Final Report

of the

University of Michigan

Presidential Task Force on Ethics in Public Life

June 2005

Table of Contents

Charge to the Presidential Task Force on Ethics in Public Life

Task Force Membership

I. Executive Summary

II. Introduction
- A. The Aims of Education
- B. Re-Balancing the Mission of Universities

III. A Presidential Initiative on Ethics in Public Life

IV. A Useful Distinction: Acting Ethically and Addressing Ethical Issues
- A. Acting Ethically: An Institutional Commitment
- B. Addressing Ethical Issues

V. Existing Programs and Activities at the University of Michigan Related to Ethics in Public Life
- A. Teaching and Learning About Ethics
- B. Acting Ethically
- C. Research That Addresses Ethical Issues
- D. Ethical Engagement
- E. Summary

VI. Ethics-Related Activities on Other Campuses
- A. Mission
- B. Scope and Audience
- C. Curricular Activities
- D. Research Activities
- E. Co-Curricular Activities
- F. Outreach Activities
- G. Organizational Structure
- H. Long-Range Planning and Funding
- I. Conclusion

VII. Campus Needs and Opportunities at the University of Michigan
- A. Student Needs
- B. Faculty and Staff Needs
- C. Institutional Concerns
- D. Community/State Needs
- E. Priorities

VIII. Recommendations of the Task Force
    A. Undergraduate Education
    B. Research on Ethics in Public Life
    C. Public Discourse and Research
    D. Academic Integrity in Learning and Research
    E. Graduate and Professional Education

IX. Conclusion

Charge to the Task Force
September 2004

In recent years, Americans have witnessed a significant number of individual ethical lapses and organizational and systemic failures in key institutions of American life. These include highly visible instances of corporate malfeasance, the abuse of military prisoners in Iraq, sexual abuse by priests and woefully inadequate responses by the church hierarchy, unethical and corrupt acts by government officials, an apparent increase in cheating by students and fabrication of scientific evidence by researchers, violations of journalistic integrity, and violations of the standards of fair play in athletics. We have seen the erosion of accepted standards of conduct or their enforcement, undermining individual responsibility and civic values, harming innumerable individuals and generating a loss of public trust in the institutions of our society. In other areas, dramatically changing circumstances or technological advances have made existing norms seem inapplicable or inadequate for ethical guidance, leaving institutions and leaders searching for guideposts regarding complex emerging issues such as individual rights in the context of new concerns about national security, the implications of discoveries in the life sciences, the challenges to privacy that attend the expansion of information technology, and software, music and video piracy.

Concerns about ethics in public life frequently arise concerning behavior within the professions, many of which are represented among the University's professional schools. Others concern actions within government and illustrate the perpetual challenges of governing and organizing a democratic society. The University of Michigan is superbly positioned to contribute — theoretically, empirically, and practically — to public understanding, discourse and action on emergent crises of ethical behavior in the key institutions of our society. The University of Michigan Department of Philosophy has long been known for its contributions to scholarship and teaching concerning ethics. The University's community of professional schools has a breadth and excellence that is unmatched in the United States. Our social science departments, which rank among the nation's best, can provide vital insights into the individual and organizational dimensions of ethics in public life.

The University of Michigan wants to explore the synergies of education and scholarship on the issue of ethics in public life, contributing to and in some cases structuring a broader public discourse on these issues.

The committee is charged with developing recommendations for action by the president and provost as well as the deans and faculty. We ask you to consider the following, among other possible foci:

- What are Michigan's key areas of strength regarding its ability to understand and provide reflective leadership on the ethical crises, conundrums, and breakdowns in the key institutions of our own society? In what areas do we currently make, or

have the potential to make, unique contributions to understanding and practice? Are there emergent areas of concern in which we can have a significant impact?

- Building on this reading of UM's current strengths and potential, what bold steps should we take to foster rigorous scholarship on ethical issues in the public domain? How can an initiative in ethics in public life best incorporate both basic and applied scholarship, research and public service? Are there ways in which the University's professional schools can work separately and together to strengthen their students' understanding and commitment to ethics in professional life? Should we be more active on these issues in continuing education in the professions? What are ways in which we can expose undergraduates, many of whom will later seek professional training here and elsewhere, to the issues that confront them as citizens and will soon confront them as professionals? And what steps should we take to engage elected officials, business leaders, policy-makers, professional associations, heads of social and cultural institutions, and the public in discourse on these important issues?
- What organizational mechanisms and structures for advancing work on these issues should be created or developed — e.g., a major center, consortium, seed funding, coordinated faculty hiring, etc.?
- In answering these questions and developing recommendations, we ask that the committee:
  - Examine comparable or exemplary efforts, both inside and outside of academe.
  - Seek broad campus input.
  - Periodically report on its progress to the Provost and the President.
  - Submit its report and recommendations by March 15, 2005.

Presidential Task Force on Ethics in Public Life
Member List

John Chamberlin, Co-chair
Professor of Public Policy, Gerald R Ford School of Public Policy
Professor of Political Science, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Marvin Krislov, Co-chair
Vice President and General Counsel
Adjunct Professor, Law School. Political Science

Stanley Berent
Professor of Psychology, Psychiatry and Professor of Psychology,
Department of Neurology, Medical School
Professor of Psychology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts,

Bunyan Bryant
Professor, Urban Planning, School of Natural Resources

Anthony Collings
Lecturer III in Communication Studies, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Gary D. Fenstermacher
Professor, School of Education

Timothy Fort
Associate Professor of Business Law, School of Business Administration

Thomas Fricke
Senior Research Scientist, Survey Research Center
Senior Research Scientist, Population Studies, Institute for Social Research,
Professor of Anthropology, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Allan Gibbard
Richard B Brandt Distinguished University Professor of Philosophy
Professor of Philosophy, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts

Susan Goold
Associate Professor, Internal Medicine, Medical School

Siri Jayaratne
Associate Dean of Faculty and Academic Affairs
Professor of Social Work, School of Social Work

Sharon Kardia
Associate Professor of Epidemiology, School of Public Health

Ann Lin
Associate Professor of Political Science, College of Literature, Science, and the Arts
Associate Professor of Public Policy, Gerald R Ford School of Public Policy

William Martin
Donald R Shepherd Director of Intercollegiate Athletics

Jason Mironov
President, Michigan Student Assembly
Student, Undergraduate Business Administration

Marianne Ryan
Doctoral Student, School of Information

Jason Weinstein
Law Student

Wendy Lockwood Banka
Graduate Student, Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy
staff to committee

Executive Summary

In the 19th century, religious piety and moral character were central to the agendas of most American universities. By the turn of the 21st century, this was no longer true, particularly at public universities. As the disciplines developed and became the chief organizing device for universities, knowledge was no longer seen as rooted in moral theology, and universities consciously and deliberately reduced the attention paid to piety as an institutional goal. Decreased attention to moral character and its relationship to civic responsibility came about in a less deliberate fashion as disciplines developed, as for a variety of reasons individual disciplines did not feel particular responsibility for attending to the development of the moral discernment of students. As a result, over time these matters lost their place as an important goal of education, particularly at the undergraduate level. The specialized languages and research agendas that accompanied the evolution of disciplines also increased the distance between disciplinary discourse and public discourse about matters important to public life.

At the same time as these forces were playing out, interest in professional ethics was on the rise, driven by public concerns and a growing sense that professions should be more accountable to those they serve. As a result, professional schools began to pay more attention to professional ethics, to include it in their curricula, and to become engaged in discourse within the profession and with the public about the behavior of professionals.

The experience at the University of Michigan reflects these national trends and concerns that matters of ethics in public life receive too little attention were the impetus to the appointment of the Presidential Task Force on Ethics in Public Life. The task force spent the academic year discussing our charge with a broad array of members of the University community, as well as with some members of the broader community. We examined how other universities engage these issues. Our deliberations on these matters led us to conclude that the University should place matters of ethics in public life higher on its agendas for teaching, research, and service to the public.

We found many individuals, programs, and activities on campus that already engage these issues in serious and continuing ways. But we also found many undergraduate students eager to be more engaged with these issues, particularly in the classroom. We also found a broad desire among faculty, staff, and communities beyond campus for the University to be more active in this arena and to pay increased attention to important public issues that transcend disciplinary and professional boundaries.

Our discussions convinced us that the University has strong foundations on which to build new efforts in this area. We have a distinguished philosophy department, outstanding social science departments and professional schools, and a culture of interdisciplinarity that can foster productive collaborations across these units.

In response to our charge, we recommend that the University undertake an Initiative on Ethics in Public Life that will stimulate, support and coordinate activities throughout the

University that promote research, teaching and public discourse about ethics in public life. To be successful, such an initiative will require both resources and leadership. For this reason, we recommend that the Initiative report to the President or the Provost, and that they provide leadership in encouraging all schools and colleges to become more engaged with these issues and to work together to implement the recommendations in our report.

We recommend that the University initiate a national search to find a director for the Initiative, someone who can provide vision and leadership as it develops. In the meantime, an interim director and a campus-wide steering committee should provide leadership to get the Initiative underway. We have identified three primary priorities for the Initiative in its first several years--undergraduate education, research on ethics in public life, and public discourse and outreach—and have suggested specific steps that can be taken to make progress on each of these priorities. We emphasize that in each of these areas, we have existing strengths on campus on which we can build. It is important that the Initiative begin by taking advantage of these strengths and by enlisting units across campus to integrate concern for ethics in public life into their existing teaching, research, and public service activities.

Introduction

Ethics in Public Life: The Role of the University

The Aims of Education

Comenius, the seventeenth century Moravian scholar called the "father of modern education," remarked that education has three aims:

> Erudition which aims at man's reason, moral education which aims at man's character and independence, and piety which aims at his understanding of God."[1]

These same aims later shaped the development of universities in the United States. For instance, in words that are now emblazoned on the façade of Angell Hall here at the University of Michigan, the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 declared:

> Religion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged.

In the subsequent century and a half, however, universities gradually diminished the attention given to piety. This they did largely with forethought. For example, as society became more diverse in cultural and religious backgrounds, consensus on defining morality, especially in the context of one or even a few religious viewpoints likely became more difficult to achieve. Moral education, on the other hand, lost its privileged status in ways that were hardly noticed until it was almost gone. Enlightenment notions of reason and the growth of scientific method, the increasing emphasis on the "science" in social science, and the maturing of academic disciplines ever so slowly "dissolved" the moral curriculum, particularly at the undergraduate level, until it was barely visible in most academic programs. [2]

Re-Balancing the Mission of Universities

Now the pendulum is swinging back, with more and more institutions of higher education acknowledging the marginalization of moral and civic education and discussing what might be done to restore it.[3] As Ernest Boyer noted in his landmark study of undergraduate education:

---

[1] Ulrich, Robert. History of Educational Thought, American Book Company (NY) 1945.
[2] For a history of these developments in American higher education, see: Rueben, Julie, The Making of the Modern University, The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
[3] Colby, Anne, Erlich, Thomas, Beaumont, Elizabeth, Stephens Jason Stephens. Educating Citizens: Preparing America's Undergraduates for Lives of Moral and Civic Responsibility. Jossey-Bass, 2003

> Throughout our study we were impressed that what today's college is teaching most successfully is competence—competence in meeting schedules, in gathering information, in responding well on tests, in mastering the details of a special field. But technical skill, of whatever kinds, leaves open essential questions: Education for what purpose? Competence to what end? At a time in life when values should be shaped and personal priorities sharply probed, what a tragedy it would be if the most deeply felt issues, the most haunting questions, the most creative moments were pushed to the fringes of our institutional life. What a monumental mistake it would be if students, during the undergraduate years, remained trapped within the organizational grooves and narrow routines to which the academic world sometimes seems excessively devoted.[4]

In the two decades since Boyer's study, the grooves and routines of academia have become even more pronounced, as faculty reward structures and the quest of research funding continue to deflect faculty (and therefore students) away from grappling with the "essential questions" listed by Boyer. At the University of Michigan, as at many other leading universities, these essential questions play a relatively small role in the formal curriculum experienced by the vast majority of our undergraduates. They also play only a small role in the public discourse of the University.

At the same time that attention to moral and civic responsibilities has moved to the periphery of the educational experiences of most undergraduates, ethics has become increasingly important in professional schools, as scandals and demands for accountability required these schools to give increased attention to professional ethics. The priority assigned to professional ethics has been most visible in the schools in the medical field, where professional ethics has undergone significant changes in the last 30 years, but nearly every professional program on campus pays attention to these issues in their formal and/or informal curricula. However, the list of recent institutional failures and ethical lapses by business executives, government and military officials, journalists and clergy makes it clear that much important work remains to be done. Education that stresses inquiry into ethical questions can, in the course of time, work to improve the ethical climate of powerful institutions in our society - or so we must hope.

A Presidential Initiative on Ethics in Public Life

We believe that the University of Michigan should embrace the challenge of restoring the consideration of ethics in public life to a central place on the University's educational and research agendas. We have a proud tradition of commitment to ethics in public life that dates to the founding of the University and includes the presidency of Robert B. Angell, who laid the foundation for the modern University of Michigan, the path breaking work of John Dewey and such early 20th-century exponents of social reform as Henry Carter Adams, Charles Horton Cooley and Robert C. Angell, and a Department of Philosophy

[4] Boyer, Ernest L. College: The Undergraduate Experience in America. New York: HarperCollins, 1987. At page 283.

that has been a world leader in research on ethics for decades. Over the last half century we have established ourselves as home to some of the world's leading social science departments and a broad array of outstanding professional schools. We have the foundations to be a leader in teaching, research and discourse about ethics in public life.

But given the changes in universities during the last half century, we face equally strong challenges—the institutional and social forces that have moved concern with ethics in public life away from the center of universities' agendas. Because of the magnitude of these challenges, we strongly believe that success in this endeavor can be achieved only with leadership from the President, the Provost, and the Deans. It will take a sustained commitment by these leaders to bring about a change in the culture of the University and to allocate the resources that will be required to make the initiative a success.

Restoring concern for ethics in public life to a central place in our educational and research programs is not just a matter of resources. There is significant intellectual work involved. The sectarian religious consensus that once permitted the university to promote strong ethical norms and precepts is gone. In its place has evolved a structure which gives little or no formal attention in degree requirements or the curriculum to matters of moral and civic responsibility, channels attention to matters of ethics in public life to the discretionary, extra-curricular life of the campus, and engages in various "soft" initiatives that do not disturb whatever peace can be achieved across the pluralistic, often oppositional, academic communities of interest that characterize contemporary universities. A university that settles for so modest a range of commitments can hardly be said to be seriously engaged with the moral and civic dimensions of higher education. A more ambitious set of options requires breaking new ground, seeking ways to undertake a robust moral and civic mission without running afoul of the diversity of values that characterizes the modern university in a democratic polity.

In light of the significance of the intellectual and organizational challenges that face us, we recommend that President Coleman establish a Presidential Initiative on Ethics in Public Life, directed from her office or the Provost's office, and enlisting the support and participation of all the academic units of the University. We believe that in the short run these challenge can be met successfully only by a centrally-driven initiative that demonstrates to the University community the high priority assigned to placing ethics in public life at the center of our educational and research programs.

A Useful Distinction: Acting Ethically and Addressing Ethical Issues

Before discussing the University's existing activities, strengths and unmet needs in areas related to ethics in public life, we call attention to a distinction that applies usefully throughout our discussion, the distinction between ethical conduct on the part of the University and its individual members, on the one hand, and explicit consideration of ethical topics and issues in teaching, research and service, on the other hand. The distinction here is between *acting ethically* and *addressing ethical issues*. The first pertains to the ethical conduct of an institution and its members, acting within institutional roles. The second pertains to teaching ethics, to discourse about moral and

social problems and individual and institutional responses to them, and to research on these issues. The two, of course, are closely linked. A central aim of teaching, research, and the discussion of ethics is to enhance the moral awareness and discernment that acting ethically demands. Ethical inquiry is idle unless it can serve to guide conduct, and conduct threatens to be ethically blind if it is not guided by critical ethical inquiry.

The work of medical school faculty illustrates this distinction. Faculty members act ethically in the care given to their patients, as when they communicate carefully with patients as part of the informed consent process and when they model for medical students and residents the ethical treatment of patients. These same faculty members address ethical issues when they explicitly involve their students in exploring the ethical ramifications of various treatments, as well as when they engage in research that, for example, explores the type and level of information provided in the course of meeting requirements for informed consent.

The distinction between acting ethically and addressing ethical issues goes to the role of a university in the following way. On the one hand, like any institution, a university has moral duties and obligations acting as an institution. In such matters as formulating strategies for investing its endowment, regulating its athletic programs, and relating to the community in which it resides, the university reveals its capacity for and attention to ethical action. Teaching and research, when properly conducted, are prime instances of "acting ethically" as we mean the phrase—whether or not those who conduct these activities conceive them in explicitly ethical terms.

On the other hand, a university is an institution of a special kind, defined by its missions of teaching, research, and the public dissemination of learning. In the course of any of these activities, members of a university may well engage in ethical inquiry explicitly. All human beings confront deep and puzzling questions about how we shall conduct ourselves in the face of moral complexity and dilemma. In pursuit of these questions, university scholars consider not only issues of right or virtuous action, but evidence and theories that favor or oppose alternative possibilities courses of action. Teachers strive to cultivate in their students ways of approaching ethical questions that are informed, reflective, and critical. They work to foster their students' abilities to recognize ethical issues when they arise, to bring a suitably rich array of relevant considerations to bear on the questions, and reason to conclusions that are well thought out. Researchers think about what empirical findings are relevant to important societal problems, and how competing ethical considerations weigh on difficult or controversial questions of public life. These are the kinds of things we mean by "addressing ethical issues." Through such intellectual efforts on the part of its teachers and researchers, a university explicitly fosters ethical inquiry. Teachers, researchers, and other staff also may address ethical issues explicitly in the course of deciding how to act in their institutional roles, attending, for example, to the ethical dimensions of various curricula, and thinking about what research it is important to conduct. A university's responsibility here is to foster free and profound inquiry into issues of importance, advancing the development and diffusion of knowledge.

Acting Ethically: An Institutional Commitment

A university must act ethically if it is to address ethical questions in its teaching and research with any credibility. In the everyday activities and dealings of its senior leadership, it must exemplify high ethical standards in order to succeed in raising the priority that faculty, staff and students assign both to acting ethically and to addressing ethical questions. Only by "walking the walk" in modeling ethical and just behavior can the University's senior leadership convey to the students, faculty, and public that this is more than just another project, but a high priority integral to the University's missions.

A university as an institution may, indeed must, on occasion, take positions on questions of how it is to ethically engage the pursuit of its own mission. The University of Michigan's recent strong, public defense of affirmative action policies in undergraduate and law school admissions is a case in point. Other examples include the University's divestment of tobacco-related investments and its adoption of labor standards and a human rights code for its licensees and vendors (the latter, the first of its kind in the nation).

Acting ethically in an institutional sense goes beyond these positive examples, extending also to admission of wrongdoing and expression of genuine remorse. The recent case of improper loans and payments to some basketball players by a former booster exemplifies this point. Senior University officials launched a new investigation, acknowledged responsibility, and took the lead in placing a ban on post-season play, forfeiting championship status for the team, and relinquishing revenue.

When a university does take an institutional position, individual members of the university must be free to agree or dissent. They are free in their teaching to treat the issues as they judge best. In their research, they are free to develop research findings at odds with the conclusions on which the university is acting as an institution. They are free to engage in public questioning of those conclusions and advocacy to the contrary. This set of rights and privileges serves a moral purpose in protecting democratic liberties. The University of Michigan is a public institution in a free society, and it plays a special role in promoting free inquiry. Not all is known, and what we think we know may be open to question. Even when a conclusion is established beyond reasonable doubt, a university protects the right of its members to challenge that conclusion.

It is also important to note that on many, perhaps most public issues, a university will not have an institutional interest above and beyond its interest as a member of society. As one person we interviewed noted, when the University itself takes a stand on ethical issues, it may appear to be rejecting the pluralist notion that there are multiple ethical perspectives. This point was echoed in one of the groups at our public forum, which asserted that the fundamental goal of the University should be to encourage critical thinking about ethical issues, including an appreciation for ethical ambiguity.

In general, a university pursues its missions not by taking institutional positions on issues of public concern, but by fostering the abilities of its members and the public at large to

inquire into these issues, to discuss and debate them, and to come to their own conclusions. This lies at the heart of the academic freedom accorded faculty, students, and all who participate in the life of a university. Teaching is not indoctrination, and research is not directed to preordained conclusions. This commitment to unfettered inquiry does not mean that there are no right or wrong answers to controversial questions; it does mean that a university fosters free inquiry into whether there are right answers, and if so, what those answers are. On some ethical issues there is widespread agreement in our society, but other questions are deeply contentious. A university must pursue its special mission with due heed to our lack of agreement on significant ethical issues.

Addressing Ethical Issues

Whether or not a university as an institution, as well as its individual members, acts ethically tells us only a little about the degree of attention it devotes to ethical issues. That is, while a university and its members may be ethically above reproach, they may still give little regard to developing this capacity in others or to exploring the application of ethics in other domains. The question here is the degree to which ethical considerations are explicit matters of concern and discussion in the teaching, research and service missions of the university. On all of these dimensions, the changes in universities that have moved attention to issues of moral and civic responsibilities to the margins of the community have affected the University of Michigan as well. As a result the University is currently under-committed and under-invested in people, curriculum and programs necessary to meet high aspirations on these dimensions of ethics in public life.

Much of the rest of this report deals with ways the University can foster the ability of its members to address ethical issues. As we have already urged, the University does not for the most part take ethical positions of its own, as an institution. Rather, as with any intellectual question, it lets its members come to their own conclusions, as experts, as students, and as citizens and inquirers at large. It leaves its members free to support their convictions by evidence and reasoning. The hope is that individuals' conclusions will be carefully and critically thought out, guided by evidence and good reasoning. The University, though, does not enforce such standards. Rather, it leaves others free to challenge conclusions and criticize the reasoning behind them. Still, the University can do much to foster ethical inquiry of high quality. It can offer courses on ethics and on subjects that give rise to ethical questions. It can support research into questions that have ethical implications. It can provide fora for debate and discussion on questions of ethical significance. It can encourage dialogue from various perspectives, including a full range of cultural, religious, professional and philosophical perspectives.

Existing Programs and Activities at the University of Michigan Related to Ethics in Public Life

A survey of the programs and activities of the University's schools and colleges, administrative and student service units, and campus organizations reveals a broad range of existing efforts that provide members of the University of Michigan community with

opportunities to engage in learning, research and discussion of issues concerning ethics in public life. We provide below an incomplete but representative survey of these efforts.

In order to become aware of the activities already in place at Michigan and to assess the unmet needs of the campus community, members of the task force met individually with representatives of all schools and colleges in Ann Arbor, as well as other selected University units. We held an open community forum attended by approximately 75 students, faculty, staff and Ann Arbor community members. We spoke with SACUA, the Michigan Student Assembly, and a group of University staff. We hosted meetings with Ann Arbor civic and business leaders, southeastern Michigan corporate leaders, and Ann Arbor interfaith and social service organization leaders. The Life Sciences and Society Program coordinated an internet survey of students. Individually and collectively, we solicited opinions and feedback from hundreds of interested persons.

Teaching and Learning about Ethics

Undergraduate Education in the Liberal Arts

With the exception of students who pursue a concentration in philosophy, undergraduate liberal arts students at Michigan are not required to take any courses that focus on moral inquiry.

The Department of Philosophy offers an extensive set of courses on ethics. Each term a number of sections of Introduction to Philosophy are devoted to topics that fit the "ethics in public life" rubric. For students interested in studying ethics in depth, the Department offers PHIL 361: Ethics and a variety of advanced courses. It also offers each year several large-enrollment courses in applied ethics: PHIL 355: Contemporary Moral Problems, PHIL 356: Issues in Bioethics and PHIL 359: Law and Philosophy. These courses are taught by regular faculty and are fully enrolled nearly every term, a sign that demand for such courses exceeds the supply. The offerings in Philosophy provide a very solid foundation for coursework in ethics for undergraduate students at the University.

The Residential College in LS&A is noteworthy for offering courses that address ethics in public life, particularly courses that combine classroom discussion with community engagement.

The Life Sciences and Society Program offers a wide range of educational resources focused on the ethical, legal, and social issues (ELSI) that arise in the application of the life sciences. They have developed a web-based curriculum guide of courses that deal with ELSI issues at the intersection of the life sciences and society in business, engineering, public health, medicine, and religion. They are also sponsoring the development of web-based educational modules focusing on ethical issues in life science technologies and applications to allow faculty from across campus to more easily integrate these critical concepts into existing courses. A guest lecturer network is also being formed to provide a mechanism to facilitate this integration.

Other course offerings in ethics for liberal arts undergraduates are more scattered. The array of courses within the rest of LS&A that engage ethics in some fashion is impressive although these aspects are rarely featured in course titles or descriptions, so students searching for such courses must usually dig below departmental sub-concentrations and course titles to find them. In this regard, it is interesting to compare the information available to LS&A undergraduates about ethics courses with that available to students at Duke, which several years ago instituted a degree requirement that students take two "ethical inquiry" (or EI) courses. Although the set of courses at Duke that are designated EI criteria is quite extensive, applying the same criteria to existing undergraduate courses at the University of Michigan would likely result in an even larger number of courses qualifying for EI designation. In many, if not most, of these courses, however, exposure to ethical inquiry is not explicitly featured in the catalog description of the course or in the syllabus. This means that students inclined to seek out courses that address ethics receive little guidance from the formal structure of the LS&A curriculum. One way in which we can address the student interest in ethics-related courses is to make them easier to identify.

Community Engagement

A common theme at universities that have sought to strengthen the moral and civic component of undergraduate education is student engagement with individuals within the university and in the broader community who come from different backgrounds and cultures and who may have different perspectives on morality.

The University's commitment to campus diversity is a very significant asset in this regard. Our admissions policies and our efforts to infuse concern for diversity in all aspects of campus life play a key part in encouraging and enabling students to become familiar with the range of cultural and moral beliefs that characterize our society. The University has also been a leader in engaging students in activities that promote the development of personal commitments to moral and civic responsibility. The Program on Intergroup Relations (and its associated courses, SOC 122 and PSYC 122) is a particularly noteworthy example of a program that has built outstanding courses and activities on the foundation of the University's commitment to diversity. The new Center for Institutional Diversity being established at the University of Michigan will provide an important locus for future efforts to connect diversity with ethics in public life.

The University of Michigan also has genuine strengths when it comes to student engagement with communities beyond the campus. The Princeton Review recently named the Ann Arbor campus as one of the "81 great schools with outstanding community involvement".[5] The Ginsberg Center for Community Service and Learning is home to a wide variety of programs that facilitate student engagement with communities outside the University. Among its most prominent efforts is SOC 389: Project Community. This course enrolls several hundreds of students who combine community service with an academic component that prepares them for their work in the community

[5] Staff of Campus Compact and the Princeton Review. Colleges With A Conscience, 81 Great Schools With Outstanding Community Involvement, p. 172. The Princeton Review, NY, 2005.

and offers them opportunities to reflect on their experiences. The Ginsberg Center is also home to the Detroit Initiative, the Michigan Community Service Corps, Americorps, America Reads, and SERVE.

In addition to the Ginsberg Center, several other University programs coordinate courses and co-curricular activities that provide significant opportunities for engagement with ethical and civic issues. These include the Residential College, the Environmental Justice Program in SNRE, the Center for the Ethnography of Everyday Life, the Arts of Citizenship Program, Imagining America, and the Program in Religious Studies.

Professional Education

In almost all of the University's professional schools, students encounter professional ethics in the formal and informal curricula, in programs and centers within schools, and in clinical settings.

There is no question that the professional schools and colleges in the medical/health areas lead the way in professional ethics. In Dentistry, Medicine, Nursing and Pharmacy, ethics occupies a prominent role in the curriculum and in clinical training. Codes of ethics in these fields are well developed and are taken very seriously by professional associations, to which many graduates belong. Student engagement in patient-based clinical training, usually on campus and directed by faculty, makes these programs particularly effective in exposing students not only to the formal structures of professional ethics, but to professional ethics as it is put into practice.

There are also many efforts underway in the School of Public Health. It recently formed a Center for Public Health Law and Ethics and has a CDC funded Center for Genomics and Public Health that promotes professional education on public health ethics (e.g. HMP 623: Topics in Public Health Ethics). The Life Sciences and Society Program has funded course development in Public Health Ethics and the conversion of a Health, Management, and policy course (HMP 518: Ethical, Legal, and Social Implications of Genomics) into a distance learning course. Currently, these three programs are working together to foster graduate educational and research opportunities.

Some of the other professional schools (Law, Public Policy) require courses that specifically address professional ethics or require that professional ethics be addressed in each course (social work). In some schools (Engineering, Urban Planning) ethical issues are addressed within one or more core courses; in others (Business, Education, Information, SNRE), ethics courses are offered but not required. The attention paid to professional ethics in these schools is for the most part invisible to undergraduates outside of the professional schools, many of whom will go on to careers in the professions and who would benefit from earlier engagement with these issues.

There is at present relatively little activity concerning professional ethics that crosses the boundaries of the professional schools (or of the professions, for that matter). They differ in the extent to which a code of ethics plays a central role in the profession. In the health

professions, social work, and law, codes of ethics are very important, and this is reflected in the attention paid to ethics in the curriculum. In others, such as business and public policy, codes of ethics have much less impact. These variations across the professions provide opportunities for cross-school inquiry and discourse that are possible only at a university like Michigan.

Center for Research on Learning and Teaching (CRLT)

In addition to units that offer courses, the Center for Research on Learning and Teaching is an extremely important asset when it comes to the teaching mission of the University. It works with academic units, faculty and GSIs on a wide range of teaching issues. As an initiative on ethics in public life moves forward, CRLT can play a key role in helping faculty and GSIs develop ways to integrate ethics into existing courses and in promoting cross-unit collaboration on the development of new courses and teaching methods.

Acting Ethically

Office of the Vice President for Research

The Office for the Vice President for Research (OVPR) is engaged in a variety of activities that focus on acting ethically in research. As regulations concerning research ethics have become increasingly formalized, the strategy within OVPR has become one of proactive education. The overall goal is to avoid the necessity of sanctions. A major effort in this direction was the implementation of a computer-based education and certification to program, the Program for Education and Evaluation in Responsible Research and Scholarship (PEERRS). PEERRS modules currently available include:

- Foundations of Responsible Research Conduct
- Human Subjects Research
- Animal Research
- Conflict of Interest
- Research Administration

OVPR is also responsible for conducting investigations of all claims regarding research misconduct, which have increased in recent years. In recent years OVPR has developed thorough investigative procedures and has increased the transparency of investigative outcomes.

Conflict of Interest and Institutional Review Boards

The University's conflict of interest policies and its institutional review boards (IRBs) are vital features of its commitment to the integrity of research at the University of Michigan. OVPR and the Medical School educate faculty and research staff, and through their conflict of interest committees and their IRBs, oversee research funding and research designs. This attention ensures that all research carried out at the University complies with federal and University guidelines concerning research integrity.

Despite these efforts, some faculty, staff, students, and administrators are left with an insufficient understanding of ethical considerations in research and related activities. A number of faculty and staff expressed frustration with the IRB process, noting its bureaucratic nature and lack of transparency. Many individuals who are affected by the review groups' decisions never directly witness the problem solving process, the ethical principles that are considered, and the decision making involved in the course of these reviews. The level of understanding needs to be raised for all, and more meaningful participation in all aspects of the process needs to be made available. As an area of applied ethics, these review activities present an attractive but incompletely realized pedagogical opportunity.

Doctoral Education

For the most part, individual academic units are assumed to take responsibility for introducing their students to research ethics. In most cases, this occurs as part of regular coursework and through faculty mentoring and interactions with IRBs rather than through specific courses addressing these issues. A noteworthy exception to this pattern is the course required of graduate students in the Program in Biomedical Sciences (PIBS). "Research Responsibility and Ethics" (PIBS 503) offers a series of research case studies and utilizes small group discussions designed to help students define their own standards, appreciate alternate approaches, and develop the skills to analyze and deal with future problems. This is a popular course, with very strong demand from students outside of PIBS. It serves as an outstanding model that might be emulated by other parts of the University.

Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program (UROP)

Undergraduate students who participate in the Undergraduate Research Opportunity Program (UROP) are required to enroll in biweekly research seminars, some of which focus on research ethics. Students are also assigned readings and journal writing relevant to their research projects and to the research seminars.

University Staff

Ethics training for the University of Michigan staff is limited. Some basic information is provided during orientation, and a hotline is available to medical center staff who face dilemmas or seek information, but our conversations with staff suggest that many feel under-informed. There is a demand from staff for ongoing engagement in ethical matters.

Academic Integrity

Several units, including the College of Engineering and the School of Public Health, have honor codes, and conversations are currently underway about developing honor codes for other units, including LS&A. Student organizations such as the Michigan Daily have developed their own code of ethics. The Center for Research on Learning and Teaching

(CRLT) is a key campus resource as units seek to strengthen student commitments to high standards of academic integrity. An outstanding example of intellectual engagement with these issues is the three-day symposium—entitled "Originality, Imitation, Plagiarism"—planned for this fall by the Sweetland Writing Center. It will provide a rich opportunity for the campus community to talk seriously about the intellectual foundations of these issues, the kind of conversation that can give participation to a deeper understanding of these important matters and inform the development of University policies concerning academic integrity.

Research That Addresses Ethical Issues

A large number of faculty address ethical issues in their research. We note below some of the principal units on campus that are home to this work. In addition to these units, there are faculty in every school and college whose research concerns ethics. In most cases, however, these faculty interact with one another infrequently and important potential synergies are therefore lost. The decline in attention to moral and civic issues over the years at the University has resulted in an underinvestment in tenure track faculty who focus on ethics-related issues, and this has meant that research on ethics has often been a lower priority than teaching about ethics. In addition, research funding for work related to ethics is often difficult to obtain. These issues are among those that need to be addressed by an Initiative on Ethics in Public Life.

The Department of Philosophy

The ethics faculty in the Department of Philosophy has been among the most distinguished in the discipline for decades. In terms of faculty scholarship and doctoral training in ethics, the Department continues to be a very significant force in philosophical discourse concerning ethics and metaethics.

The Bioethics Program

The Bioethics Program at the University of Michigan is quickly developing a national, regional, and local reputation for excellence in scholarship, education, and service. Core and affiliated faculty engage in empirical and theoretical research, with special emphases on values, ethics and decision making, ethical aspects of health policy, financing and organization, innovation and assessment in ethics education, and ethical, legal and social implications of advances in medical science. Several junior faculty have career development awards from the NIH, VA and Robert Wood Johnson Foundation to study consent to research, organizational strategies to improve care of the dying, and barriers to palliative care. Other faculty study the psychology of decision making, the influence of life experiences like discrimination on healthcare decisions, historical perspectives on reproductive technologies, citizen perspectives on resource allocation, trust relationship in health care contexts, public views on genetic explanations, and other topics in bioethics (broadly defined). The Bioethics Values and Society Seminar successfully brings together researchers from dozens of disciplines and many schools, and faculty and students frequently collaborate across traditional academic boundaries.

Besides achievements in research, the Bioethics Program advances the educational mission of the Medical School and beyond, teaching classes or portions thereof in the undergraduate medical curriculum, the graduate medical curriculum (where the Bioethics Program houses a cross-specialty curriculum in ethics and professionalism), the School of Public Health, the Law School, and LS&A.

Life Sciences and Society Program

In addition to the curricular efforts noted above, the Life Sciences and Society Program supports research that addresses ethical issues. Its seed grant program, currently being restructured, has provided research funding for a variety of projects that address ethical issues related to the life sciences. LSS has also produced briefing papers on topics in the life sciences that highlight legal and ethical issues. They have also established networks among faculty, research staff and graduate students that provide important cross-school linkages among the research communities on campus.

Other Centers

The University is also home to a number other programs and centers in which research on ethics is a primary concern. An illustrative list includes:

- Center for Advancing Research and Solutions for Society (CARSS)
- Center for Public Health Law and Ethics (Public Health)
- Michigan Center for Genomics & Public Health (Public Health)
- Michigan Initiative on Inequalities in Health (Public Health)
- Corporate and Environmental Management Program (Ross School of Business and Natural Resources and Environment)
- National Poverty Center (Ford School of Public Policy)

Ethical Engagement

Campus Living Environments

The University of Michigan's living learning communities (which include communities focused on health sciences, women in science and engineering, community service and social justice, and women and global leadership), its residence halls, and the other residential environments at the University can play an important role in facilitating discourse about issues of ethics in public life by connecting academic work and everyday life in the residence halls. It is important that an Initiative on Ethics and Public Life develop productive synergies with the Residential Life Initiative developed by the Division of Student Affairs.

Student Organizations

One of the most important venues through which students can engage with issues of ethics in public life is the vast array of student organizations. The Maize Pages on the University of Michigan website list hundreds of organizations, among which are:

- 71 religious organizations
- 111 community service organizations
- 98 political/social activism organizations
- 101 minority/ethnic organizations

In our discussions with undergraduate students, they expressed a strong desire for more opportunities to engage in discussion of issues concerning ethics. These organizations are important campus assets that can be partners in an initiative that seeks to increase opportunities for discussion of issues concerning ethics in public life.

Public Discourse and Outreach

A number of units on campus currently sponsor important annual lectures and symposia that address issues concerning ethics in public life. These include (with their sponsors):

- Tanner Lecture on Human Values (Department of Philosophy)
- Wallenberg Memorial Lecture (Raoul Wallenberg Endowment)
- Waggoner Lecturership on Ethics and Values in Medicine (Psychiatry)
- Jerome B. Weisner Symposium (OVPR)
- John Dewey Lecture (Ginsberg Center for Community Service and Learning)
- Human Rights Lecture (International Institute)

The range of these lectures is impressive and they bring to campus an outstanding set of national and international leaders. The distributed nature of the responsibility for these lectures is testament to broad commitments across campus to engage issues of ethics in public life, but the aggregate impact of these lectures is limited by the lack of a central source of information about such activities. It is, for instance, difficult to find information about the lectures on the University of Michigan website (including transcripts or videos of past lectures).

Other units on campus regularly sponsor events and activities that offer opportunities for faculty, students, and members of the local community to reflect on ethics in public life. Important contributors to this discourse include:

- Life Sciences and Society Program
- Bioethics Program
- Life Sciences Institute
- Urban Planning Program (e.g., its recent Series on Equity Planning
- School of Education (e.g., its recent Social Justice and Education Series)
- Environmental Justice Initiative at the School of Natural Resources and Environment
- Erb Institute for Global Sustainable Development

Summary

From this survey of existing activities at the University, it is clear that there is much current momentum related to ethics in public life. We also have rich institutional foundations on which to build further through an Initiative on Ethics in Public Life. We have strengths in theoretical approaches to ethics in our distinguished Department of Philosophy. In our preeminent social science departments we have faculty whose research provides insights into the individual and institutional forces that motivate behavior and who can help us understand the origins of ethical lapses and organizational failures and the challenges of avoiding them. We have a broad array of professional schools, with outstanding faculty and links to practitioner communities here and abroad, that can play leadership roles in the enhancement of professional ethics. And we have a demonstrated interest in greater engagement with ethical issues on the part of many students, faculty, staff, and members of the community.

Ethics-Related Activities on Other Campuses

In order to situate the task force's investigation in a broader context, we examined existing ethics-related activities at other U.S. colleges and universities. Our aim was to identify exemplary programs that demonstrate a significant impact on campus life, and to discover practices that would suggest strategies that might also be successful at the University of Michigan. As importantly, we wished to determine whether an opportunity exists for Michigan to contribute a unique voice to the national conversation on ethics in public life. In order to connect this discussion of external ethics centers with the specific interests of the University of Michigan community, we integrate comments offered by individuals at the University of Michigan and the local community whom we interviewed in the course of our work.

Mission

Altogether we discovered a wide range of approaches to addressing ethics-related issues at universities nationwide. One useful way to categorize these centers is to identify whether the mission of the center focuses on *applied* or *theoretical* ethics. This is particularly relevant because many University of Michigan deans and directors with whom we talked made a similar distinction in discussing the appropriate focus of an ethics initiative here.

For example, one individual suggested that training and oversight of ethical behavior is best accomplished within the context of what individuals accomplish in their work, rather than from the study of ethics from a philosophical point of view. In contrast, a second person observed that the set of issues at the beginning of the charge to the ethics task force (corporate malfeasance, prisoner abuse, etc.) were not morally controversial, since nearly everyone views the acts in question as unethical. By comparison, there do exist issues that *are* morally controversial (the war in Iraq, abortion, the distribution of health care, etc.), but these do not appear in the charge. The first set of questions may be answered with a set of applied ethics approaches which seek to understand the individual

and institutional forces that allowed these events to happen. However, the second set may require a different type of analysis informed by more theoretical arguments.

The distinction between applied and theoretical ethics is a significant one, and the decision to commit to one or both will produce an enduring impact on an ethics initiative at the University of Michigan. The institutional titles, mission statements, and associated documentation culled from a variety of established ethics centers provide a valuable starting point from which to consider the implications of this choice. What follows are excerpts from the mission statements of an illustrative array of ethics centers, beginning with those that take a more applied approach:

The Institute for Applied and Professional Ethics, Ohio University:

> "The Institute for Applied and Professional Ethics at Ohio University is dedicated to promoting the application of fundamental ethical techniques to decision-making in an ever-changing world."

The W. Maurice Young Centre for Applied Ethics, University of British Columbia:

> "The mission of the Centre is to bring moral philosophy into the public domain by advancing research in applied ethics, supporting courses with a significant ethical component and acting as a community resource."

Dartmouth College Ethics Institute, Dartmouth College:

> "The Ethics Institute exists to foster the study of applied and professional ethics throughout the Dartmouth community, both at the undergraduate level and in the professional schools. We strive to facilitate scholarship and teaching in applied and professional ethics."

Center for Professional and Applied Ethics, University of North Carolina at Charlotte:

> "The Center for Professional and Applied Ethics at The University of North Carolina at Charlotte exists to increase the moral awareness and ethical skills of professionals, of the professional schools. More generally, the Center exists to provide ethics education to the general public, for there is scarcely a topic of note that does not require a morally reflective person to consider questions about what makes a society and the individuals within it good."

In contrast, the mission statements of other ethics programs explicitly attempt to provide a perspective that is informed both by theoretical and practical concerns:

Edmund J. Safra Foundation Center for Ethics, Harvard University:

> "The Edmond J. Safra Foundation Center for Ethics encourages teaching and research about ethical issues in public and professional life; helps meet the growing need for teachers and scholars who address questions of moral choice in business, education, government, law, medicine, and public policy; brings together those with competence in philosophical thought and those with experience in professional education; and promotes a perspective on ethics informed by both theory and practice."

Kenan Institute for Ethics, Duke University:

> "The Kenan Institute for Ethics is a university-wide initiative at Duke University that supports the study and teaching of ethics and promotes moral reflection and commitment in personal, professional, community, and civic life.
>
> Our work is guided by the conviction that universities have a responsibility to prepare students for lives of personal integrity and reflective citizenship by nurturing their capacities for critical thinking, compassion, courage, and their concern for justice."

Program in Ethics, Politics, and Economics, Yale University:

> "The Program on Ethics, Politics and Economics sponsors interdisciplinary teaching and research in the Social Sciences and Humanities at Yale. It is designed to foster informed debate about public policy in the light of disciplined reflection on the fundamentals of human association. The program was created in the belief that, for all the value of specialized fields and sub-disciplines, these should not displace attempts to integrate empirical, analytical and normative concerns that range over different disciplines in the modern university. The complex social realities of our time demand a wide-ranging understanding of the human sciences on the part of citizens and leaders alike; EP&E seeks to provide it."

Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions, Indiana University:

> "The Poynter Center promotes moral deliberation about developments in science and technology, the provision of health care, the aims of higher education, the duties of corporate responsibility, and the challenges of democratic life and culture. Critical reflection about the meaning of rights, community, justice, diversity, power, and virtue provide the more general terms for much of the Center's inquiry."

Articulating a well-defined mission statement will be an important early step in establishing the proposed Presidential Initiative on Ethics in Public Life at the University of Michigan. It should reflect the university's dual commitment to acting ethically and addressing ethical issues. In addition, it should consider how best to integrate both applied and theoretical perspectives related to ethical concerns. This critical calibration will help guide subsequent administrative and academic decisions in terms of shaping ethics-centered curricular, research, and public discourse activities with the University community and beyond.

Scope and Audience

In evaluating the goals of a campus ethics program, one factor to consider is whether its activities should primarily focus on the needs of undergraduates, or emphasize the role of faculty members, or address graduate students in the professional schools. For example, ethics initiatives at Harvard, Duke and Princeton offer graduate or postdoctoral fellowships in ethics. In contrast, Bentley College's Center for Business Ethics provides undergraduate scholarships through its "Sullivan Scholars" program. Of course, many

comprehensive programs seek to include a wide variety of constituencies, including staff members and the local community as well. This goal also can be accomplished through the activities of several independent ethics initiatives located on a single campus, often with separate disciplinary foci.

In particular, well-established programs often can offer an extensive array of options for both faculty and student participation. The Turner Program in Moral Leadership at Vanderbilt University conducts outreach to faculty and students from such professional schools as nursing, management, law, divinity, and medicine. The Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life at Boston College sponsors national scholarly conferences, a visiting scholars program, a competition for student essays, and faculty/student reading groups. Similarly, the Dartmouth College Ethics Institute offers an undergraduate writing competition as well as an endowment for visiting professors.

Curricular Activities

Ethics initiatives we reviewed varied widely in the amount and nature of their curricular offerings, which often were correlated to the size of their enterprise. Some programs sponsor seminars such as "Moral Dilemmas," "Individual and Social Responsibility," and "Ethical Issues in High Risk Situations," all available at Harvard. Similarly, Princeton University offers courses entitled "Ethics and Economics" and "Bioethics and Public Policy." Intensive summer seminars on moral theory are offered by the Center for the Teaching and Study of Applied Ethics at the University of Nebraska College of Law, and by the Practical Ethics Center at the University of Montana. Others, such as the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology, support the integration of ethics-related topics into standard courses, an approach known as "ethics across the curriculum." Alternatively, Duke's Kenan Institute for Ethics sustains a campus service-learning program, and also has proposed a new undergraduate certificate program in the study of ethics.

As another example, Arizona State University's Lincoln Center for Applied Ethics appoints "Lincoln Professors" in each college who serve as mentors for other faculty members developing ethics courses. They also teach one ethics seminar each semester in their department. The Poynter Center for the Study of Ethics and American Institutions at Indiana University has an intriguing tradition as well. Each year it identifies a relevant theme and appoints several campus faculty members who engage with that topic from the vantage point of their own discipline. For instance, the theme selected for 2004-05 relates to the politics of childhood.

Research Activities

Several ethics programs we studied provide funding and professional development resources to help faculty members develop new ethics courses, or to engage in research on ethical topics. For example, the Dartmouth College Ethics Institute supports ethics research by both faculty and students. Many ethics centers, particularly those that focus on medical and bioethics, devote attention to ethical issues raised by institutional review

boards with respect to faculty-sponsored research. The Kenan Institute for Ethics at Duke University also provides training in research ethics to graduate students.

Co-Curricular Activities

In addition to offering ethics courses, many schools support external activities that provide additional opportunities for undergraduate and graduate students to engage with ethical issues. For instance, forty universities participated in the 2005 Ethics Bowl for undergraduates held during the annual conference of the Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE). Similarly, the Institute for Applied and Professional Ethics at Ohio University supports undergraduate research projects and subsidizes travel expenses to attend ethics-related conferences. The Notre Dame Center for Ethics and Culture sponsors an undergraduate dinner that includes faith-based discussions on ethical topics. At the U.S. Naval Academy, the Center for the Study of Professional Military Ethics offers a discussion series entitled "Friday Night Ethics at the Movies."

At Duke University, the outgoing president was personally committed to the ethics initiative there, and even sponsored a series of dinner parties on the subject. As a result of her commitment, the ideal of ethics has infused the culture there. This idea was echoed at the University of Michigan Forum on Ethics in Public Life, which noted the singular value of communicating clearly to faculty, students, and staff that ethics is important here.

Outreach Activities

Many campus ethics initiatives also conduct public outreach by publishing monographs, journals, or newsletters. For example, the Institute for Philosophy and Public Policy at the University of Maryland publishes the ethics journal *Philosophy & Public Policy Quarterly*. The Notre Dame Center for Ethics and Culture supports a monograph series on cultural topics, as well as several books on medical ethics and a newsletter for subscribers. The Markkula Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University publishes an online series of articles on ethical decision-making. In addition, the Princeton University Press publishes the work of scholars at the University Center for Human Values. Most of these centers maintain extensive websites targeted to both local and national audiences.

A large variety of innovative programs support outreach to the larger community to address ethical issues. For instance, Harvard's Edmond J. Safra Foundation Center for Ethics supports a lecture series that is open to the general public. Case Western Reserve's Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science provides online resources such as case studies and professional guidelines, as well as a help line for engineers and scientists seeking assistance with concrete ethical dilemmas. Likewise, the Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology provides assistance in drafting professional codes of ethics, and also delivers ethics workshops for local businesses and governmental units. The Kenan Institute at Duke University collaborates with local school districts to develop character education initiatives. Finally, Loyola

University's Center for Ethics and Social Justice hosts a series of "Corporate Values" breakfasts for Chicago business and civic leaders.

Organizational Structure

When classifying ethics programs, one important factor involves the nature of their relationship with other campus units. Some programs are more informal and reside within an academic department or consist of a cluster of affiliated faculty members. For example, the University of Pennsylvania's Center for Bioethics operates within the department of medical ethics at the medical school.

In contrast, some programs consist of freestanding interdisciplinary institutions that often report directly to the provost's office. These may sustain independent staff, funding, and a governing board to set strategic priorities that also may include members of the local community. For example, the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics supports the work of fifteen staff members and 52 associated scholars, as well as relationships with community partners. Often such programs function as an integrated "hub-and-spokes" distributed model that supports activities across several campus units.

Long-Range Planning and Funding

These and other issues will require careful thought and discussion as the initiative on ethics and public life moves forward. The Association for Applied and Professional Ethics (APPE) acts as a clearing house for information on ethics programs and centers, and participation in its activities would provide deeper contact with units on other campuses and opportunities to learn from their experiences. For example, the theme of the ethics center colloquium at the 2005 APPE national conference was "Ethics Centers and Conflicts of Interest," a topic that surely would resonate across any academic institution.

Other ethics programs have undergone a formal process to establish benchmarks for assessment and to evaluate programmatic outcomes. For example, task force co-chair Marvin Krislov visited the Kenan Institute of Ethics at Duke University in January 2005. The Kenan Institute has incorporated transparent evaluation metrics within its current five-year plan to generate accountability. It also plans to use an independent evaluator to assess specific programs.

Identifying dependable funding sources is a critical issue for the survival and expansion of campus ethics initiatives. For instance, the Boisi Center for Religion and American Public Life at Boston College supports the full-time roles of director and assistant director with endowment funds. Case Western Reserve's Online Ethics Center for Engineering and Science is funded by a grant from the National Science Foundation. The Center for Ethics at Emory University administers a million-dollar budget. Other programs raise funds through planned giving; by selling journal subscriptions as well as videos of conferences and other events; or by seeking private or foundation support.

Summary

Several outstanding ethics initiatives have been established at prominent private universities such as Harvard, Princeton, and Duke, as well as at large public institutions such as Indiana University. These peer institutions offer potential guidance to the University of Michigan regarding its ability to support a major ethics program with a presence and visibility across campus and beyond. We suggest that much also can be learned from the success of smaller, specialized ethics programs that focus on particular issues such as medical or religious ethics, in response to the needs of a more highly defined community. Other institutions have discovered that integrating the examination of disparate ethical issues under a larger umbrella can help establish a holistic identity that connects independent campus initiatives.

Of course, it may not be possible or desirable for the University of Michigan to replicate effective programs at other institutions. The particular administrative structure and constellation of services offered on each different campus reflects the unique combination of institutional commitment, academic culture, available resources, and stage of evolution of that program. Several staff members affiliated with other campus ethics programs suggested that Michigan might consider leveraging its national profile and moral stature on issues of academic equity and institutional diversity. Michigan thus could establish a potential foundation for leading a broader discussion of contemporary ethical concerns facing academia in particular, as well as society in general.

Needs and Opportunities at the University of Michigan

In the preceding sections, we have described the current array of activities at Michigan and some of the activities at other universities. We now turn to areas where the University could most effectively focus its efforts, either to capitalize on our strengths, meet important and unmet needs of students, faculty and society or, often, both.

Student Needs

Students' needs in ethics include, most importantly, preparation for their future roles in society. Overall, we found that many students (and some faculty) viewed ethics as being avoided or, at least, not part of the culture of learning, in most units, and the availability of opportunities for ethics education, reflection and dialogue quite uneven. Some units make concerted and specific efforts to ensure the ethics is "on the agenda" all the time, while others do not. The University needs to create a culture in which ethics is prominent. This is not to say that students are not currently exposed to ethics. At our community forum, many of the students were impassioned and well informed about a variety of ethical issues. When one student was asked where he learned to think about these ethical issues, his response was, "Michigan." This was, of course, a self-selected group. But, the challenge for the University is to graduate not just some students with ethical education, but all students. Put differently by another student, "Ethics should be part of campus life all the time, not just for one course." The fundamental goal should be for the University to encourage critical thinking about ethical issues, including in that an appreciation for

ethical ambiguity and diverse points of view, without letting the fear of offending limit the dialogue. Unlike an ethical code or set of rules, reflection and critical thinking require consideration of why some actions are considered generally unethical, that is, not just "plagiarism is wrong" but learning and discussion about why. Open and respectful dialogue, in turn, requires time and space not always found in typical course settings. Besides tackling issues of personal action in public settings, preparing students to become full and ethical members of society means including in their education some experience with community service and engagement, creating future citizens who would act more ethically and have a more nuanced view of what that entailed.

Naturally, students' educational needs differ tremendously depending on their level (undergraduate, graduate, post-graduate, professional school) and what their future role(s) might be. Conversely, many of our contacts spoke of a need for cross-disciplinary contact, for instance, different health professional schools may have varying perspectives on resource allocation, and social work and economics may have different views, values and expertise on poverty. Educational forums that co-mingle learners and faculty from diverse units have great potential for enhancing dialogue. Similarly, many believe that ethics learning needs to be integrated into the context and curriculum. Rather than having individual ethics courses, then encountering an issue in a separate venue where it may be ignored (or where actions may contradict the views developed in the standalone ethics course), issues and problems confronted in a wide range of classes would benefit from the addition of an ethics component. For example, as one professional school dean noted, professional students confront tension between the "learning needs of a student [and] the treatment needs or wants of their patient" and this is a learning opportunity that should be met in the context in which the issue arises. This integration can be a challenge, as an individual faculty member teaching a course on design, for instance, may not feel qualified to teach the moral question of the economic value of lives. On the other hand, some of the more interesting discussions about character-building occur when professors actually talk about their own dilemmas. The need to integrate ethics into coursework and learning presents a formidable challenge, as it runs counter to the traditional model of coursework which is focused on a particular topic and is taught by someone with expertise in that area.

In addition to emphasizing and integrating ethics into education generally, we found a particular need to ensure that ethics in public life is seen not only as a matter for individual thought, reflection and action, but also as an institutional concern, one that engages the roles of individuals in creating and maintaining ethical institutions and systems.

Unfortunately, teaching ethics can encounter resistance from learners for a number of reasons. Some people consider ethics and morals an intensely private and individual matter and are reluctant to discuss them in public arenas. These feelings can be intensified when individuals hold, or think they hold, minority points of view. Others do not see ethics as "teachable." Resistance may be intensified if ethics education is perceived as imposed by others (e.g., as a required course), if does not seem open to diverse points of view (e.g., "conservative" opinions in a setting with mostly "liberal"

students and/or teachers), or if it is taught in an overly didactic and authoritarian way. Fortunately, most students will engage with ethical topics when they are broached and when they see their relevance. Indeed, many are eager to do so. As one student respondent to our survey noted, "When ethical discussions arise, there is generally a sincere interest in acknowledging and addressing such issues. However, I have not seen a strong desire to independently pursue such issues." This reinforces our conclusion that we need more formally organized opportunities on campus that will engage students in discussing these issues.

There are students who would like to pursue ethics in public life more deeply or seriously than current opportunities permit. The presence of student groups focused on ethics in business, medicine, public health, LS&A and many other units attests to their unmet need for special courses, seminars, and paths of study. Many undergraduate students also expressed the desire for more course offerings focused on ethics issues. As part of the initiative on ethics and public life, consideration might be given to designing academic concentrations, minors, or certificate programs that would provide formal pathways for these students to pursue their interests in ethics.

In addition to the need to prepare students for their future roles in public life, students have needs related to ethics in their daily lives as students. These can differ enormously depending on the type and level of student. For instance, while all students face issues of academic integrity on a regular basis, doctoral students face special issues related to the use of human subjects and integrity of research, and professional students need to understand the ethical dilemmas they may face in their careers. All students may confront ethical issues related to academic integrity, career choices and recruiting, athletics, drinking and drug use, relations with friends and intimates, and relations with employers, coworkers, neighbors, and property owners. For example, plagiarism, and particularly internet-based plagiarism, is viewed as a significant problem, one that (we think) illustrates a profound generation gap in perceptions of right and wrong, and one where we have an opportunity to engage students in questions about responsibility, attribution, originality and the like. The symposium planned for September 2005 by the Sweetland Writing Center on "Originality, Imitation, and Plagiarism" is an outstanding example of the kind of program that can engage students intellectually with important ethical issues and through this have an impact on their behavior.

In summary, we find that the greatest student needs include:

- Expanded course offerings at the undergraduate level
- Integration of ethics into already present curriculum and activities, and a general greater emphasis on ethics in daily life
- More opportunities for reflection
- Discussion in respectful and "safe" spaces (especially on topical issues)
- More opportunities for discourse across the professions
- Open and public dialogue and engagement with the community
- Improved coordination and expanded opportunities for those students (at all levels) who wish to pursue their intellectual interest in ethics in public life
- Attention to specific relevant issues such as plagiarism and teacher-student dilemmas

Faculty and Staff Needs

Faculty and staff at the university face ethical issues in their public lives as well. In trying to define the needs of staff in this area, we concluded, finally, that the most important need is for more information. To this end, it might be profitable to survey staff to discover their concerns. University employees are numerous and there are nearly as many roles as individual job titles. Librarians confront ethical issues (e.g., privacy, intellectual property, theft) that differ from those faced by laboratory assistants, maintenance workers, or nurses. Generalizations fail. Interestingly, many employees noted that ethics rarely, if ever, arose during orientations and similar training events; ethics was, sadly, notable for its absence rather than its presence. Staff generally perceive that content in research ethics and integrity is covered well and consistently, but that skills and daily problem-solving are not addressed at all by some units (confirmed by interviews with unit leadership) and addressed inconsistently in others. Some noted the need for guidance on how to deal with a system where ethical concerns are raised. For example, staff from health care units noted that the phenomenon of moral distress arises not from lack of knowledge or an ethical viewpoint, but rather from the need for knowing how to behave within the system's constraints. Information privacy – for students, for volunteers, for patients – was an important topic for staff, as were issues related to hierarchy and attribution (e.g., co-authorship).

We know more about the needs of faculty, which can be grouped into their needs as teachers, as researchers and research supervisors (in all areas of inquiry), and as researchers whose scholarship focuses on ethics in public life.

As teachers, faculty report concern about students' ethical lapses and reluctance (on their faculty part) to draw attention to them. As researchers, faculty face pressures to publish research in leading journals and in books from leading publishers, some of which have limited interest in work concerning ethics. Faculty also face pressure to pursue research that is likely to be funded rather than their own preferred intellectual agenda, and funding for ethics-related research is not plentiful. Sometimes funders pressure faculty to release findings early, or not at all, or in less than forthright ways. Faculty believe that the areas of research ethics and integrity are given sufficient attention at Michigan, in most cases because regulatory regimes require serious attention to these issues. As supervisors, however, faculty aren't sure how and when to credit paid research staff. Most importantly, there are few forums where faculty can turn for advice or to discuss their concerns.

Faculty who pursue research in ethics and public life – those to whom the University can most profitably turn for assistance and expertise in meeting the needs thus far described – provide a number of strengths upon which the University could build. However, there are also significant gaps and weaknesses here that the University could address. For instance, professional ethics teaching is too often entrusted to adjunct faculty, which reduces the presence of research programs devoted to these topics. Our strengths in interdisciplinarity, the social sciences, philosophy, and the professional schools provide a foundation on which to build, so long as bridges can be erected to enable shared

discourse. One associate dean asked for, "examination of these kinds of issues across disciplines and professional schools, and allowing [them] to challenge each other, is critical." Another dean wondered "How can we, across disciplines, look in a concerted way at the way in which our various social systems create justice?"

On the other hand, a number of cautions were raised by those with whom we talked say that ethics is seen as a risky area for faculty. One faculty member and unit leader commented: "Ethics is not an area where it is easy to get federal grants – if available, [there are] low rates and indirect costs… [It] may be dangerous for an untenured faculty to focus on ethics. Would a school be willing to commit faculty for this purpose with the understanding that it is unlikely to generate grant funds?" Numerous challenges beyond financial ones face these scholars; practical obstacles include the allocation of space to discipline-based units, making co-location of similarly minded colleagues extremely difficult, a lack of a central "ethics" gateway for the University (and the broader community), and a lack of a strategic plan (which we hope this report will help to change).

Institutional Concerns

The institution itself (and its component organizational units) faces ethical issues as an employer, as a member of the community, as an educational institution, and in its research mission. Repeatedly, those who spoke with us emphasized the need for the university to "walk the walk," to model ethical and just behavior, so that all those who arrive at the University of Michigan should sense that this is an institution committed to ethics, justice, respect, fulfilling its mission of service to society, and educating excellent future citizens.

Community/State Needs

Two themes emerged from our discussions with community leaders and those external to the University. First, many expressed the desire for University leadership on ethical issues locally and nationally. Several supported University-led discussions on ethics issues with practitioners.

Second, some articulated the need for the University to demonstrate ethical leadership, including greater transparency and responsibility. These concerns broke down into roughly two categories: greater community involvement with the University, and greater openness in University decision-making. In terms of community involvement, local implications of decisions affecting the public schools and economic development were frequently mentioned. In decision-making, the areas of building, construction, environmental impact, and transportation were noted frequently.

Throughout these sessions, many articulated the view that our society needed intellectual leadership and that the University of Michigan was uniquely positioned to play such a role. A local business leader summed up this view by saying that it is critical that the University of Michigan develop the capacity to provide practical answers to those

wrestling with ethical concerns. He noted that managers typically lack the time or knowledge to address such issues themselves. In his opinion, philosophical concepts may be useful, but practical considerations are far more important by comparison. He concluded by highlighting a rhetorical question: If the University of Michigan universities do not lead in the study of ethics, who will?

Priorities

Society faces numerous compelling issues in ethics and public life: life-altering biotechnology, equitable resource distribution in a global marketplace, institutional and individual malfeasance, the tension between moral pluralism and political decisions on moral issues. Where should the University of Michigan focus its human, financial and other resources? The Task Force has identified three areas of emphasis, where the University has the potential to be a "leader and best" in ethics and public life, based on analysis of existing activities and our institutional strengths and our own and society's greatest needs.

Based on our discussions with members of the University community, we believe the three greatest areas of need are:

- Undergraduate courses and opportunities for discussion of ethics in public life
- Research and scholarship on ethics in public life, including empirical research on ethics and values, institutional (or organizational) ethics, and professional (or role-based) ethics
- Public outreach and discussion of ethics in public life.

Recommendations of the Task Force

To respond to the needs we have outlined, we recommend to the President that she establish a Presidential Initiative for Ethics in Public life to report to the President or Provost. This initiative would stimulate and support activities throughout the University that would promote research, teaching and learning about ethics in public life. The Initiative would also promote public disclosure, as appropriate, dialogue about ethical issues in the University and the academic community, as well as in the external community. This Initiative would embrace both theoretical ethics and applied and professional ethics. The overarching goal would be to place ethics and the study of ethics at the heart of the University.

We further recommend that the President and Provost actively promote and encourage this initiative, since re-establishing moral and civic concerns as central to our mission will require strong leadership. We note the importance of the work of the Task Force on Promoting Interdisciplinary Teaching and Scholarship to reducing barriers to cross-college collaborations in fields such as ethics. The President and Provost might consider support for ethics-related activities in their evaluations of Deans and Directors. Perhaps most importantly, the President and the Provost should set the tone: that ethics and ethics-related teaching, scholarship, and outreach are valued in this university.

Because the overall goal is to encourage ethical scholarship and to promote ethical deliberation across the curriculum and throughout the University — as a fundamental dimension of University activity — we are hesitant to recommend immediate creation of an "ethics center" or "ethics institute," which would run the risk of confining the initiative to a single unit on campus. The Initiative needs both central facilitating activities and broadly distributed efforts centered in other academic units. Most importantly, we believe, it needs immediate action, to build upon existing activities and commitments at the University and to start new activities that address unmet needs. We therefore propose an initiative that gets underway with some specific tasks, while evolving a longer-term organizational structure.

One of the principal tasks of the Initiative would be to serve as "ethics central" on campus, coordinating, publicizing and stimulating ethics-related activities. We identify below the priorities that we believe should guide the Initiative's early activities. The Initiative would also develop a media strategy, including the creation of a website, to publicize all ethics-related activities across campus and in the community and state so that interested individuals may learn more easily about the many activities available.

During the next academic year (2005-06), this Initiative would be headed by a designated University official(s) (the Director) who would work closely with the Provost, deans and other faculty, staff and students to design and launch longer term strategies and structures to promote the goals of the initiative. This work might include establishing one or more centers or institutes that would serve in the long run as an organizational locus for the Initiative, but it certainly should include a search for a permanent director or unit head for the Presidential Initiative. The director should be a distinguished scholar in ethics or a closely related discipline and might even be appointed as "Distinguished University Professor for Ethics in Public Life." It is further recommended that the search conclude in time for a permanent director to begin in the fall of 2006.

To help coordinate the Initiative activities and to support the Director, we recommend that the President create a university-wide Steering Committee for the Initiative, comprising faculty, students and staff from various schools, colleges, and units. This Steering Committee should meet regularly and guide the planning and operations for the Initiative. It should also evaluate and recommend programs and activities.[6]

We also recommend that the President encourage the creation of an Advisory Committee for the Initiative, including outside academics, experts, and professionals, who can advise and support this new entity. This Advisory Committee can help provide resources, expertise, and focus for the Initiative.

[6] While the Task Force focused on Ann Arbor campus activities, we recognize that the Flint and Dearborn campuses also present opportunities for teaching, scholarship, and discourse in these areas. We would encourage the Initiative to include faculty, staff and students from those campuses in the further development of activities.

The President and/or Provost should also provide sufficient funding to support the Director, a support staff, and program development. Such funding might be called the Presidential Initiative Fund to demonstrate the President's commitment to these activities. It would be expected that the Initiative and its projects would, with the support of the President and the Development Office, seek outside funding in addition to continued significant support from the University.

In addition, we would recommend that the Director and Steering Committee begin work immediately to create programs that answer the goals and aspirations outlined in the previous sections.

The Initiative should at its outset give particular emphasis to three areas. Among the activities that might be pursued in these areas are the following:

Undergraduate Education

1. Encourage the development of new undergraduate courses or parts of courses that develop moral discernment among students.
   - Work with units that teach first year students to expand their offerings in ethics and public life (e.g., living learning communities, first year seminars, and the Residential College).
   - Encourage faculty to be more explicit about the ways in which their courses address ethics and to integrate ethics-related issues into existing courses.
2. Support the development of courses that may not naturally arise from existing academic units (e.g., courses on religion and public life or courses on ethics in the professions targeted to undergraduates). Also, utilize professional schools in developing case studies for undergraduates (using a model developed by the Carnegie Foundation for Advancement of Teaching).
3. Encourage and support new and existing programs that provide opportunities for students to become involved in community engagement (the Ginsberg Center, Arts of Citizenship).
4. In collaboration with CRLT, develop faculty/GSI workshops on incorporating an ethics component in undergraduate courses and provide incentives for faculty to teach (whole or partial) courses related to ethics outside their own departments and schools. This activity could include creating modules to incorporate ethical and social issues in existing courses.
5. Establish a program of ethics fellows for practitioners and others who work in ethics-related fields who would interact with faculty and students during short campus residencies.

Research on Ethics in Public Life

1. Support scholarship and research by establishing a competitive grant program for faculty and/or graduate students who pursue research on ethics in public life.
2. Suggest that existing seed/pilot grant programs within the University include an interest area in ethics and public life among their funding categories.

3. Seek funding for on-campus sabbaticals where faculty members spend time in other units working on issue related to ethics.
4. Encourage the recruitment, hiring and promotion of scholars in the area of ethics in public life, including the creation of tenure-track faculty lines in this area.

Public Discourse and Outreach

1. Collaborate with student groups and academic units to increase the number of opportunities for informal discussion of issues concerning ethics in public life. These activities should emphasize small group discussions, with ample opportunities for participants to engage with one another.
2. Several times each term, provide a forum for timely discussion of topical ethical issues, led by faculty or members of the community and aimed primarily at undergraduates and the general public.
3. Collaborate with other units on campus to plan an annual symposium or conference on cross-cutting ethics issues, open to the public and inviting a broad audience to consider complex and contemporary problems in ethical study.
4. Support and encourage community-based initiatives in ethics-related fields. These might include workplace, trade association, government, social service or religious groups in such projects as deliberative democracy discussions.

In addition to these priorities, the following activities are also worthy of consideration as part of the Initiative:

Academic Integrity in Learning and Research

1. Encourage, support and publicize activities that highlight the importance of ethical conduct to the life of the university.
2. Support efforts to develop honor codes or other academic integrity programs in schools and colleges.
3. Collaborate with OVPR and Rackham to provide workshops on integrity in research for new faculty, staff, and doctoral students.
4. Support conferences and symposia that provide opportunities for the university community to think deeply about the nature of integrity in teaching, research, and university management.
5. Work with OVPR and individual schools and colleges to build public awareness of the seriousness of the university's efforts to ensure an ethical research climate (e.g., PEERRS training, IRBs, or conflict of interest committees, etc.).
6. Promote discussions related to the ethical management of the University (e.g., investment, purchasing, or HR policies).
7. Survey staff to determine ethics issues on campus that concern them and work to address those through dialogue.

Graduate and Professional Education

1. Support and encourage cross-school dialogue about professional ethics, including discussion of how ethics of particular professions are viewed by professionals outside of that field.
2. With CRLT, co-sponsor a seminar or summer workshop for faculty in professional schools who teach professional ethics.
3. Work with the Provost to encourage and support efforts by professional schools to make ethics an integral part of their curricula and to provide opportunities for professional students to engage with practitioners with experience in professional ethics.

Conclusion

In her charge to the task force, President Coleman noted the rising public concern about unethical behavior and institutional failures that have been front page news in recent years. She asked us to assess current efforts at the University of Michigan to address these issues and to make recommendations concerning ways to increase attention to issues of ethics in public life in the teaching, research and public service activities of the University. During the course of our work, we identified many programs and activities that are already in place that address these issues and strong foundations on which new efforts can be built. We also identified some significant needs, particularly in the areas of undergraduate education, research on ethics in public life, and public discourse and outreach. In order to establish concern for ethics in public life as a significant campus priority, we propose that the President and Provost take the lead in implementing these recommendations through establishment of an Initiative on Ethics and Public Life. Their strong leadership will create greater investment and energy in the various units, schools and colleges of the University. Such an ethics initiative will help fulfill the mission of modern education--by placing moral and civic discourse at the center of University life. Through this initiative, the University of Michigan can not only promote important teaching and research, but make a difference in addressing important societal needs and concerns.