For a recent Mock Convention parade, the Idaho delegation created a float with a banner "I Da Ho," and female students dressed as prostitutes rode on the float. There was also an "I Da Ho" T-shirt based on this theme.

"The Bracket" refers to an article in the student newspaper *The Trident*. In that article, two student authors created a March Madness-style tournament bracket in which students were matched up in competition as to who was the worst student at W&L. Actual students' names were used, and each student was satirized in the text below, which provided a reason why the student won at each point in the tournament. Some real events that students would recognize were referred to.

"The List" is a list of sorority women sorted into categories based on the sexual acts they were considered willing to perform. Actual women's names were used. This list was circulated by e-mail by its creator and the creator's friends throughout the campus.

W&L has blocked on-campus access to the College ACB website. Examples of postings on College ACB include: anonymous upper division students rating and discussing their plans to have sex with and/or rape women from the entering first-year class based on viewing those women's Facebook profile pictures; and discussions of how African American students and Johnson scholars are "ruining" W&L and its reputation for being exclusive, rich, and white. Many derogatory remarks concerning individuals' sexual orientation are peppered throughout these conversations.

Derby Days, a week-long charity fundraising event, is series of activities and social gatherings sponsored each spring by Sigma Chi fraternity. While Sigma Chi chapters at other campuses host Derby Days, W&L's events have caused consternation among many members of our community. During the past few years, several female students have been physically injured during recreational endeavors, such as flag football. Many of the women are reportedly under the influence of alcohol and jeered on by male spectators in loosely refereed games. Each sorority participates in a banner competition with several of the banners displaying women in sexually charged and provocative positions. Some women serve men food and cocktails while scantily clad. Although many students (men and women) report enjoying the events, it is evident there are several cultural, health, and safety issues that need to be addressed.

assault rate that is much higher than the national average.

In classrooms, locker rooms and labs, faculty members hear a familiar refrain from students: Before they arrived at W&L, their parents taught them a set of values for how they should behave and treat other people. When they arrived at W&L, however, they quickly learned that being accepted by their peers meant adhering to a set of norms and behavior that were the opposite of what their parents had taught them. Such disappointment increasingly is leading many students to dismiss or ridicule W&L's claims of civility and honor as hollow rhetoric.

Most students at W&L would like to change the student culture. Almost all recognize that there is a gender relations problem, and many feel excluded or rejected by a social environment sharply stratified according to Greek membership, race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and citizenship. However, students express a sense of helplessness to resist conformity to norms they find repugnant. In order to be accepted, students find they must conform, and the cost of resistance—social exclusion—is too high for vulnerable young people. They actively seek the assistance of faculty, administration, and other adults at W&L to reconfigure the available options: Option 1, conform; Option 2, commit “social suicide.”

Students know that their time at W&L is generally limited to four years. This makes it far easier for them to tough it out than to invest, at great personal and social cost, in attempting to change what they see as practically immutable. While a small number of students are mobilizing in attempts to change their student culture, they have found it difficult to sustain momentum with a four-year turnover.

Organizations at W&L, such as 1 in 4, SPEAK and LIFE, are in fact Student Affairs initiated, educated, funded, and supervised, and follow a standard peer education model. The idea is that students will be more likely to listen to other students, and will find other students more approachable, than adult student affairs personnel. For this reason, it is a model frequently used on college campuses to provide education about substance abuse, sexual assault, mental health, and other student health concerns. These programs, while valuable, often have limited outcomes in terms of shaping student culture surrounding core institutional values.

There are student organizations that are not formed, funded, and closely supervised by the Student Affairs Division. For example, there is the GLBTQ Equality Initiative (GEI), which receives a great deal of support and involvement from GLBTQ alumni, Knowledge Empowering Women Leaders (KEWL) and END IT. However, the viability and visibility of these organizations ebb and flow. Student, faculty, and staff attendance at events hosted by these organizations is irregular and often low. How active an organization is varies with the commitment of student leaders at any given time and with how much competition organization members have for their time. W&L students notoriously spread themselves too thin. For example, in Fall 2010, the president of END IT had difficulty finding other members of the organization to simply make posters to raise awareness, and the poster project was never completed. In Winter 2010, a student was pressured by the advisor of SPEAK to become president of that organization (because no one else was willing), although she was also the president of KEWL and an officer in END IT. Finally, as a senior her schedule simply became

too full, and she resigned from all three organizations. KEWL has been nearly invisible since her resignation, although under two administrations it hosted multiple engagements and undertook multiple projects in a month. GEI nearly became defunct until its new president picked it up and resuscitated it. Even those students most active in attempting to improve campus culture have found it difficult to sustain the effort.

In a course taught last year by the committee's chair, students suggested that faculty should take a proactive role in promoting respect and responsibility within the W&L community by developing a multidisciplinary, academically rigorous course that all students would be required to take early in their college careers. The students said they thought faculty could facilitate productive, open discussions to guide students as they figured out what it means to belong to a community of civility and honor.

It was against this backdrop that several faculty members, recognizing the potential of the class's suggestion, asked the Provost to appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing a one-credit academic course for first-year students. The faculty's motion passed, and the Provost appointed this committee on March 25, 2010. (See the Provost's charge, Appendix A.)

B. Sources Consulted

During its nine-month investigation, the committee consulted, read, reviewed and discussed numerous sources to determine the desirability and feasibility of establishing a one-credit academic course for first-year students that would engage them in discussions, based on multidisciplinary reading selections, concerning the benefits and responsibilities associated with participation in a community of respect. The following details specific sources reviewed in thorough consideration of each item in the Provost's charge to the committee. For a complete list of sources consulted, please see Appendix B. For the Provost's charge to the committee, please see Appendix A.

The Provost's charge asked the committee to consider the following six suggestions. After each suggestion, we have summarized the committee's work with respect to each.

1. Investigate such courses offered in the past and currently at other institutions. Useful information will include: the purpose and history of the course; syllabus and readings and whether these are the same for all sections; whether the course is required; how faculty are assigned to teach it in the context of managing course loads; and most important, evidence of assessment-based value for the course in meeting its objectives.

According to the 2006 National Survey on First-Year Seminars, 84.8% of the 968 colleges and universities surveyed offer a seminar for first-year students intended to ease their transition to college life. 53.8% of these schools offered an academic seminar. Furthermore, academic seminars with variable content across sections were more prevalent at highly selective institutions (60.7%). Of the colleges surveyed, 46% require first-year students to take the seminar. At 90% of the institutions, faculty teach the first-year seminar. Given those numbers,

the committee wanted to investigate existing first-year seminars and supplement our W&L research and experiences with the successes and failures learned in the seminars already being taught. Therefore, at the outset of the committee's work, we engaged Debbie Dailey and the Office of Institutional Effectiveness to solicit responses through HEDS (Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium) to the following committee-drafted prompt:

The Respect and Responsibility Course Committee of Washington and Lee University would like to know if you offer substantial academic courses and other extended programming (beyond the usual orientation-type program) that are designed to accomplish any of the following:

- 1. To address a particular campus problem and change the student culture or campus climate (for example: to reduce binge drinking or sexual assault, to assimilate women into military institutions).*
- 2. To change student behavior and/or culture (whether or not in response to a particular problem).*
- 3. To improve students' ability to make responsible decisions with respect to social peer interaction (for example: to reduce intentional exploitation of vulnerable students such as hazing or sexual assault, to reduce peer pressure to drink alcohol or use drugs, and/or to increase bystander intervention in potential cases of these).*

The committee reviewed the resulting responses and requested the OIE to send a follow-up inquiry to further hone in on course structure, content, objectives and assessment methods. The follow-up inquiry was sent not only to HEDS institutions, but also to twelve existing programs aimed at integrating moral and civic learning into the academic curriculum. We learned about these programs from descriptions in *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* by Colby et al. The *Educating Citizens* authors were quite thorough in their research, however, and we were unable to obtain information that expanded usefully on the descriptions we found there. Furthermore, no HEDS institution identified a program that would be of interest to us. This may be because the inquiries were addressed to administrative rather than academic offices, and tended to produce responses about orientation programs. It may be because the main objective we had in mind shifted from producing cultural change to the idea of stimulating intellectual engagement surrounding core institutional values, and the inquiry was not well framed for obtaining the information that would be useful to us in the end. In any event, identifying academic programs that engage character development and citizenship would require a more targeted and time-intensive method of research, which was beyond the resources of this committee and apparently beyond the resources of the OIE.

The committee also read about programs at other colleges and universities or offered by coalitions of them, which are described on the college's or organization's website, including the Consortium on High Achievement and Success (CHAS) at Trinity College, the Johns Hopkins Civility Project, and the National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI). We looked carefully at Rutgers University's recently instituted "Project Civility," a two-year project that began in the fall of 2010 to engage all students, faculty, and university personnel in ongoing inquiry about the nature of civility and the true nature of respect for others. This project features a wide array of formal and informal discussions, lectures, and student-driven activities to focus attention on

issues of civility both within the Rutgers community and in society at large.

2. Consult some background on the subject of teaching values and citizenship: examples (there are many others) are *Cultivating Humanity* by Martha Nussbaum, 1997 Harvard Press; *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* by A. Colby, T. Ehrlich, E Beaumont, J Stephens, 2003 Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching; *Education's End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life*, by Anthony T Kronman, 2007, Yale.

In preparation for our deliberations, committee members consulted a number of different sources to gain information about what other schools are doing to promote the values of respect and responsibility (broadly construed) on their campuses. The committee consulted a wide variety of sources related to teaching values and citizenship, including all the books listed above, which were provided by the Provost. Every member of the committee read at least one of the books on the Provost's list, with many committee members reading multiple books. Some of us read the recently published *Honor for Us*, written by emeritus professor of philosophy at W&L Lad Sessions, and K. Anthony Appiah's *The Honor Code*. We also read the 2006 National Survey of First-Year Seminars, articles from the *Journal of College and Character* and the *Journal of Moral Education*, W&L student senior theses and other student work that studied and reported on aspects of the student culture (specifically, social stratification and sexual assault), and a W&L Student Affairs Task Force Report that proposed a different type of mandatory first-year seminar, which was never approved or implemented. Please see Appendix B for a full list of sources consulted.

3. Consult with W&L colleagues who have had experience in teaching content inclusive of honor, values ethics, etc. The Student Affairs staff and the Student Affairs Committee should be enlisted as collaborators in this endeavor. W&L had a Teagle grant a few years ago for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of teaching ethics and values, and you might review the results and report of that pilot study.

The committee consulted with the Division of Student Affairs (Dawn Watkins and committee member Dave Leonard) and read the Student Affairs Task Force Strategic Planning Reports from 2005 and 2006, which proposed a first-year seminar of a different kind. That proposal was not accepted or implemented. Dean Leonard provided the committee with the 2006 National Survey of First-Year Seminars to provide examples of existing first-year seminar programs at other colleges and universities.

The committee reviewed the Washington and Lee University Teagle Reports, which documented a study conducted by a committee that included two members of this committee, Michael Anderson and Julie Woodzicka. Two members of the committee also met with Greg Cooper, who was part of the Teagle committee, to collect additional information regarding the Teagle study.

Two members of the committee attended a leadership conference at VMI entitled "Answering the Nation's Call for Leaders of Character" on October 5-6, 2010. Various approaches to

teaching leadership and character were discussed at the conference, but almost all assumed a military-type educational setting in which a specified set of shared values is uniformly accepted and training students to internalize those values is viewed as a legitimate objective. In a liberal arts setting, there is no agreed upon set of values that all students should be expected to internalize, and for that reason the approaches discussed are not useful in a setting like W&L. An important observation was offered by keynote speaker David Callahan, who received his Ph.D. in Politics from Princeton, and has authored several books on public policy. Callahan addressed the compartmentalization of moral domains across American society and, specifically, among the college student population. He argued that students today are governed by two separate moral compasses – one in the academic realm and one that governs how they live their lives outside the classroom. Because his claim is relevant to the committee’s work, a committee member read his book on the topic, *The Cheating Culture: Why More Americans Are Doing Wrong To Get Ahead*.

In its course of investigating the ramifications of requiring first-year students to take a course taught by faculty volunteers from various departments, a committee member met with Jim Warren of the English Department to discuss the logistics, successes and challenges of WRIT 100, an existing course with these features.

4. Confer broadly with students to gain their perspective on the idea of the course that is envisioned. How would it be received by the majority of students? What impact would it have on student culture?

Student input about program design, curriculum and course structure was considered paramount to the committee’s charge. Committee members nominated many students for the committee and selected two students to serve. Both students regularly attended meetings and provided invaluable contributions throughout the process.

Committee members nominated and selected 15 students to serve as members of this committee’s student advisory committee. Student advisory members provided input and critical feedback on numerous ideas and concepts pertaining to the course, campus culture and the student body. The student advisory affirmed many of the committee’s initial thoughts, ideas and potential options for a course and provided critical feedback and direction.

Additional student input was sought through five student focus groups that were held during the winter term. Committee members were purposeful in seeking a broad array of voices regarding student year of graduation, major, co-curricular involvement, fraternity or sorority membership or independent, and other kinds of diversity. Although many of the focus group participants were engaged in multiple W&L clubs and organizations, the committee organized the groups by overlapping interests. Group one consisted of members from PAACE, SAIL and MSA; group two were members of the First-Year Leadership Council; group three were members of KEWL, END IT, and 1 in 4; group four was composed of an eclectic group of upper division students selected for their candor, knowledge of the W&L social scene, and reputation for not “sugar coating” campus culture issues; and group five was composed of student leaders from the EC, SJC, SFHB and Peer Counseling. A total of 33 students participated in the focus groups.²

² Student group acronyms are as follows: 1 in 4 (male student group who serve as peer educators for sexual assault

After viewing a draft sample syllabus and hearing a short description of the course proposal, focus group participants completed a questionnaire at the onset of the meetings, which you can view at Appendix D. Participant responses to the written questionnaire are documented in Appendix E.

The focus group approach provided valuable information. Students generally reacted positively to the idea of a course and the proposed syllabus. They provided several suggestions and advice, ranging from urging the university to be highly selective in choosing professors to teach the course to “carefully framing” the course with the first group of students that takes it. Students shared that upper division students should be properly educated about the rationale for the course and broached to present it to new students in a positive light based upon their influence of first-year students and the fact that older students drive W&L’s student culture.

Students reacted favorably to the theory and applied/practical portions of the course, yet consistently commented that course discussions must focus on real life W&L issues, traditions, and what happens on and off campus (examples included: W&L’s “bracket” and “list” incidents, College ACB, etc.) as well as collegiate issues receiving national attention such as the recent murder of the University of Virginia lacrosse player and the issues that contributed to the suicide of the first-year student at Rutgers University last fall.

The majority of students, including focus group participants, were supportive of a course that placed heavy emphasis on class participation and discussion, along with students’ maintaining a course journal. Students debated on whether the course should be pass/fail or graded and whether an upper division student should serve as a teaching assistant. Upper division student participants were largely in favor of a grade for the course, while first-year students tended to lean toward a pass/fail grade requirement. Most students felt strongly that at a minimum, some form of student leadership should be invited to participate in the class as a guest speaker or panel participant.

5. Approach the work with an open mind and balanced viewpoint, not assuming that a course is needed but rather asking in the first place “what is the evidence that courses like this will meet the intended goals.”

The committee adopted as its first task to frame and define the objectives of a program (not necessarily a course) on respect and responsibility. As a result, the committee put significant time and effort into defining objectives prior to discussing how to meet them or exactly what type of programming would best meet them. In early meetings, some committee members suggested that helping students who were dissatisfied with their culture to change it should be an objective of the course. However, as our discussions progressed, we came to agree for the most

prevention); EC (student executive committee, which administers student government and the Honor System); KEWL (Knowledge Empowering Women Leaders); MSA (Multicultural Student Association); END IT (co-ed student organization whose mission is to end sexual assault at W&L); PAACE (Pan Asian Association for Cultural Change); SAIL (Student Association for International Learning); SFHB (Student Faculty Hearing Board, the conduct body that hears complaints of discrimination and hazing policy violations); SJC (Student Judicial Council, the conduct body that hears complaints of student misconduct other than allegations that the Honor System has been violated or allegations of discrimination and hazing policy violations).

part that, while it would be a welcome by-product if the student culture improved as a result of academic learning, cultural change should not itself be an objective of an academic program. Instead, the committee decided that the objectives of any academic program it proposed should be closely tied to the university's stated mission to provide a liberal arts education that develops students' capacity to think freely, critically, and humanely, which would *equip* students to conduct themselves with honor, integrity, and civility, regardless of how they in fact choose to conduct themselves. Any program the committee would propose, we decided, should be designed to stimulate thoughtful discussion, critical reflection and sustained investigation among students of *Washington and Lee's core institutional values: respect, integrity, civility and honor*.

Once the main objective was agreed on by the majority of the committee, we then began the process of evaluating different types of programming, models and courses that would provide the most effective means for meeting that objective. We considered many alternatives to a course, as well as ancillary programs that might support a course. Some of these program alternatives and complements are described in Part II. However, the committee arrived at a point where it became necessary either to divide into subcommittees to pursue multiple models (course-based and non-course-based options); or to pursue and flesh out one particular type of model. Based on information already gathered, including the information collected by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, a review of current Washington and Lee programming relating to core institutional values, student feedback, the 2006 National Survey of First-Year seminars, and other reports of programming at other universities and colleges, the committee voted to direct its efforts toward investigating the feasibility and desirability of a required course on core institutional values. The committee agreed, however, that even if it endorsed a course-based approach in the end, that this would not preclude and, in fact, may be strengthened by, additional non-course based initiatives and programming.

After considering various factors described in more detail in Part II, however, a majority of the committee favors implementing and requiring all first-year students to enroll in a one-credit academic, multi-disciplinary, discussion-based course whose subject matter is W&L's core institutional values.

The objectives of the course the committee proposes are not unlike the objectives of many courses that are already taught at W&L: to engage in and promote sustained investigation of W&L's core institutional values; to provide students opportunities to reflect critically on and discuss the values that are important to their own personal identities, character development, and aspirations; and to provide students with common resources for engaging in intellectual discussion with other first-year students, both in their section and in other sections of the course. These objectives could be measured in the same way other course objectives are measured: for example, by asking students in course evaluations to what degree they believe the course met the stated objectives. Although there is one objective that differs from other W&L course objectives—to provide additional student mentoring to complement W&L's initial advisor mentoring program, helping students to make a successful academic transition to university—this could also be measured in the usual way, with final course evaluation questions for students. Other data about first-year students that the university already collects (first-year GPA data, for example) might suggest whether students are making more successful academic transitions to

university since implementation of the proposed course. For more detail on course assessment, see Part III, Section D *infra*.

6. As part of your inquiry, consider ways other than a course by which the goals driving this effort could be met and weigh the pros and cons of various options.

The committee considered several alternatives to a required course to meet its main objective. These alternatives are described in Part II.

PART II: PROGRAM DESIGN

In this section, we briefly describe the alternatives to a new course that we considered, and in the following sections we explain our rationale for preferring a new course and for the particular course design we propose.

A. Alternatives to the Course We Propose

The committee considered a number of concrete proposals for fostering reflection and discussion about our institutional values of respect, integrity, civility, and honor that would not involve instituting a new, mandatory one-credit course for first-years. These proposals ranged from requiring students to take one course (at some point during their undergraduate career) from a list of existing courses that address our core institutional values, to sponsoring a community-wide (and ideally student-led) program that would consist of multiple events and discussions centered on themes related to core institutional values. These alternative proposals are briefly described below.

1. Alternative Course Proposals

The committee was quite mindful that additional resources would be needed to institute a new mandatory course for all first-year students. Therefore, we looked at our existing course offerings to see if our aims could be met in some other way. Upon a review of the existing course catalogue, it was determined that we currently have nearly 30 courses on the books, across at least ten different programs and departments, which address core institutional values in some form or other. One possibility we considered, therefore, is that all W&L students might simply be required to take at least one course from this approved list at some point during their undergraduate career.

Another course proposal we briefly discussed was a required half-credit course, perhaps administered by Athletics or Student Affairs, modeled on a course offered at Bryn Mawr. This course would be required of all first-year students, and would be a kind of “extended orientation” that takes place throughout the entire first year of college. Students would be brought together on a regular (though not weekly) basis to discuss student life issues and issues of wellness throughout the year.

2. Non-Course Proposals

The committee also considered a number of proposals for fostering reflection on our core institutional values that would not *necessarily* involve a course requirement. (Some of these proposals were envisioned as complements to a required course, rather than as alternatives to it.) These proposals generally revolved around the idea of creating some kind of “umbrella” program that would explicitly connect events that emphasize respect and responsibility within the W&L community. It was widely agreed that such a program would have to receive substantial support from university leadership (from the President on down), and also that there should be a

significant role for student-initiated and student-run events. Here are some of the specific ideas we discussed under this heading (not all of which were endorsed by every member):

- Events such as a series of workshops, lectures, films, performances, and other participatory forums (such as fireside chats) related to campus culture and broader student culture issues; these events may be sponsored under a specific theme each year (such as “A Civil Tongue: Showing Respect in Speech and Electronic Forums”) or under a broader theme (such as “Civility” or “Honor”)
- The institution of a Faculty Mentors group which would be committed to contributing to this program in a variety of ways, from sponsoring talks/lectures, to teaching classes with specific content related to core institutional values, to meeting on a regular basis with discussion groups on campus about current campus issues
- The institution of a Student Mentors group or a Student Community Forum, which would be committed to helping to sponsor and coordinate activities, participate in monthly discussions, and perhaps take a certain number of courses over the course of their W&L career, all of which address core institutional values in some way
- Choosing a University Book each year on a topic related to core institutional values that everyone on campus would be expected to read, and organizing a series of events around this book (such as a lecture by the book’s author, lectures on related themes, etc.). First-years could perhaps be required to attend these lectures through their first-year writing seminars

The general idea behind all of these non-course proposals is that the university should make it an *institutional priority* to emphasize the values at the core of our university mission statement, and that it can best do so by contributing both resources and official institutional support to a unified program devoted to encouraging reflection upon these values throughout our campus community.

B. Rationale for Preferring the Proposed Course

According to the 2006 National Survey on First-Year Seminars, 84.8% of the 968 colleges and universities surveyed offer a seminar for first-year students intended to ease their transition to college life. 53.8% of these schools offered an academic seminar. Furthermore, academic seminars with variable content across sections were more prevalent at highly selective institutions (60.7%). At 92.2% of these institutions, the seminar carries credit for graduation; at 82%, students receive a letter grade for the course. Of the colleges surveyed, 46% require first-year students to take the seminar. The objectives for these first-year seminars include developing academic and study skills; developing critical thinking; strengthening faculty-student relationships; providing a common first-year experience; and orienting students to campus resources and services. At 90% of the institutions, faculty teach the first-year seminar; 64.4% teach it as part of their regular teaching load. At 31.9% of responding institutions, academic advisors teach their advisees in the first-year seminar.

At W&L, part of our stated mission is to “provide a liberal arts education that develops students’ capacity to think freely, critically, and humanely and to conduct themselves with honor, integrity, and civility. Graduates will be prepared for life-long learning, personal achievement,

responsible leadership, service to others, and engaged citizenship in a global and diverse society. Students on this committee's student advisory committee, in focus groups, and in our classes have told us they do not feel that W&L is living up to this aspiration. The reason to have a course or program that focuses on core institutional values such as respect, integrity, civility, and honor, is to provide students with an opportunity to reflect critically on, and engage in academically informed and structured discussion with other members of their community about, how these institutional values should be understood and practiced.

The main educational objective, then, is *to engage in and promote sustained investigation of W&L's core institutional values, in and outside of class*. Other objectives include to provide students opportunities to reflect critically on and discuss the values that are important to their own personal identities, character development, and aspirations; to provide students with common resources for engaging in intellectual discussion with other first-year students, both in their section and in other sections of the course; and to provide additional student mentoring to complement W&L's initial advisor mentoring program, helping students to make a successful academic transition to university.

In mid-November the committee voted 9-2 "that the committee's work be directed toward developing a course-based response to the Provost's charge." Reasons offered in favor of this decision include:

- A course can provide extended and repeated exposure to issues of respect, integrity, civility, and honor (our core institutional values)
- A course can provide extended and repeated opportunities to discuss and reflect on core institutional values
- A course can provide for rigorous academic treatment of the nature of our core institutional values and the challenges they present, and collective critical reflection on how they are embodied at W&L
- A course can provide for both some uniformity of approach and content across individual classes/instructors as well as some variety of approach and content—variations on a theme
- The previous four points together provide for:
 - a common core experience for students in different sections which may lead to discussion of core institutional values outside the classroom
 - enough variation between sections that faculty can teach to their strengths as well as be exposed to parts of other disciplines
 - a message that faculty and administrators take campus culture seriously and want to engage students in rigorous and extended consideration of core institutional values

- a message that faculty and administrators take student self-governance seriously and want to facilitate both individual and collective self-governance through critical reflection on institutional values and how these are enacted by individuals and groups on campus

C. Proposed Course Design

(A detailed sample syllabus appears as Appendix C).

The committee recommends Honor 100:

1. Honor 100 is a multidisciplinary discussion-format seminar taken by all first-year students that provides opportunities for students to engage in critical reflection on and discussion of W&L's core values. Its main purpose is to consider what it means when we say that W&L is a community of respect, integrity, civility, and honor.
2. Required of all first-year students
3. One-credit course, meeting 90 minutes per week for 12 weeks
4. Offered in both the fall and winter terms
5. Small class size of about 15 students per section
6. Though the exact approach of each section would vary by professor, all are required to address the four core values of respect, integrity, civility, and honor
7. The course design should involve each of the following
 - a. **Theory Component:** rigorous interdisciplinary consideration of the core values, through books, articles, works of art, or other discipline-specific texts and methods
 - b. **Applied Component:** reflection on and discussion of actual "real world" cases relevant to the specific value—this may include (but is not restricted to) newspaper articles, television news reports, film, books, internet resources, works of art
 - c. **Relevant W&L Policy:** education in and critical discussion of actual W&L policies that bear on core institutional values

D. Rationale for Each Element of Proposed Course

1. The focus on respect, integrity, civility, and honor:

The committee identified these as the university's four core values. This is based on the

University and College mission statements, and other public expressions of our institutional goals and values, including especially the student Honor System, speaking tradition, and commitment to student self-governance.

2. Required of all first-year students:

The committee views Honor 100 as part of the overall effort (which includes the Division of Student Affairs, academic advising, and others) to orient students to college life, to the particular challenges of our campus, and to rigorous academic approaches to problem solving. All students should be involved at the outset of their career at W&L.

If courses on core institutional values were offered but not required, students might regard them more favorably. However, those who most would benefit from deeper reflection on core institutional values, because they are not already inclined to reflect on such matters, are the least likely to take such a course. The rationale for requiring such a course would be similar to the rationale for having other general education requirements: students are not always good judges, prospectively, of what will benefit them educationally. Additionally, the creation of a common first-year experience offers benefits that would be lost if the course were optional.

3. One-credit course, meeting 90 minutes per week for 12 weeks:

The committee recognizes the costs of a universally required course in terms of (student/faculty/administrator) time and resources. A one-credit, 12-session meeting schedule seemed to be the optimal balance of cost and impact.

While a 3-credit course might have a larger impact than a one-credit course, it was generally agreed that in terms of faculty coverage and demand on students, it would be a good idea to begin a course addressing core institutional values as a one-credit course. If the course turned out to be successful in meeting the important educational objectives it is designed to meet, we might then consider devoting additional resources to a 3-credit version of the course.

4. Offered in both the fall and winter terms:

Necessary to ensure that all first-year students can take the course in sections small enough that meaningful discussion can take place.

5. Class size of about 15 students per section:

Since the course is to be in a discussion format, fostering collective critical reflection, the section size should be small. In order to cover the whole first-year class, it cannot be too small. A class size of 15 would, in a 90-minute session, provide each of the students and the professor about 5-6 minutes each to speak, if everyone participates. This would require a total of about 32 sections to cover a typical first-year class of 475. These seem to us to be reasonable goals. This is also the class size selected as optimal by the English

Department for Writing 100.

6. Though the exact approach of each section would vary by professor, all are required to address the four core values of respect, integrity, civility, and honor:

A completely uniform syllabus would be both unattractive to potential instructors and potentially stultifying to students. A core approach with variations chosen by instructors enhances the multidisciplinary nature of the course, while still providing a common experience.

7. The course design should involve each of the following

- a. **Theory Component:**

This is to be an academic course in which students learn to think rigorously about values. Theoretical background is necessary for usefully framing critical discussions.

- b. **Applied Component:**

Critical discussion of institutional values will not be worthwhile unless students can relate it to their lives as young adults on a college campus heading toward the workplace and citizenship.

- c. **Relevant W&L Policy:**

An extension of b., above. Knowledge and examination of actual W&L policy must be part of the examination of our institutional values and our individual and collective attempts to enact them.

E. Student Input and Response to Program Design

The committee's student advisory committee was sent a two-page prompt about the committee's initial ideas for a course prior to meeting. Students were encouraged to provide input, feedback and new ideas and were instrumental in providing the committee with refined direction and considerations in further developing the course and in developing a draft sample syllabus. Subsequently, student focus groups were each provided with a draft sample syllabus and a short description of the course proposal, then asked to complete a questionnaire. Committee members engaged in discussion with students about the committee's proposals for most of the duration of meetings with both the student advisory committee and the student focus groups.

Students were generally receptive to the program design for the course. Many of the students acknowledged the importance of addressing issues of disrespect among students and most thought that class discussions and critical reflection about the core values of respect, integrity, civility and honor would be an appropriate method of engaging students. Students consistently shared the need to address honor beyond academic cheating and the need for further application

of the principle of honor in addressing issues within the W&L social scene. Almost all of the students acknowledged the cavernous disconnect between honor “on and off the hill.” One student summarized the concern by stating: “Honor is not a coat you put on when entering the class and take off upon leaving class.”

Several students shared that the course would fit well in terms of the liberal arts and that the university needed to address the student-to-student issues in a forum of open discussion such as the course concept.

Students were highly receptive to the idea of attending a series of campus-based programs, talks and speakers and felt such a course requirement would be useful to supplement the experience and reinforce why most students chose to attend W&L. Students suggested their peers should have the opportunity to fulfill the program requirement by selecting events from a pre-approved menu of campus events.

Students also had a favorable response to pertinent readings, case studies, current events, films and other content to stimulate discussion. Student feedback was consistent about the course needing to be taught in a manner that doesn’t alienate or threaten the majority who enjoy the social scene and see no reason for changing it. Students consistently stated that if the course was to be successful, it was essential to secure professors with passion, enthusiasm, strong facilitation skills, and the ability to “drill down” to get students to openly discuss some of the difficult course topics.

Students debated the merit of having an upper division student as a teaching assistant. Although some students worried that having an upper division student witness what first-years said or felt about various class topics might chill discussion, most students said that having an older student presence might help to authenticate actual campus culture issues and advance class dialogue. Students also discussed possible panel or class visitation roles for members of the EC, RAs and peer counselors.

Most of the students (30 of 33 in the focus groups) and all on the student advisory committee acknowledged that W&L social issues need to be addressed and that an academic course would be beneficial for first-year students. Many of the students acknowledged a course wouldn’t resolve all of the behavioral issues and that it would likely take several years until substantial change occurred in campus culture. Several students said the course would offer a foundation and common experience for first-year students that may help to solidify W&L’s core values.

Although students didn’t provide many alternatives to the course, they gave several suggestions for enhancing it, most of which are highlighted in sections of the report. One alternative included the possible establishment of a marketing campaign aimed at creating prominent signage throughout the campus that reinforced core institutional values and stood as a continuous reminder for the community.

Part III: Curriculum

A. Philosophy

The committee's rationale for creation of Honor 100 can be traced directly to the university's mission statement, which vows to develop "students' capacity to think freely, critically, and humanely and to conduct themselves with honor, integrity, and civility."

The words "respect," "integrity," "civility" and "honor" appear repeatedly in Washington and Lee campaigns to recruit students and entice alumni to make generous contributions to the university's continued growth and improvement. These four words are used so frequently on campus that it seemed only natural to the committee that they should serve as the philosophical cornerstones of the proposed course's curriculum.

From its famed student-administered honor system to its revered speaking tradition, W&L professes deep devotion to these four pillars of personal responsibility:

- *"Honor provides the common thread woven through many aspects of this institution and creates a community of trust and respect affecting fundamentally the relationships of all its members,"* the university proclaims on its website.
- In the White Book, student government leaders proclaim *"the notion of an honorable community is essential to the University's educational objectives, for the learning process, like society, flourishes best in an environment where mutual trust and respect form the bedrock of relationships."*

The committee proposes the course at a time when students themselves are asking faculty to help them build a better environment on campus that is based on the cherished ideals of respect, integrity, civility and honor. In focus groups conducted by the committee, several students repeated the refrain of the disappointed—"This isn't what I thought it would be"—in describing the gap between their expectations and reality of life at W&L.

By providing a structured approach for faculty to help students understand and apply these core values, the proposed course will enable first-years to make a smoother transition from high school to Washington and Lee, academically and personally, by fostering a sense of belonging, promoting engagement in university activities, and by clarifying not only what is expected of them but also what they should expect of themselves as they figure out who they are and who they want to be.

The course will provide first-year students with the opportunity to engage in critical reflection on and discussion of the meaning of respect, integrity, civility, and honor. The course also will give students the chance to tackle sensitive subjects in a safe, academic setting where they can feel free to discuss openly how they define and invoke these core concepts in their daily lives.

To help students think critically, committee members recommend that academically rigorous readings from a variety of disciplines should be combined with case studies from current events

to ignite class discussions as students examine a specific example, such as the murder of a female University of Virginia lacrosse player, to explore how W&L men and women treat one another on and off campus. As more than one student focus group participant told the committee, a faculty commitment to “keeping it real” will determine the course’s success by providing the catalyst for positive student participation.

B. Structure

The committee believes the course could be divided naturally into four subject areas by using what we have identified as the core institutional values of respect, integrity, civility, and honor. Professors could take a two-pronged approach, focusing first on theoretical and then practical applications of each topic over a 12-week term.

Theoretical discussions could revolve around academic readings from a variety of disciplines, including business, philosophy, psychology, sociology, politics, religion, history, literature, and journalism. The practical portion of the course could focus on real-world examples of people who acted with honor while facing difficult challenges, such as the story of Joseph Darby, the young soldier who tipped off U.S. Army investigators to abuses committed by American troops in Iraq’s Abu Ghraib prison.

C. Sample Syllabus (including sample reading list)

The committee created a sample syllabus using readings that relate to the four institutional values. The syllabus includes course descriptions and objectives, along with readings, news accounts and films that address both theoretical and applied aspects of the course. Please note that this syllabus is simply a sample. The goal of creating a syllabus was to give faculty members an idea of what the course might look like and what types of readings might be assigned. We expect that the course structure and readings will vary by instructor. Furthermore, the committee recommends that a curriculum task force representing a wide diversity of disciplines develop these ideas more fully. For example:

1. Select a permanent name for the course.
2. Develop permanent objectives for the course.
3. Decide what the minimum course requirements should be and make recommendations regarding how much each should count for in determining the final grade. For example, we have suggested that the grade be based on class participation, weekly journal entries or response papers, and possibly exams or quizzes.
4. Compile, for each core value (respect, integrity, civility, honor), a more complete list of readings, films, news stories, and other material from various disciplines that faculty teaching the course could choose from among.
5. Determine which reading or readings should be offered in common in all sections, at least

for the first year the course is offered.

6. Create a plan for training faculty who wish to teach the course, perhaps using Faculty Academy.

Please refer to Appendix C for the sample syllabus.

D. Assessment Plan for Proposed Course

In the course objectives we outline the importance of students critically reflecting on W&L's core institutional values (respect, integrity, civility, honor). After taking Honor 100, it is expected that students will better understand these values and be able to apply them to their own lives.

The success of these objectives will be measured with a pre/post-test paradigm. On the first day of class, students will be given a pre-test to complete. The pre-test will contain questions that address both objective and subjective issues pertaining to the course. For example, students will be asked some questions that have an objective answer (e.g., "What is honor?" "When and why does diffusion of responsibility occur?" "What does SFHB stand for?"). These questions will be based largely on readings that will be assigned throughout the course. In addition, in an attempt to measure students' level of engagement in thinking about the core values, several subjective questions will be asked using a 5-point Likert scale. For example, students will be asked to rate their agreement with the following types of statements: "I often think about the meaning of integrity." "I frequently act without thinking about how my behavior will affect others." "I understand the complexities of honor." Course instructors will grade each pre-test according to objective criteria and pre-tests will not be returned to the students.

At the end of the term, students will be given a post-test that is identical to the pre-test. After the post-test is graded, a difference score will be calculated between the pre- and post-test. It is expected that students will score significantly higher on both objective/factual and subjective/engagement questions on the post-test.

E. Student Feedback Regarding the Proposed Honor 100

Students responded favorably to the curriculum and embraced its philosophy. Many members of focus groups favored a uniform experience for all first-year students, requiring "everyone to read the same thing." But other members of groups wanted to give professors freedom to choose readings from a master list. One student shared, "If a professor is extraordinarily passionate" about this course and relies on his or her field more heavily in teaching the course, "the message is still going to get across." Many students shared that a common experience may provide for more meaningful discussions beyond class and serve the dual purpose of bonding the first-year class.

Students were largely receptive to the core values and many felt it was important to reiterate and remind members of the community about them in creative ways.

Students liked the idea of a discussion-driven format, pertaining to pertinent readings, current events, case studies and relatable topics. Most students felt the course needed to be more practical than theoretical/philosophical.

Students were unanimous, stating that no tests should be given in the class. They liked the idea of a discussion-based class in which participation and contribution would account for the majority of the final grade.

One student shared professors should be clear to ensure students understand that they must “tell me what you think,” and not what you’ve memorized. Students also like the idea of journal entries, which they believed would give peers a chance to connect what they learn to their lives and retain more of their reflective personality. Another student said that a journal would be a good tool for first-years to “keep track of their behavior” by encouraging them to ask themselves “what have I done? How has my behavior affected other people? How does this fit with honor?”

During the last week in January 2011, members of the W&L student body participated in focus groups regarding the proposed course. (For details about these focus groups, their membership, and how the meetings were conducted, see Part I.B.4, *supra*). Each focus group discussed several aspects of the proposed course, including whether it would likely achieve its stated objectives and the format and content of the proposed course.

In general, students responded very positively to the proposed one-credit course. Many students reported that they believe a liberal arts college should have requirements such as an Honor 100 course, and a program that addressed core institutional values could foster a more intellectually vibrant life at W&L. Students reported that providing an in-class theoretical framework and helping students think about some issues and values important to them on a deeper level could foster a greater level of intellectual engagement outside the classroom. Some focus group participants suggested ancillary programs, such as hall discussions and the requirement to choose from among dinner discussion sessions, to foster further organized discussion among students. Many liked the idea that this intellectual conversation could take on a “life of its own,” especially because the course would be a common experience among first-year students that they could share. Students also responded favorably to the applied aspect of the course to supplement the more traditional theoretical perspective. Further, they reported that the syllabus and possible readings looked highly interesting. To view copies of all written student comments, see Appendix E.

Part IV: Program Structure

A. Section Size and Duration of Weekly Meeting

15 students per section, 90-minute weekly meetings: While the committee initially considered sections of 17 as optimal, and assumed a one-credit class would meet for one hour per week, those numbers did not seem compatible with a discussion-based class. Even if the faculty member said nothing, if every student talked, each student would have about 3 ½ minutes to speak. Because courses normally have 2 hours of homework assigned for every credit hour spent in class, it might be better to have 90-minute classes, but assign only 90 minutes of homework, for the one credit per week, as well as reducing the class size to 15 students. This would give each of the students and the professor about 5-6 minutes each to speak, if everyone participated, which seems like a more reasonable goal. Students remarked that what is said in class is what they will take away with them, not so much what they read or view in preparation.

B. Classroom Scheduling:

Sections offered throughout entire day and evening: Because preferred class times vary greatly by student and faculty, sections could be offered early morning, evenings, and regular times throughout the day. Some students indicated that this might make the class more “fun,” and some faculty have been choosing to teach evenings. This would also open more classroom space for Honor 100.

The committee consulted Associate University Registrar Barbara Rowe about classroom availability and received confirmation that space is quite limited. Assistant Dean of the College Wendy Price completed “a rough informal assessment” of College classroom usage for the past three years, comparing the number of spaces used vs. open spaces for seminar rooms and for traditional classrooms. Reducing the size of the class to 15 would open the availability of seminar rooms. Additionally, Wendy Price and Barbara Rowe indicated that Leyburn 103, with some upgrades, could be used as a dedicated classroom for Honor 100, scheduling back to back sessions all day, since Leyburn 103 is not heavily used now. The committee also noted that there are spaces on campus that are not used regularly at a broad range of times (e.g., an athletic room used for faculty meetings and team meetings two nights a week), so evening offerings could create more space.

Sixteen 90-minute meetings per week, in each of fall and winter terms, would be required by Honor 100. If these were all done on Tuesdays and Thursdays (as 90 minute meetings are normally scheduled), there would have to be 8 each day. That would mean scheduling one during each traditional meeting time between 8:35 a.m. and 4:25 p.m., possibly in a dedicated space such as Leyburn 103; and two additional sections, perhaps in the evening, when classroom space is widely available. The class could also be scheduled MWF in a dedicated meeting space, since in a dedicated classroom the 90-minute blocks would not pose a problem. At 9:00, 10:30, noon, 1:30, and 3:00, fifteen sections could be completed MWF in a dedicated classroom. That would leave only one section to be scheduled at an alternate time, such as a TR or an evening. That is

the worst case scenario; if more sections were held during evenings, rooms would not have to be scheduled even as tightly as just described.

C. Extracurricular Activities:

1. Attendance at outside speakers: Some students thought participation should be mandatory; others thought students should be required to attend some of the events (organized and sponsored by student groups, such as KEWL, SAIL, etc. as well as departments and programs), but given a choice of events to attend.

2. Dinners: Some students suggested having social events, like dinners, built around conversations on core institutional values.

3. RA-led hall discussions about topics related to the class. It would be helpful to have the conversation continue outside of faculty supervision, and this would be a way of creating a new conversation among a different group of people and create additional opportunities for bonding with another student group.

D. Credits for Graduation:

The committee considered:

1. Raising the number of credits by 1, which is regarded as the most feasible. As one student noted, "This is a drop in the bucket compared to demanding majors."

2. One student suggested using Honor 100 as a replacement for one of the PE requirements, but the committee does not regard this as desirable.

E. Faculty Coverage:

There are several options the committee considered:

1. Faculty who are interested in teaching a section of the course could receive a stipend for teaching it in addition to teaching their regular teaching load.

2. Faculty who are interested in teaching the course could teach 1 section every other year in addition to 5 courses per year. This provides an incentive for faculty to teach the course, since they would teach 5-1/3 courses per year, instead of 5-1/2 per year. However, that would not significantly diminish W&L's total course offerings in any given year.

3. Faculty who are interested in teaching the course could teach 3 sections in a given year in place of a regular course. This first-year seminar might serve as a feeder course to other classes in the faculty member's discipline, thus encouraging departments to release faculty to teach the course. This would result in less than a 2% reduction in total curricular offerings in any given year, even if released faculty are not replaced.

In January 2010, 33 faculty members indicated that they would be willing to teach a one-credit multidisciplinary course on respect and responsibility after viewing a general description of a course consisting of the same core elements as Honor 100. In conversations and correspondence with the committee chair, which were initiated to determine whether there was sufficient interest to propose this committee, these faculty members indicated their willingness to teach such a course providing that their departments would allow them to do so. Because the committee chair did not systematically contact all faculty, there is reason to believe that more than 33 faculty members would be interested in teaching Honor 100 if a universal request were made.

F. Faculty and Course Development:

1. Faculty Academy: faculty members who have already taught material related to this curriculum could offer a series of workshops during faculty academies to those interested in teaching this course.
2. Spring Term model: Building on the success of the spring term model for developing new courses, the committee also suggests that faculty could submit ideas for developing courses in the winter term, meet to discuss them together at the end of the academic year, then develop them over the summer.

G. Estimated Additional Cost:

1. Faculty
 - a. Stipends for developing new course
 - b. Stipends for teaching each section, or course release/replacement
2. Program administrator

H. Funding Sources

The committee considered several possible sources for support: capital campaign priorities, Roger Mudd Center for Professional Ethics, Johnson directorship, Class of '65 grants, as well as working with the grants office to seek outside support.

Another possibility the committee considered is that a donor might find appealing the opportunity to attach his or her name to a class on core institutional values that every W&L student is required to take. For that reason, we might be able to obtain an endowment from a donor.

I. Student Input and Response to Program Design

Focus group participants, advisory board members and student committee members were impressive in terms of their understanding of resource issues, how the course might fit into the curriculum, and the logistical challenges under consideration. Almost all students were positive about the proposed course structure and agreed that the course should be offered for one credit to be added to graduation requirements. However, one focus group consisting of half of the First-

Year Leadership Council was split with three students in favor of the course and three who felt students would resent the course. One student said the course would “cheapen” values at W&L and the core values would be better placed in orientation and residence hall talks.

Many students on the committee’s student advisory committee and in focus groups indicated that a required course that considers institutional values is just the sort of requirement they would expect at a liberal arts institution. Such a requirement would enhance rather than diminishing their liberal arts education, in their view. By contrast, they regarded the requirements of many majors as posing an unreasonable obstacle to the institution’s liberal arts objectives, since heavy major requirements make it difficult to experiment with courses in various disciplines. A required course that considers institutional values is harmonious with a liberal arts mission in a way that demanding requirements for many majors are not. Compared to the burdensome major requirements, many students did not view a one-credit course as a significant additional burden. Many found the idea of a common first-year experience appealing.

Some students felt the course should be pass/fail, others felt it should be for a grade. Most upper division students that were juniors and seniors, including those in primary student government and leadership roles strongly suggested that the course be graded to challenge students to fully participate and maintain student motivation throughout the course. Students felt strongly that the course be offered during the fall term (a 12-week course meeting one hour per week) of the first-year and that all new students be required to take the course.

All students emphasized the importance of ensuring that the course workload be fair and commensurate for a one-credit course offering.

Students were concerned about the unique nature of the course content, coupled with the heavy emphasis on class discussion and participation. They emphasized that creating a class atmosphere of trust was essential for success.

Students were adamant about maintaining small classes for the first-year seminar. Several said small classes were critical to achieve the intended outcomes and strongly encouraged no more than 12-15 students be enrolled in each course section with an ideal class size consisting of 12 students. Students warned that larger classes would create roadblocks prohibiting students from sharing their honest thoughts and perspectives and that the course would be doomed from the onset.

Student participants thought classroom scheduling issues could be addressed by offering several sections of the course during the evening hours. When polled about evening classes, approximately 70 percent of the students said they either enjoyed their evening classes or would be receptive to the idea of night sessions, and about 30 percent said they have never considered an evening class or would prefer not to attend evening classes. Several students suggested that evening sessions would feel more informal and “fun.”

Appendix A-- Provost's Charge

Ad Hoc Committee for a Course on Respect and Responsibility March 25, 2010

Members: Melina Bell, chair; Mike Anderson; Paul Gregory; Dan Kramer; Dave Leonard; Shana Levine; Toni Locy; Mark Rush; Angie Smith; Julie Woodzicka

Provost's charge

The mandate for this committee rests in a motion passed at a University Faculty Meeting on March 1, 2010, as follows :

BE IT RESOLVED that the Faculty charges the Provost, by March 21, 2010, to appoint an ad hoc committee to investigate the desirability and feasibility of establishing a one-credit academic course for first-year students that would engage them in discussions, based on multidisciplinary reading selections, concerning the benefits and responsibilities associated with participation in a community of respect."

Rationale for the motion: W&L's mission is to "provide a liberal arts education that develops students' capacity to think freely, critically, and humanely and to conduct themselves with honor, integrity, and civility. Graduates will be prepared for life-long learning, personal achievement, responsible leadership, service to others, and engaged citizenship in a global and diverse society." Engaging first-year students in discussions about these values, as an early part of their academic experience, seems a promising way for faculty to further enhance the university's fulfillment of its mission. The committee could collect information about similar programs at peer institutions, explore different ways such a program might be used at W&L, and report back to faculty on its findings.

In the course of its work, the committee should consider these suggestions:

1. Investigate such courses offered in the past and currently at other institutions. Useful information will include: the purpose and history of the course; syllabus and readings and whether these are the same for all sections; whether the course is required; how faculty are assigned to teach it in the context of managing course loads; and most important, evidence of assessment-based value for the course in meeting its objectives.
2. Consult some background on the subject of teaching values and citizenship: examples (there are many others) are *Cultivating Humanity* by Martha Nussbaum, 1997 Harvard Press; *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* by A. Colby, T. Ehrlich, E Beaumont, J Stephens, 2003 Carnegie Institute for the Advancement of Teaching; *Education's End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life*, by Anthony T Kronman, 2007, Yale. I would be glad to purchase copies of whatever you select for the committee to use.

3. Consult with W&L colleagues who have had experience in teaching content inclusive of honor, values ethics, etc. The Student Affairs staff and the Student Affairs Committee should be enlisted as collaborators in this endeavor. W&L had a Teagle grant a few years ago for the purpose of assessing the effectiveness of teaching ethics and values, and you might review the results and report of that pilot study.
4. Confer broadly with students to gain their perspective on the idea of the course that is envisioned. How would it be received by the majority of students? What impact would it have on student culture?
5. Approach the work with an open mind and balanced viewpoint, not assuming that a course is needed but rather asking in the first place “what is the evidence that courses like this will meet the intended goals”.
6. As part of your inquiry, consider ways other than a course by which the goals driving this effort could be met and weigh the pros and cons of various options.

Timetable and report:

1. Please strive to bring forward a report and recommendations by February 1, 2011 (if possible) so that recommendations can be discussed and voted by the faculty as necessary before the end of the academic year.
2. The Committee’s recommendations should strive for cost-neutrality or at least be incrementally cost-minimal in the present economic environment. For example if you recommend that a course should be offered, outline a plan on how it could fit into normal course loads so that additional hiring will not be required. It may require a consideration of replacing some existing endeavors that are less important than you believe this new venture to be. These issues will no doubt be part of your feasibility study.
3. For recommendations put forward, please state the specific goals and outcomes that will be used as evidence that those goals are being met, and sketch out a rigorous assessment plan to measure outcomes.

Appendix B – Sources Consulted

Books

Kwame Anthony Appiah, *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010).

David Callahan, *The Cheating Culture: Why More Americans Are Doing Wrong To Get Ahead* (Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2004).

Anne Colby, Thomas Ehrlich, Elizabeth Beaumont, and Jason Stephens, *Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility* (San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishing, 2003).

Michael Kimmel, *Guyland* (Harper Collins, 2008).

Elizabeth Kiss and J. Peter Euben, eds., *Debating Moral Education: Rethinking the Role of the Modern University* (Duke University Press, 2009).

Anthony T. Kronman, *Education's End: Why Our Colleges and Universities Have Given Up on the Meaning of Life* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2007).

Martha C. Nussbaum, *Cultivating Humanity: A Classical Defense of Reform in Liberal Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997).

Lad Sessions, *Honor For Us: A Philosophical Analysis, Interpretation and Defense* (New York: Continuum Books, 2010).

Journal Articles

Jon C. Dalton and Pamela C. Crosby, "College Peer Culture: Taming the 'Monster Within the Gates'," *Journal of College & Character*: 11, No. 4, November 2010.

Jon C. Dalton and Pamela C. Crosby, "How We Teach Character in College: A Retrospective on Some Recent Higher Education Initiatives that Promote Moral and Civic Learning." *Journal of College & Character*: 11, No. 2, May 2010.

Patricia M. King and Matthew J. Mayhew, "Moral Judgment Development in Higher Education: Insights from the Defining Issues Test," *Journal of Moral Education*: 31, No. 3, 2002.

W&L Reports

Washington and Lee University Student Affairs Task Force, Strategic Planning Efforts Reports, June 2005 and May 2006.

Value-Added Assessment of Student Learning in the Liberal Arts: Assessing the Impact of Engaged Learning, Teagle Ethics Questionnaire, Freshman 2006 and Senior 2007 Reports and Data Summary, Washington and Lee University.

Additional Documents and Sources

The Consortium on High Achievement and Success (CHAS). See at Trinity College, CT: <http://www.trincoll.edu/depts/student-services/chas>

Johns Hopkins Civility Project. See <http://krieger.jhu.edu/civility>

National Coalition Building Institute (NCBI), Furman University. See <http://www.ncbi.org>

Rutgers Project Civility. See <http://projectcivility.rutgers.edu>

Barbara F. Tobolowsky and Associates, *2006 National Survey of First-Year Seminars: Continuing Innovations in the Collegiate Curriculum* (Monograph No. 51). Columbia, SC: University of South Carolina National Resource Center for the First-Year Experience and Students in Transition (2008).

VMI Leadership Conference: Answering the Nation's Call for Leaders of Character, October 5-6, 2010. Shana Levine and Melina Bell attended.

Redacted threads from Washington and Lee University's College ACB website.

Washington and Lee University's Office of Institutional Effectiveness

Debbie Dailey solicited responses from HEDS (Higher Education Data Sharing Consortium) consisting of 150 private liberal arts colleges, including highly selective institutions like Middlebury and Amherst as well as less selective private liberal arts institutions. The committee reviewed compiled information from a variety of institutions, including:

Alverno College, Eckerd College, Duke University, Portland State, Spelman College, U.S. Air Force Academy, Messiah College, University of Notre Dame, Rutgers University, Vanderbilt University, University of South Carolina, Mount Holyoke College, University of Connecticut, Boston College, Trinity College, California State University, Monterey Bay, Guilford College, College of St. Catherine, Boise State University, University of Northern Illinois, University of California, Santa Barbara, Tusculum College, Furman, Turtle Mountain Community College, and Kapi'olani Community College

W&L's 2006 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Institutional Summary.

W&L's 2008 Higher Education Research Institute (HERI) Tuition Funding Sources (TFS) Institutional Summary

W&L Student Work

Kristine Early, Senior Thesis in Sociology, "Sorority Women: Negotiating a Status-Oriented Society," April 8, 2007.

Meredith Welch, Honors Thesis in Sociology, "Sexual Assault at Washington and Lee," May 2000.

WGS 296A: Sexual Assault Prevention Workshop, "Recommendations for Improving Sexual Assault Education, Prevention and Response at Washington and Lee University." WGS 296A: Sexual Assault Prevention Workshop Final Report, December 14, 2009.

News Articles

Caitlin Flanagan, "The Hazards of Duke," *The Atlantic*, Jan/Feb 2011, available at: <http://www.theatlantic.com/magazine/print/2011/01/the-hazards-of-duke/8328> (retrieved 1/22/2011).

Michael Kimmel, "The Men, and Women, of Yale," *Ms. Magazine* Blog, Oct. 17, 2010, available at <http://msmagazine.com/blog/blog/2010/10/17/the-men-and-women-of-yale> (retrieved 10/20/2010).

Appendix C – Sample Syllabus

Respect, Integrity, Civility, and Honor at Washington and Lee University Honor 100

[Fall or Winter]

Professor []

Contact Info []

Office Hours []

Class meets: [One day per week, for 90 minutes]

Course Description:

Honor 100 is a multidisciplinary discussion-format seminar taken by all first-year students that provides opportunities for students to engage in critical reflection on and discussion of W&L's core values. Its main purpose is to consider what it means when we say that W&L is a community of respect, integrity, civility, and honor.

Grading

Class Participation

Journal (weekly entries)

[Exam or quizzes?]

Course Objectives:

- Students will have opportunities to reflect critically on and discuss W&L's core institutional values: respect, integrity, civility, and honor.
- Students will have opportunities to reflect critically on and discuss the values that are important to their own personal identities, character development, and aspirations.
- The Honor 100 curriculum will provide students with common resources for engaging in intellectual discussion with other first-year students, both in their section and in other sections of the course.
- Faculty teaching this course will provide student mentoring to complement W&L's initial advisor mentoring program, helping students to make a successful academic transition to university.

Assignments

Every other week, we will read an article that will help us understand the theoretical aspects of the core value under consideration. On alternate weeks, we will discuss a film, a newspaper article, or other concrete example that reveals something about that value. We will also consider the way official W&L policies might reflect the core value under consideration that week. Sample assignments (suggestions only; not all will be used, and individual professors may come up with their own):

Respect

Theory:

Discussion Questions: What is respect? Does everyone deserve it? What do we do when we don't get the respect we think we deserve? How are respect and self-respect connected, if at all? Are there degrees of respect?

- Onora O'Neill, "Between Consenting Adults," *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, Vol. 14, No. 3 (Summer, 1985), pp. 252-277.
- Thomas Hill, "Servility and Self-Respect" in *Autonomy and Self-Respect* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991): 4-18.
- Michael Kimmel, *Guyland* (Harper Collins 2008), Chapters 9 "Hooking Up: Sex in Guyland," 10 "Predatory Sex and Party Rape," and/or 11 "Girls in Guyland: Eyes on the Guys."
- "Cyberbullying: A review of the literature on harassment through the Internet and other electronic means." Kiriakidis, Stavros P.; Kavoura, Androniki. *Family & Community Health: The Journal of Health Promotion & Maintenance*, Vol 33(2), Apr-Jun 2010, 82-93.
- "How do sexual assault characteristics vary as a function of perpetrators' level of intoxication?" Parkhill, Michele R.; Abbey, Antonia; Jacques-Tiura, Angela J. *Addictive Behaviors*, Vol 34(3), Mar 2009, 331-333.
- "Does alcohol contribute to the confluence model of sexual assault perpetration?" Parkhill, Michele R.; Abbey, Antonia. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, Vol 27(6), Jun 2008, 529-554.
- "Towards a Performance Model of Sex." Thomas Macaulay Millar. In *Yes Means Yes: Visions of Female Sexual Power and a World Without Rape*, edited by Jessica Valenti and Jaclyn Friedman

- Short Fiction, Poetry?

Applied:

- Film: *Haze*, Gordie Foundation (2008). Available at <http://www.snagfilms.com/films/title/haze>.
- De Anza College—alleged gang rape of drunk female high school student by male baseball players and rescue by female soccer players:
 - San Jose Mercury News story: http://www.mercurynews.com/crime-courts/ci_17108063?nclink_check=1
 - KTVU TV story: <http://www.ktvu.com/news/13370961/detail.html>
- University of Virginia murder of women's lacrosse player, allegedly by boyfriend who played on men's lacrosse team:
 - “The Mercurial Nature of George Huguely; The U-Va. Lacrosse Player Accused of Killing Ex-Girlfriend Was a Young Man of Privilege and Rage”, David Nakamura, Washington Post, May 23, 2010, p. A1..
 - Links to other media: http://www.cbsnews.com/8301-504083_162-20004464-504083.html
- Rutgers cyber-bullying suicide/Nightline piece:
 - <http://abcnews.go.com/Nightline/video/rutgers-cyberbullying-suicide-11781706>
 - “Private Moment Made Public, Then a Fatal Jump”, Lisa W. Foderaro, New York Times, Sept. 30, 2010, p. A1.
- Positive cyberspace:
 - It Gets Better Project <http://www.itgetsbetter.org/>

Relevant W&L Policy:

- University Policy on Prohibited Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Misconduct, and Retaliation (<http://www.wlu.edu/x32882.xml>) and slides at http://www.wlu.edu/Documents/general_counsel/cair&do.discrimharass.2005.ppt.

Integrity

Theory:

Discussion Questions: What is integrity? What does it mean to act with integrity? How are integrity and courage related? Under what circumstances would I have the courage to stand up for what I believe is right? If not, why not? What would stop me?

- “Of Individuality, as One of the Elements of Well-being,” John Stuart Mill, Chapter 3 of *On Liberty* (1859).
- “Moral Luck and the Virtues of Impure Agency,” Margaret Urban Walker, *Metaphilosophy* 22 (1991), pp. 14-27.
- “A situationist perspective on the psychology of evil: Understanding how good people are transformed into perpetrators.” Zimbardo, Philip G. Miller, Arthur G. (Ed), (2004). *The social psychology of good and evil*, (pp. 21-50). New York, NY, US: Guilford Press, xiv, 498 pp.
- “The Kitty Genovese murder and the social psychology of helping: The parable of the 38 witnesses.” Manning, Rachel; Levine, Mark; Collins, Alan. *American Psychologist*, Vol 62(6), Sep 2007, 555-562.
- “Groups, identities, and bystander behavior: How group processes can be used to promote helping.” Levine, Mark; Cassidy, Clare. Stürmer, Stefan (Ed); Snyder, Mark (Ed), (2010). *The psychology of prosocial behavior: Group processes, intergroup relations, and helping*, (pp. 209-222). Wiley-Blackwell, xi, 450 pp.
- Stanford Prison Study (Zimbardo) or Obedience (Milgram) (both demonstrate the power of social roles and situations)
- Michael Kimmel, *Guyland* (Harper Collins 2008), Chapter 3 “Bros Before Hos: The Guy Code,” and/or Chapter 5 “The Rites of Almost Men: Binge Drinking, Fraternity Hazing, and the Elephant Walk.”
- Selections from Stephen L. Carter, *Integrity* (Perseus Basic Books, 1996).

Applied:

Discussion Questions: Does W&L’s social culture encourage students to cover up each other’s bad behavior? Do I believe in anything worth gambling my social standing on campus? If so, what would that be? If not, why not?

- Orwell, “Shooting an Elephant,” in *Shooting and Elephant and Other Essays*, 4th ed. (London: Penguin Classics, 2009): 31-40.
- Film/TV/Internet
 - *Full Metal Jacket*. Stanley Kubrick. Warner Bros. (1987).
 - *American Violet*. Tim Disney. Uncommon Productions (2008).
 - *American History X*. Tony Kaye. New Line Cinema (1998).
 - *The Thin Blue Line*. Errol Morris. MGM/UA Home Entertainment (1988).
 - *What Would You Do?* ABC News. <http://abcnews.go.com/WhatWouldYouDo/>
 - California College Rape Case. <http://www.ktvu.com/news/13370961/detail.html>
- Abu Ghraib—Joseph Darby, who tipped off Army investigators to abuses committed by U.S. soldiers in Iraq:
 - 60 Minutes piece:
<http://www.cbsnews.com/stories/2006/12/07/60minutes/main2238188.shtml>
 - “When Joseph Comes Marching Home ... Ambivalence about the Son Who Blew the Whistle at Abu Ghraib”, Hanna Rosin, Washington Post, May 17, 2004, p. C1.
- Karen Silkwood, the plutonium processing plant worker who may have been murdered to prevent her from exposing safety hazards to workers. Movie starring Meryl Streep:
<http://www.imdb.com/title/tt0086312/>
- Pat Tillman: Telling lies and official cover-ups
 - “Review Finds Army Mishandled Friendly-Fire Case; Internal Report Cites Problems”, Josh White, Washington Post, Dec. 3, 2006, p. A17.
 - Krakauer, Jon. *Where Men Win Glory: The Odyssey of Pat Tillman*. (2009) Doubleday.
- My Lai Massacre and Lt. William Calley:
 - <http://www.ebooks.greenwood.com/reader.jsp?x=C8337&p=115&bc=EC8337&type=g&t=>

- BBC pieces on 40th anniversary of the massacre:
http://www.bbc.co.uk/worldservice/documentaries/2008/04/080327_mylai_partone.shtml
- Tailhook scandal:
 - “Wall of Silence Impedes Inquiry into a Rowdy Navy Convention”, Eric Schmitt, New York Times, June 14, 1992, p. A1.

Relevant W&L Policy:

- Student conduct structure (<http://www.wlu.edu/x36832.xml?font=small>)
- Hazing and Retaliation (Student Handbook pp. 30ff,
http://www.wlu.edu/documents/student_affairs/2010-11_Student_Handbook_Online_Edition.pdf)
- University Initiatives on Alcohol and Other Drugs (<http://www.wlu.edu/x36849.xml>).

Civility

Theory:

Discussion Questions: What is civility? Is there more to it than ‘being nice’?

- Lad Sessions, *Honor For Us: A Philosophical Analysis, Interpretation and Defense* (New York: Continuum Books, 2010), pp. 188-189. Lad Sessions’s concept of civility: it is a way of publicly showing others respect. Beyond that, “it refers to the way people act towards one another on *civic* occasions.” It “requires accepting and promoting others’ full participation in public life. Civility in this sense is a political virtue.” This idea comes from the following two sources:
- Mark Phelp, “Democratic Citizenship,” Chapter 9 in *Political Conduct* (Harvard University Press, 2007).
- J. Patrick Dobel, excerpts from *Public Integrity* (Johns Hopkins University Press, 1999).
- “Words That Wound: A Tort Action for Racial Insults, Epithets, and Name-Calling,” Richard Delgado, 17 *Harvard Civil Rights-Civil Liberties Law Review* 133 (1982). (posted on Speaking Freely blog with author's permission, letter on file, <http://home.wlu.edu/~mayocke/SpeakingFreely/index.htm#resources>).

- Lawrence Blum, “Moral Exemplars: Reflections on Schindler, The Trocmes, and Others,” in P. French, T. Uehling, Jr., H. Wettstein, eds., *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 12 (1988): 196-221.
- Lawrence Blum, “Virtue and Community,” in Blum’s *Moral Perception and Particularity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994): 144-169.
- Selections from Stephen L. Carter, *Civility* (Basic Books, 1998).
- Hate crimes.

Applied:

- Film/TV/Internet
 - *Mad Men*. Lions Gate (2007-?) Selections from Season 2,3: “The Mountain King” (212), “Meditations in an Emergency” (213), [Optional – “Out of Town” (301)], “Love Among the Ruins” (302), “My Old Kentucky Home”(303).
- MLK Jr. Letter from a Birmingham Jail

Relevant W&L Policy:

W&L’s speaking tradition—what’s it all about? Are we using good manners to avoid confronting gender, race, sexual orientation and class conflicts on campus?

Honor

Theory:

Discussion Questions: What is honor? Is it the courage of one’s convictions? Or is there more to it? How do I know what is the right thing to do? How do I come to grips with the consequences of doing the right thing?

- Lad Sessions, “Five Peripheral Concepts” (Chapter 2), “Personal Honor” (Chapter 3), pp. 123-127 (the portion of “Academic Honor” that deals with students) and “Honor for Us” (Chapter 12) of *Honor For Us: A Philosophical Analysis, Interpretation and Defense* (New York: Continuum Books, 2010).
- Kwame Anthony Appiah, “The Duel Dies,” “Wars Against Women,” and/or “Lessons and Legacies,” all in *The Honor Code: How Moral Revolutions Happen* (New York: W.W. Norton & Co., 2010).

Applied:

Discussion Questions: W&L's Honor System. White Book. What does it mean? Is it more than words on a piece of paper? Should it go beyond academic behavior? Should it be more aggressively applied to social behavior? If so, why? If not, why not?

- Pudd'nhead Wilson by Mark Twain (entitlement)
- To Kill a Mockingbird by Harper Lee (acting honorably and earning respect)
- The Things They Carried by Tim O'Brien (fear of being shamed in front of peers)
- Hillary Mayell, "Thousands of Women Killed for Family 'Honor'", *National Geographic News* (February 12, 2002), at http://news.nationalgeographic.com/news/2002/02/0212_020212_honorkilling.html.
- Shahid Qazi and Carol Grisanti, "Honor Killings Persist in 'Man's World'," MSNBC, at http://worldblog.msnbc.msn.com/_news/2008/09/12/4376470-honor-killings-persist-in-mans-world.
- Damien McElroy, "Saudi Woman Killed for Chatting on Facebook," *The Telegraph*, March 21, 2008, at <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/1583420/Saudi-woman-killed-for-chatting-on-Facebook.html>.
- Film/TV/Internet
 - *Seven Samurai*. Akira Kurosawa. The Criterion Collection (1954).
 - *The Wire*. HBO Home Video (2002-?) Selections from Season 3: "All Due Respect," "Hamsterdam," "Middle Ground," and "Mission Accomplished"
- The Bracket
- Duke Sex Ratings http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2010/10/07/karen-owen-duke-sex-rati_n_754186.html

Relevant W&L Policy:

- The White Book. Student Executive Committee and its compositional history (minimal female and ethnic/racial minority representation).

Appendix E – Student Responses

All Focus Groups' Responses

1. This course is designed to engage first-year students in discussions and critical reflection about Washington & Lee University's core values of respect, integrity, civility, and honor. How necessary or effective do you think such a course would be in stimulating such discussions and reflection? Please explain.

- I think this is an effective tool in helping students understand what it truly means to be respectful, and honorable. Since the class sections would be small, it would also be an excellent opportunity to help students really learn to speak up and voice opinions. Reflection would be helpful in setting a positive outlook over the next four years for students, because they can use their knowledge throughout college from this course.

- I believe that it is necessary in so far as we must accept the fact that a good portion of every first-year population will not take values and virtues such as these as seriously as they should. Very few of the first-years, also, will be comfortable delving into such conversations, if they occur at all, with much efficacy. I believe that it would be a stimulating experience that, if conducted properly, would help many students become clearer about their personal values. Furthermore, this class would enable them to grow in their personal values, or at least develop better ones.

- I'm not completely certain how necessary this course is, for I don't know other peoples' understanding of respect, integrity, civility and honor. But I feel it can be extremely effective in making known the expected behavior as a W&L student.

- This course is necessary because students don't get any other exposure to the core values of W&L outside of orientation week freshmen year. This course would help reinforce those values that are often ignored/misunderstood by students in their later years at W&L.

- I think it is a wonderful idea. I took Professor Sessions' PHIL 180: Concept of Honor, and we discussed aspects of W&L's Honor System. I found the course helpful and it still helps me in my everyday understanding of the system. With that said, I feel that an international student perspective may be added to it.

- This is an extremely necessary and relevant undertaking but its effectiveness will depend on the way the professor engages, interests and challenges his/her students. The professor must be adept at establishing rapport and choosing the most relevant and challenging themes, catered to her/his class. This is key. Not just 'any' professor can successfully teach this course.

- I think a course on respect, integrity, civility and honor among the freshmen would receive some attention. However, while the course may be enticing because it meets only once a week, there is a philosophy class that covers similar material. Freshmen who really are interested in the University's core values may elect to take the one worth more credits

instead.

- I think that a course of this nature would be quite effective. Of course, there are always going to be students you cannot reach (as is the case with any subject), but I feel that this course would cause many students to stop and think about the foundations of W&L- its values. Even if students were reluctant to the discussion of W&L values, a mandatory first-year course would provide a great transition from high school to college (comparable to a university 101 class). It's a non-threatening atmosphere that reinforces the reason many students came to this school and this course is definitely worth a shot.

- I think that there is already a large amount of discussion and reflection currently happening on campus regarding these values. Students are always faced with the questions, "Is this honorable? Is this respectful?" in their academic lives. However, I think students tend to ignore answering these questions in their social lives. I think a class based on this would be interesting, but not exactly necessary or effective.

-This should never need to be a course at W&L, unless it follows or will follow-up with essays that are graded to the vigor of a 101 writing course. I agree this should be emphasized, but I don't want to see a University 101-type course that seems to preach good character.

- I think that this would be a very good course. I think that it would be better if all students were to take it in the fall term, and not be split between the two semesters. I think this would produce solidarity and a good central experience (Sort of like in a school with a core curriculum).

- I certainly think that there are values in teaching this course and I actually do believe that getting the freshmen class to have a bond through these values would be quite effective in opening up such discussion.

- I think those students who would truly take part in a stimulating discussion and reflection are those who already understand the core values here at W&L. I feel that those who really need the course would not really appreciate and glean all they could.

-Now that I have been a student at W&L, I would be skeptical to see much change in the students already here; however, if first-years were required to take this class from day one, it may be different. I do believe the students have such a large influence on the social scene and culture on campus though, and that unless they "buy into" these values as well, the class will not be as impactful.

- I think that as students at W&L we are all reminded of respect, integrity, civility, and honor at random points during our studies. I think a course would effectively push these core values to the forefront of people's minds.

- I think it is a great idea and I agree with the fact that we say honor is a big part of our school but these isn't really discussion or sometimes application of it. I think a discussion-

based class would stimulate reflection.

- I think the course could be very effective. It would give students a comprehensive introduction to what living and studying under the concept of honor is really like. Personally, I don't think I had any trouble adjusting into life at W&L under those expectations, but it could be beneficial.

-I don't think it would be necessary or effective. As a student with labs and a heavy course load, any extra class would stress me out more than anything else. I think this is one of those situations where forced behavior and beliefs will incite rebellious feelings in annoyed students.

- I think students here sometimes forget the importance of W&L's core values in the rush of college life, and a course that centered specifically on these ideals would help remind students of respect, integrity, civility and honor.

- I believe that adding an academic aspect to socialization at W&L can be incredibly helpful in stimulating and encouraging otherwise overlooked discussions and reflections about ourselves, our community and our culture in general. I believe a course if taught correctly from both a theoretical and tangible (applied) framework could expose students to things they otherwise would have overlooked.

-I think it could be effective if done properly- the success though would hinge on the professor. They would have to be both relatable and able to let students lead discussions and create their own definitions. It cannot be seen as an attempt by either the faculty or the administration to shape these RICH values in the first years but a forum for them to think and create for themselves.

- I think it a very important class to have, especially making note of what has been lost and how we can all benefit by re-imposing those core values. Students talk about it in a shallow way, but to really hit these ideas at a greater depth would be beneficial for the student body. Especially if it is done by first-years and presented well.

- Very important! I think by having an open discussion on campus it would bring current issues to the forefront allowing them to be confronted head on. This is a great way to try to bring W&L students back to their core values and what sets W&L apart.

- I think this course would be very effective in teaching about W&L's core values. I do not know if such a course would cause ALL first-years to implement said values. The discussions and reflections would be beneficial to ALL W&L students, not just first-years.

- I think the course is very necessary, but it needs to be approached in a fashion that does not make it a burden in students' minds. In order to effect change students must be reached emotionally as well as intellectually.

- I think the course is very necessary and has the opportunity to be very effective. I would like to see more in the applied section about what you can do around campus, or maybe how to act in certain situations that would reflect what we expect of a W&L student.

- I think W&L could really use something like this for a lot of reasons, but on the surface- great idea. I think it would be very beneficial – especially freshmen year; to reflect on the topics, and I think the discussion style would be vital in making it more interactive and effective.

- 1) Necessary- no- an academic course cannot and should not be the basis of good behavior.
- 2) Effective – maybe- if the goal is to accomplish the agenda of the deans in terms of “civility,” but from a practical sense, students might perceive it as stupid.

- Very necessary and potentially very effective. W&L first-years are just thrown into the mix starting O-week and although they attend various required talks/assemblies/etc. during O-week. They need a more enduring way to learn and think about these topics. This course would offer a great foundation for first-years to root themselves in that which adheres to the values most important to our school.

- Unfortunately, anything mandatory is often resented. We would not want to create something that would cause a backlash. I think it is a nice idea and something that would set W&L apart. It would open up the issues for discussion and examination in a structured environment. I enjoyed taking the “Concept of Honor” course, but it was a self-selected course.

- I think need is strong, but I do think it would have tremendous value. I think it could be quite effective.

- I think it’s an incredible idea and opportunity. It’s broad, but with specifics, it could be a very strong asset for the curriculum and reputation at W&L. Of course, some students wouldn’t be happy with the mandate, but in addition to FDR and PE requirements, it only makes sense to add this at a place like W&L.

- I think it could be incredibly helpful if it was a safe space to discuss happenings. Many first-years are conflicted about the day/night social interaction and showed experience is helpful. I also feel that it would be very expensive in the sense of thinking about ideas and opinions from students from all over the country.

- I think that a course like RICH would help to promote a campus dialogue about abstractions like respect, integrity, etc. In my personal experience, I find that classes where discussion is brought into the contemporary moment promotes conversation beyond the classroom. For most people, it seems impossible to read an article, watch a movie, or discuss an idea that directly relates to one’s life and immediately forget about it afterwards.

2. According to student responses on several surveys, Washington & Lee University has a persistent problem with students who act disrespectfully toward each other. Would a faculty-led, mandatory course for all first-years be useful or effective in changing how students treat one another? Why or why not?

- This may be effective, but it is difficult to change this overnight, because it has become part of the culture, and part of many individual's personal values. I think upperclassmen students would also need to be involved in making a change, and committed to more respect, even if we have not taken the course, so first-years are encouraged to apply what they have learned. However, this course would definitely have a positive impact on those who take it.

- Personally, I feel that few will find this class as an opportunity to change some of the vices of their lives. Those who fully engage in class, and ultimately receive its full benefit, will usually not belong to a group with a consistent problem of disrespect.

- To an extent, it can lower the amount of students being disrespected. I doubt a 12-week course could completely end all negativity between people. There are differences in beliefs, backgrounds and many other social aspects that lead to disrespect. This class will certainly make students aware of the issue and they'll have a history of knowledge to be held accountable to.

- I don't think the class should be mandatory because as first-year students they are bombarded rather harshly in orientation week with the honor code during the mandatory Lee Chapel event. I think that those students that sign up for the optional course are going to become important and future leaders on campus. You can't change students' attitudes but the students that sign up for the class will surely help direct their peers in the right direction.

- I always think that when the White Book says, "Honor pervades every aspect of student life at W&L," I think the sentence needs to say 'ACADEMIC HONOR' instead of 'Honor.' I feel the course should help the students understand that honor is not a coat you put on when you enter the class and take off when you step out. (Especially considering the seemingly HV's in terms of drinking and sexual assault that often get overlooked)

- I can definitely see how it could be useful. For example, exposing narrow-minded students to the plights of minorities that aren't usually included in the W&L social circle could help break down barriers of ignorance, misunderstanding and maybe even racism. If nothing else, it could provide accountability within the class and improve the class interaction with one another.

- I personally haven't seen this problem so I feel unable to respond to this question.

- Many students who are disrespectful are going to be disrespectful, no matter what courses they take or how much they learn about honor. I do not think this course will change the attitudes and behaviors of everyone, but it might reach a few...

- I do not believe that having a class would change anything. As a first-year, it is easy to see that fellow first-years learn how to act in this unique college setting that is W&L by watching the upperclassmen.

-No. Exemplified by Alcohol Edu's reputation among students, University-mandated courses seem to be dismissed by those who need the information and regarded as a waste of time by those who do not need it. This is something that has come to my attention- especially the loss of much of the speaking tradition. As a first-year, we need a seminar environment, but should not receive a grade for learning manners.

-Yes and no. Our students are human beings and so there will always be issues. Yet at the same time, improvement is important. I think this course would be effective. It would bring these ideas to the front.

- I think it would be effective because students that enter W&L already know the history of these values in the school. Chances are that these even factored into their decision to come here. Because of this, I think students would be open to learning about the values W&L advertises.

- Honestly, it all depends on the way it is presented and how. If groups/classes are more than 10-15, I do not think it will work. For some reason, when freshmen are surrounded by large numbers of other freshmen there is a need to "be cool" and not take things seriously. Also, it needs to just be an addition FDR or something of that nature so it isn't seen as a type of punishment/more work because people disrespect each other.

-Here too, we are all adults at this point in a sense that we know right from wrong and how to respectfully treat one another so unless the entire student body is on board with this movement, another mandatory "debriefing" of what is expected will only go so far.

- I think that the reactions to the course in dealing with these issues would be mixed. Some students would definitely react positively to the readings and message of the course, while others would simply "write it off" as a mere requirement.

- It is hard to say. I think it would affect some people but others will probably continue to be disrespectful and have to learn from the consequences. I do think a class is the only way people will take something like this seriously.

- It would depend on how the course was run. If it was more discussion or student run I think it could help as long as it avoided being preaching. The tone would need to be positive, focused on moving forward as opposed to negative and threatening.

-No. Optional may be good. The intentions are clearly great. But another course could prevent students from taking other necessary courses or cause students to overload. Kids are going to act how they want regardless of a class telling them to do things differently.

- I think it certainly couldn't hurt. If presented appropriately and in an interesting way, the message might really hit home for some students. Even if only a handful are impacted, that would be that many fewer potential issues.

- I believe it would be effective as long as it was done in an academic guise that didn't make student feel they or "their way of life" is threatened. By exposing students in both academic and practical ways the ills of our culture can produce social change.

- See the previous comment, I'm not sure how much true social change a class can have unless it's given true free will and gains independent credibility.

- I do think it could be helpful if and only if the professor was genuinely passionate about teaching and encouraging discussion. It won't be a solution, but I think it could alleviate some issues or at least put them all on the table. Nothing can be solved if it is never brought up.

- By combining different students in a class where such heavy topics are handled, this course may help people to reconsider and shift their mindsets. Even a small step or push in the right direction would be a welcome one.

- I think it would be very useful to have such a course, as it would better explain W&L's values and policies. I think it depends on the individual to change how they treat others. However, making it mandatory for everyone could help, as they then could understand where others are coming from.

- It has a chance to change students' attitudes and actions if it is engaging, interesting and relevant. It first has to change attitudes then it must force students to become conscious of their actions (possible daily journal entries).

- I believe that if we engrain the core beliefs of the university into the students immediately upon entering the university, there would be a positive effect on the way the students interact. I am worried that if the class is simply focused on designing the components of RICH that it could be boring and students would not take much away from it. I believe it really needs to apply to them and the university.

- No, honestly. I think it would be very useful from a more theoretical view, however, no 1-hour class will really make a difference in actual behavior.

- No. Forced "seminars" like these would simply make students resent the class. Change comes from the ground up.

- YES. This is a real problem though few students here want to admit it. It has a lot to do with how small our school is, how interconnected we are, how closed off from the real world we are, how intense Greek/social life is, etc. This should be a very serious course that can

apply these much larger topics to life at W&L and can hopefully impact these first-years right off the bat in preparation for their next 4 years.

- I tend to think that honor is something that is possessed or not, not learned. Someone is going to cheat or not- and this was probably decided before coming to W&L. I think that honor at W&L is mostly focused on academic cheating and stealing and should be applied in the social arena as well. Getting that to happen is the difficult task.

- I don't know, but I think it would at least give them something to think about.

- Part of it is human nature that can't be fixed. Some people just aren't nice and they have the freedom to do so. Subjecting them to a course will probably not change them. Yet, it might change a few, or at least soften the most hardened. I will say, however, that I don't think W&L students are more disrespectful than students anywhere else.

- Maybe not faculty led because there are some faculty who appear to disapprove of student life (although there are many who are receptive). It may be better to have certain students run it. Peer counselors are willing to be available to moderate such discussion.

- Yes and no. I think some students will be affected by the course but these students would most likely be those who already have respect, integrity etc. ingrained into their moral code. A lot of students, however, would most likely view this course for what it is- a mandatory seminar. A course like this would only be effective if the majority of students were eager to participate and the professor was willing to really engage his or her students.

3. Do you have other ideas for addressing these issues that might be pursued in addition to, or in place of, this proposed course? Please explain.

- I think making sure these issues are addressed during the orientation week activities would be a positive supplement to this course. In addition, Greek organizations should be committed to making sure new members and current members are committed to the values emphasized in this course. RA's could also be required to incorporate these values in hall activities. This course would help students understand what it means to live by these values, instead of just abiding by the honor system.

- Maybe if every student is required to write a journal entry on a reading for the next class. Each student could email the professor the entry prior to class. The professor then could read them and choose one that he/she finds most stimulating, and show it to the class (while keeping the writer's anonymity) in order to begin class discussion.

- Just an idea: First-year students are often influenced by students that are further in their college careers. Is there an aspect of this course that shows individuality as opposed to acting in the same manner as others they see? Is this part of integrity?

- I think that in addition to this course, course organizers should look into "guerilla" advertising/signage to continuously remind upperclassmen and other W&L community members of the core values of W&L.

- The course should:

- 1) Incorporate a section that addresses 'acceptance' and not necessarily 'tolerance' coming from rich.
- 2) Introduce the HS in terms of a broader concept other than just academic honor.
- 3) Incorporate an international student perspective:
 - a) This will serve to address and help the domestic students- they often have a misconception that international students do not understand/respect the HS (from personal experience)
 - b) Also help the international students understand the HS better than the EC's clichéd explanations of it
 - c) Have the EC come over and have an open-session with the students

- Participation is key. Exams would be useless. Quizzes and reading checks may be useful. The innovation of this course would be in the opportunity to break barriers down and force students outside their comfort zones. Recommendation for the class is to add mandatory field trip/activities (obviously the University should covers all costs). It would be a worthwhile investment as long as the excursion is worthwhile:

- 1) Trip to Holocaust Museum in DC.
- 2) Trip to Virginia Tech to have a roundtable discussion with ethnic minorities on their campus
- 3) Trip to Project Horizon shelter - something with discussion.

4) A mosque etc.

- Left blank

- I feel that this course is a great idea. However, the course would be more beneficial if it included outside activities as well – speakers, volunteering, hands on...

- I think student led organizations would be the most effective way to teach students about these values.

- As stated above, this should be done outside of class- extended O-week hall talks, for instance. Something strikes me wrong about taking a class that should be unnecessary for W&L students.

- I think it might be good if the central tenet of the course were honor alone, because after all we do have an “honor” code and not a “civility” or other code. Within this honor course these other ideas of respect, integrity and civility could be discussed but the main theme would be honor. It would be the primary context.

- I think that it would be imperative that all students were reading the same book and had the same assignments, regardless of section.

- Something meaningful that can reach the whole campus on a personal level, but small groups at a time. The class is a start in the right direction.

- In my opinion, it all comes down to the parties and life outside the classroom. Everyone is proper and act mature and amiable during the class day, but it is the Greek life and party scenes that prompt such disrespectful behavior.

- I think that it is a difficult issue to address. This proposed course could help, but other options such as seminars during O-week could also contribute to solving the problem.

- I think when people hear that they have a mandatory class; they are not going to like it. Maybe if it was called a FY seminar and advertised as a way to get to know other students and to learn more about W&L it might get a better response.

-Left blank

- Offer an optional seminar. Just don't force it on students.

-Upperclassmen involvement might be better received, so as to avoid students perceiving that they're getting preached at.

- Adding a faculty/student panel series to discuss these issues may be another direction as

well.

- I would like to see student representation in this course, possibly an EC or SJC member who could act as a TA-like party and keep the course grounded to W&L.

- I feel the green dot program is going in the right direction in their approach. Students don't take it as a joke. I think with the class could use speakers (maybe W&L specific). Other than that, I feel the class would be a good way to incorporate all other things that would have had to be done in the co-curricular.

- Since this is for first-years students, the mandatory events they attend concerning alcohol, depression, sexual conduct could be tied into the course.

- In addition to this course, I think a follow-up course or projects, perhaps in the junior year could be beneficial as well, as it would force students to recall their own college and W&L experience. I might change the course availability to ONLY fall or winter, so that an entire class would be experiencing the course simultaneously.

- I think that measures need to be used to assess each class/section before the professor sets the syllabus completely. In order to improve something, a baseline must be established. I also think that the curricula should not be completely uniform. Students are more likely to retain information they see as relevant to their lives, interests and academic pursuits.

- I would discuss the tradition at W&L like the speak tradition. Tell students why it is a part of the school, how it started and why it still exists, and discuss how it needs to continue and then talk about how it is RICH. I would hope each class explains a tradition of the school (Maybe it is only half the semester, if these aren't enough traditions).

- I think it has to have a W&L/ Rockbridge Co./ VA Mountains Educational aspect of it. Make people visit one or two historical landmarks, float a river, go hiking, bike ride, take a walk, discover a new country road.

- A course that focuses on honor – study of Lee's life and how honor plays a part of W&L society.

- a) I think the course should only be in the fall, before formal recruitment. That way, it can impact the 80+% of our school who aims to go Greek equally.

- b) The idea of voluntary teacher agreement is a great one. I think they all need to be on the same page and the curriculum should be uniform.

- c) It should be graded or else the students won't take it seriously.

- Perhaps having things like the Honor Institute for students. If talks were given on these issues, students could be required to attend- though less commitment, there would also be less

accountability.

- EC President could address these issues more in the Lee Chapel Speech.
- Continue broad paragraph of civility and respect I added this year in Lee Chapel Honor Orientation Speech. But the impact of that small gesture is minimal. Perhaps just big posters in the Commons and academic buildings saying, in huge letters just “Honor” or “Respect” or “Civility.” Simple, maybe even dumb, but would be noticed and possibly effective.
- I believe that first-years need a place to discuss life at W&L. It is full of changes and often students feel like they are the only one to be going through an obstacle or emotion. An open discussion forum would be very helpful to first-year students and their mental health.
- It might be as simple as having a few mandatory discussion groups throughout the year that students would expect and anticipate- really folding these concepts into the general experience of W&L- which would demonstrate that honor extends beyond the classroom.

Appendix F – Dissent from the Proposal

Michael Anderson and Angela Smith

We respectfully dissent from the proposal of the Ad Hoc Committee for a Course on Respect and Responsibility that the faculty proceed toward implementation of Honor 100, a mandatory, one-credit, multidisciplinary course for all first-years. Before explaining the reasons for our dissent, however, we want to emphasize that we are fully committed to the underlying aim of this proposed course: namely, to provide students with opportunities to critically reflect upon Washington and Lee's core institutional values of respect, integrity, civility and honor. We are also convinced that the particular campus problems leading to the formation of this committee are genuine, serious, and widespread, and that we as a community need to address these significant problems in an explicit and meaningful way. Our dissent, then, is *only* to the proposal that a mandatory, one-credit credit course for all first-years is the best way of addressing these problems and of meeting this underlying aim. We would fully support a variety of non-course-based proposals for generating more critical reflection about our core values on this campus.

We have three general worries about this proposal. The first concerns the academic content of the proposed course, the second concerns possible unintended bad consequences of such a course, and the third concerns the resources required for the implementation of such a course. We briefly address each of these worries, in turn.

Honor 100 is designed to be a multidisciplinary, discussion-format seminar that provides opportunities for students to engage in critical reflection on and discussion of Washington and Lee's core institutional values. This course is supposed to have a theory component, in which there is rigorous interdisciplinary consideration of respect, integrity, civility, and honor, an applied component, involving current event cases relevant to these values, and a policy component, in which students are educated about Washington and Lee policies regarding student conduct.

Our first concern is that this is simply too much to expect to cover in a one-credit course. This university has long offered a three-credit course devoted solely to the theoretical investigation of the concept of honor; to think that a one-credit course could provide an adequate theoretical treatment of this value as well as three other important values, while also engaging students in discussions about current events and campus policies, is simply not credible. The most plausible way of addressing our first concern would be to minimize or drop the theoretical component altogether. Given the limited amount of time students would have in (and devote to) this class, it would be natural to place emphasis on the "applied" and W&L-specific aspects of the course. And this is, in fact, what the students in our focus groups consistently said they would like to see. We heard repeatedly that the course should not be too "abstract," "theoretical," or "dry," and that we need to make sure that whatever we cover in the course is "directly relevant" to their daily lives. In fact, what students appear to want is simply a safe place in which they can talk openly and honestly about some of the social issues they face here on this campus. The problem we see with this response to the concern about over-breadth, however, is that once this course has been stripped of its theoretical content, its academic pretensions become far less clear. We simply do not see how a one-credit class can deliver academic content in addition to fostering the kind of

conversation about campus issues that our students evidently crave. And without the academic content it is not an activity that we believe should receive academic credit. We would favor, instead, a wide range of high-profile, university-sponsored events, forums, and workshops on our core institutional values in which the entire campus community is invited to participate. We return to this recommendation at the end of our comments.

Our second concern is that this course might in fact have unintended bad consequences. We have seen a wonderful grassroots movement emerging on campus over the last few years of students who are concerned and passionate about campus climate issues. Groups like END IT, SPEAK, and One in Four, and initiatives like Green Dot, have made a huge impact in drawing attention to the problems of sexual assault and power-based violence on this campus. Other groups are committed to highlighting issues of diversity and to sponsoring a wide range of consciousness-raising activities that are prompting critical reflection and discussion of what it means to be a part of a community of respect and trust. While it is natural to think that a required academic course could only add to this momentum, we fear that such a course could, in fact, have the opposite effect. (Note that in this we depart from the official view of END IT, which strongly supports the creation of such a class.) Students who might otherwise have been receptive to messages of respect and civility coming from their fellow students may well resent those same messages if they feel they are being “imposed” upon them from the top down. And we worry that such a course could well become a target of ridicule and disdain, which would undermine its very aim of fostering thoughtful and critical discussion about our core values. Unlike our more optimistic fellow committee members, then, who believe that the worst case scenario is that this course might not lead to further positive changes in the campus culture, we are genuinely concerned that such a course could actually hamper or reverse the tentative steps toward positive change that we are already beginning to see.

Our third and final concern is the cost of the proposed class. The committee’s recommendation would require 16 sections to be offered, a very high cost in faculty time and resource space. There are no underemployed faculty members on our campus. Although there are a significant number of faculty members who have volunteered their time to teach this class, it is difficult to imagine that department chairs are equally willing to free up faculty from their normal teaching load. If the course requires the addition of new faculty then the cost rises substantially. Simply finding space to offer the sections is a real problem; the space crunch is such that the report considers night classes as one option to allow a sufficient number of sections to be offered. The high cost of the course contrasts with its small claim on student time. The committee’s recommendation would increase student academic workloads by 1 credit, a change of less than 1 percent over the current 113 credits required for graduation.

For the reasons noted above we cannot support the committee’s recommendation for a mandatory one-credit class on Honor. We do, however, urge that the President make it an institutional priority to sponsor and support initiatives that empower students to undertake the conversations that they so clearly crave. The campus problems that led to the formation of our committee are real, and they need sustained thoughtful attention if we are to see them diminished. The grass-roots student organizations already addressing our campus climate issues would benefit, in our view, from a series of high-profile community-wide events aimed at

examining our core values.