

8. There was a significant difference between N2 average score by SU college/school (i.e., CHHS, Fulton, Henson, Perdue, and Seidel; based on students' primary major); Perdue and CHHS majors' average scores were significantly less than Fulton and Henson majors' average scores; no other college or school comparisons were significantly different.
9. Although the sample was small, a paired analysis supported a significant increase in N2 average score for SU students over time.

Suggested Action Items

1. The National Norms/benchmarks with which SU students' Ethical Reasoning are compared should be evaluated by objective faculty and/or staff with expertise in the discipline or assessment of those skills. Although SU data are lower than published National Norms, it is not possible to test significance between SU data and the National Norms.
2. Perform an area/course mapping of the current SU courses that align with the revised Ethical Reasoning student learning outcome.
3. Teaching faculty, General Education Steering Committee-eW* 0 612 792 reW* nBT/F2 11.04 Tf1 0 0 1 469.99 55

Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background and Findings	1
Suggested Action Items	2
DIT-2 Instrument	4
Methodology and Sample	5
Results	5
Demographic Comparison of Test-takers vs. Non-test-takers	5
Validity and Reliability of the DIT-2 Instrument Administration at SU	8
SU Student Scores on DIT-2 Instrument	9
DIT-2 and SOS Survey Student Responses	11
Longitudinal SU Student Scores on DIT-2 Instrument	11
Discussion	12
References	13
Salisbury University DIT-2 Reporting Documentation	13
Appendices	14
Appendix 1. Example dilemma and associated decision-	

Detailed Ethical Reasoning Report

DIT-2 Instrument

The assessment is an instrument comprised of five dilemmas, each of which has one multiple choice decision item about the dilemma, twelve Likert-type rating items, and four ranking items. There are also other demographic items following the five dilemmas. See a DIT-2 example item in [Appendix 1](#) and its alignment with SU's student learning goals, outcomes, and curricular area mapping in [Table 1](#). Details about the instrument can be found at the [Center for the Study of Ethical Development, The University of Alabama – About the DIT website](#) (201

Methodology and Sample

Data were col

warn that "if your sample does not contain the entire range of educational levels (from Junior high to Graduate School), your Cronbach alpha is likely to be lower." Therefore, since the SU sample is only comprised of undergraduates, the SU spring 2019 DIT-2 instrument's value of $\alpha = .656$ is therefore quite close to acceptable instrument reliability for this group.

SU Student Scores on DIT-2 Instrument

On average, the students that participated ($n = 1769$) had a N2 score of 30.0 (standard deviation, $SD = 14.0$) with a range of -4.3 to 73.6 on the DIT-2 instrument. Although there are no benchmark values for the N2 score, there are several studies compiled across years of institutional data collection on the DIT-2 (Bebeau & Thoma 2003; Dong 2014; Saculla *et al.* 2016) to which we can compare our students' results. The overall SU N2 average score (30.0) was below the average score of freshmen in the two most recent National Norm reports (Dong 2014; Saculla *et al.* 2016) and equal to the average score of freshmen in the original National Norm report (Bebeau & Thoma 2003). However, since we do not have the raw data to compare the National Norm data sets to our own, we cannot evaluate statistically significant differences between them. Also, overlapping standard deviation of the National Norm studies' groups' scores with our groups' scores indicates high variance within samples that may result in inability to identify statistical differences between groups. The Saculla *et al.* (2016) study is the most comparable to the data collected at SU as it was only comprised of data collected in an online format with the most recent testing dates (2010-14) of the various norm studies. Therefore, the Saculla *et al.* (2016) study will

seniors)

program review and improvement efforts such as Academic Program Review required reporting related to assessment of program student learning outcomes aligned with this instrument, when applicable.

DIT-2 and SOS Survey Student Responses

The DIT-2 test-takers also took the SOS Survey (n = 1769; [Table 12](#)). We were able to evaluate the reliability of both subscales within the SOS Survey. The *Importance* subscale, which addresses the extent to which the student thought it was important to do well on the DIT-2 instrument, demonstrated reliability ($\alpha = .775$). Similarly, the *Effort* subscale, which addresses the extent to which the student fully engaged in effortful behavior on the DIT-2 instrument, 2 instrument,

Discussion

Based on the results presented here it seems that there is room for improvement in student learning outcomes related to Ethical Reasoning at SU. Several action items are suggested below towards this end.

1. To determine whether or not our students are meeting SU expectations for Ethical Reasoning, the benchmarks with which SU students' Ethical Reasoning are compared should be evaluated by objective faculty and/or staff with expertise in the discipline or assessment of it. Since the DIT-2 instrument lacks any definition of a proficiency level and only provides National Norm values for certain groups for which we can only assume and not test whether or not our data are statistically less than those National Norms, it is difficult to evaluate actual student ability with the current instrument. Also, since for some schemas there are not clear trends for scoring across groups for which we would expect to see increases with age, schooling, and experience – this instrument may have deficiencies in how we can use it to evaluate and inform curricular interventions for improvements in student learning outcomes.
2. Perform an area/course mapping of the current SU courses that align with the revised Ethical Reasoning student learning outcome.
3. Based on discussions and decisions related to Action Items #1-2, relevant parties such as faculty teaching courses aligned with this student learning outcome and the General Education Steering Committee should consider whether or not the DIT-2 instrument is aligned well with the revised (as of November 2018) SU General Education Ethical Reasoning

Descriptions of the Neo-Kohlbergian developmental schemas of moral judgment aligned with some issues from the example dilemma above (Bebeau & Thoma 2003; Rest et al. 1999b):