Higher Education Ethics

Higher Education Ethics:

Five Domains to Improve Education

By

Russell Porter and Janet Gordon

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing

Higher Education Ethics: Five Domains to Improve Education

By Russell Porter and Janet Gordon

This book first published 2023

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN (10): 1-5275-2928-2
ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-2928-1

From Russell Porter

To My Wife, Johnnie
And My Son, Brett
Thank you for completing my life

From Janet Gordon

To my husband, Barry
Thank you for your unwavering support

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES AND GRAPHS

Tables

Graphs

PRELUDE

This tome is based on previous publications, academic and operational practitioners' input, and literature. It focuses on and is based in a typology of ethics education in higher education in response to the need for a focused manuscript that uses content validity to illustrate the hierarchy of ethical reasoning in academia. No other manuscript brings together the five ethics education domains identified here as required for appropriate ethics education and operations in higher education.

Within the context of the two Bloom et al. (1956) cognitive and affective educational domains, the typology presents five ethics domains:

1. decision ethics,
2. professional ethics,
3. business ethics,
4. organizational ethics, and
5. social ethics.

After first presenting the issues involved in the five domains, there are specific ethics educational objectives presented for use in higher education instruction and operations, with specific cases illustrating how the objectives can be supported with the five ethics domains.

A discussion is provided on how higher education can be improved by including more specific ethics education objectives within academic programs and operations. The final two chapters provide additional cases to better understand the connection between the domains and higher education ethical operations, and a means to create a higher education taxonomy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No authors can write a book by themselves. To our families, thank you for the support during those long blocks of time spent away from you when researching, writing, and editing. To the following with all remembered but not necessarily all indicated, we thank you: Dr. Walter Murphy at Texas A&M University-Central Texas for helping with the case creations and continuing support in the research, Ms. Aubrey Craft for the support with the case creations, Mr. Brooks Moore and Mr. Jan Faber for their input and support for the cases and their overall input, to the Ethics and Compliance Officers in The Texas A&M University System who provided input during the final editing, to the students of Dr. Porter at multiple institutions who provided input for earlier drafts, and finally to Ms. Lisa Kallman Hopkins for her superb editing throughout the entire drafting of the book from first draft to final submission, and her daughter Ms. Rebecca Leyna Hopkins, helping with her mom's editing. We also thank our publishers at Cambridge Scholars for their willingness to publish the book at the international level in order to bring a better understanding of higher education ethics to colleges and universities worldwide.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO HIGHER EDUCATION ETHICS

> By Fixing our Attention upon the Ideal,
> Ethics Tends to Raise the Level of the Actual.
>
> (Seth, 1899)

Ethics in higher education involves a myriad of individuals and issues, including but not limited to students, faculty, staff, administration, operations, funding, buildings and grounds, research, athletics, and community relations. While there are a significant number of publications on the topic of higher education ethics, there is not one compendium on the five domains within the continuum of decision making to social ethics, which will be discussed here. Within each ethical domain are at least two educational domains that are necessary in ethics planning for higher education ethics course objectives and higher education operations improvement; namely, the cognitive and affective educational domains by Bloom et al. (1956).

By combining a continuum of higher education ethics with two domains from education, a typology can be created for higher education ethics. Presented below are the problems addressed when creating the higher education ethics typology.

Why We Need Higher Education Ethics: Current Outcomes

The problems addressed in this book are numerous, but all are centered around the lack of a higher education ethics typology that can be used to develop cognitive and affective objectives for education, training, and higher education operations improvement. A significant reason for creating the domains in the typology here is to improve the ethical dilemmas created from the increasingly complex nature of higher education organizations. For example, there is a wide array of individuals who have different

perspectives on using the newest technology in higher education and addressing the needs for each student. In addition to students, campus operations, the academic nature of education, and all staffing issues create a systems-based model of operations necessary for better and more informed leadership in the ethics domains presented here.

Both cognitive and affective skills and abilities are important for higher education administrators, and the affective skills become increasingly important as one gains more complex responsibilities in higher education. In other words, excellent cognitive education for higher education administration is important to obtain and sustain good educational outcomes, but the affective aspects of education that instill values on the use or non-use of important interactions with individuals is essential to reach benchmark levels in higher education outcomes.

The following provides several reasons for the need to create a typology of ethics education in higher education. Reasons include both academic gaps in education, as well as social, organizational, and student- level outcomes.

Social, Organizational, and Student Ethical Problems in Higher Education

Ethics issues in higher education have existed since the inception of the college or university, dating back to the first known institutions in the 1100s and 1200s in Bologna, Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge. However, in the United States, those issues did not materialize until the 1600s with Harvard and William and Mary coming into existence, where the opportunity to attend was reserved for those with very capable means—meaning that in those early years, ethical issues in higher education were encountered by only a select few. With the middle classes having increased exposure to higher education in the 1800s with the creation of the land grant universities, and then great masses of individuals attending higher education since the 1940s due to the GI Bill and other similar measures, the ethical issues in higher education increased to the point that several emerging social demarcations have created the need for discussion surrounding ethical issues in public, and private, higher education.

Two of the most profound impacts, both the creation of the GI Bill and access to more relaxed loans for higher education in the mid-20th century, have led to an increase in public funding that has been unmatched in terms of sheer size and number of individuals who can access higher education. Thus, there has been a significant increase in ethical problems in higher education since at least the 1960s, stemming from multiple issues of funding

as indicated above, questions of value-added education due to the higher costs, administration increase due to increased regulations, and other issues discussed below.

Contributing to the ethical problems are the social problems in education and in public policy. For example, the ethicist Josephson indicates that "families, schools and other institutions are failing to teach children about ethics and the negative consequences of unethical behavior" (Wekesser, 1995, p. 15). If ethics were taught in elementary and secondary schools, we might improve problems in higher education and have less need for ethics as a course in higher education programs, or as a continuing education program for those leading higher education institutions.

The fundamental social problem of inappropriate ethics education might not exist in our educational system alone but may be an underlying issue throughout the entire social fabric. Even with a movement toward a more virtuous business and social ethic since the 1990s (Woodward, 1995), we still have a system of decision making based on moral relativism. Even prior to the 21st century, an increase in relativism was acknowledged and examined in a study by the Ethics Resource Center (1995), where they found that lying to supervisors and falsifying records were significant ethical problems in organizations without clear ethical positions. The business atmosphere of the 2000s has only continued to support that type of ethical orientation (e.g., Enron).

Corruption is an important part of the ethics outcomes described above and occurs regardless of science- or religious-based ethics education in schools and higher education. The amount of corruption in society appears to be increasing—or at least the type of corruption that is ethically based. For example, over 50 years ago, Heidenheimer (1970) identified three types of corruption:

> … black, white or grey [with] black corruption involv[ing] actions that are judged by both the public and public officials as particularly abhorrent and therefore requiring punishment [i.e., criminal conduct]. White corruption might be political acts [or administrative acts] deemed corrupt by both the public and officials, but not severe enough to warrant sanction. Grey corruption involves those actions found to be corrupt by either one of the groups but not both. (p. 14)

Within Heidenheimer's framework, we may have more white and grey corruption occurring in higher education, especially when considering incidents where research funds are a "big business" and are important for professors to achieve and sustain tenure. There are also significant ethical issues in higher education athletics, with several evolving issues focused on

remuneration for college athletes that are close to, if not identical, to the professional athletes at the levels directly below major league levels.

Solutions for all the social problems in higher education will not occur in the foreseeable future. However, we can start at the student level, department level (i.e. business ethics), and organizational level, by improving our ethics education in higher education and in continuing ethics education at the operational level.

Ethics for Higher Education Professionals – Both Faculty and Staff

Higher education organizations are representations of the individuals who work in them. The type of higher education organization may contribute to the outcome of education, but it is the process of educating that is at the very essence of higher education. How successfully the process of educating is carried out is based on both the science and art of higher education. There will never be a situation where higher education is a seamless process without ethical issues, but improved ethics education in higher education operations could help reduce the problems found at the organizational and student level.

One example of the ethical problems found in higher education is the potential abuse of power by academic administrators in the disparity of pay within the organization. Many wonder why the average presidential salaries in the highest research doctoral universities are over 10 times that of the average faculty member (Chronicle of Higher Education, 2016). Like their business counterparts, the presidents of research universities are predominantly finance oriented and thus have a greater stake in the economics of the industry. While a president and other academic administrators have longer hours of "on-site" time, they do not necessarily have longer hours than faculty members in toto.

Most faculty members spend a significant amount of long, but flexible hours at home conducting research and writing rather than at the institution itself. Therefore, what justifies the significantly greater salaries of academic administrators over faculty? The primary reason is economics, but not all the disparities may be justified. Those differences in salaries open questions of ethical duty to the faculty members, as well as to staff who are paid disproportionately lower than faculty, with the exception of administrative positions. The disparity is especially evident in private universities, including non-profit and for-profit alike. If there are ethical reasons for the pay disparity there should be, at the minimum, transparency and better communication of the reasons. Authoritarian ethics may provide a rationale

for the pay disparity, with proponents citing the extensive time spent on advanced education and/or experience to become a university president (or chancellor). Thus the requirements for the position (i.e. the inordinate amount of time needed to obtain that degree of authority) is grounds for the higher pay.

These examples of ethical problems in higher education support the need for a more clear and focused emphasis on ethics education in higher education. A starting point for ethics education is to define the differences between morals, ethics, and laws in order to help improve ethics education objectives, improve operations, and in the education of higher education as a discipline.

Defining Morals, Ethics, Laws, and Ethics Issues

> We will be known forever by the tracks we leave
>
> - Native American Proverb

Before the higher education ethics typology is presented, basic ethics issues are discussed to help the reader better understand the context of the five ethics domains. Also, the educational domains outlined by Bloom et al. are presented towards the end of the book to frame the objectives necessary for improving higher education.

Defining Morals

The literature indicates three levels of morals: (1) social or religious context, (2) social and individual relationships, or (3) individual level context. Below is the literature that supports the definition of morals.

According to Corey, Corey, and Callanan (1993), morality is based on culture (e.g., social dogma) or religion. Bowie (1997) indicates that the social component of morality is a "set of standards [that is] acknowledged by the members of a culture" (p. 1). These authors present morality as a coming together of ideas and standards that individuals agree upon.

Boatright (1997) presents morality at the social level as standards of "conduct." Solomon (1996) further suggests that those rules are "inviolable" and point to a specific type of conduct. Flight (1988) and McCollough (1991) more specifically suggest that morals are based on "right conduct." With Flight and McCollough there is a condition of morals that indicates a normative position—namely, that social morals are positive—and point to a specific pattern of ideas and action.

At the social level, Seth (1899) wants us to believe that "moral beings" must learn to be self-controlled—or, in essence, act in a way that is socially acceptable. He indicates that without self-control, society will "control" from a social context by providing laws, regulations, rules, and standard operating procedures, as found in higher education institutions. Seth (1899) also points out that morality is based on social "reason," and society logically comes to specific actions that are accepted and not accepted. This type of moral reasoning most closely resembles ethics, but without the theoretical component. A more theoretical framework has been added to ethics in the last century (McCollough, 1991; Solomon, 1996).

At the level of individuals interacting with society, several authors suggest a normative position. Purtillo (1999) wants individuals to have a "morality" whereby their relations between people are "in peace and harmony"—or in other words, in a way that is socially acceptable for all individuals. Catalano (1995) indicates that the way to learn correct morals is through the "socialization" that one experiences in life, hopefully in an environment or social context that positively reinforces the individual to be "right."

Baier (1958) suggests that morals are accepted from society quite simply because moral reasoning is "superior" to all other reasons—or moral reasoning as a foundation to ethics is a superior ideal. With Baier there is an assumption that morals are positive aspects of living that individuals should follow. The positive aspects are actions that are socially acceptable, such as paying taxes, making morally acceptable decisions, and living without committing crime. Rachels (1999) further identifies moral actions as those that are changed or "revised" based on the interests of others. Rachels reveals how morals can evolve into ethics through changing contexts or different points of view, and with different theoretical perspectives.

At the individual level, authors are more specific as to how morals give us direction for living. Madsen and Sharitz (1992) indicate that morality is "appropriateness," and Shaw and Barry (1998) suggest that morality is proper "human conduct." Ferrel and Fraedrich (1997) point to a specific normative position when they say that morals mean that which is "right and wrong." Flynn (2000) also indicates that morals are right and wrong and, more so, that they involve what is "good and bad, should and should not, and ought and ought not" (p. 3).

Seth (1899) gives us historical perspective as to how morals have changed from antiquity to the 20th century—namely, morals have changed from an emphasis on the political or social ideal to one that is "individualistic." With that change, there is more autonomy in individual

interpretations of morals and less correlation between morals and ethics. Seth further elaborates on the individual orientation towards morals when he says that morals are an "awakening" towards what is or is not supposed to be. It may be that Seth's perspective during the previous two centuries has only intensified towards a more individualistic moral perspective in the 1900s, and especially into the 2000s.

The literature discussed above provides a basis for a definition of morals: ***A set of ideas and actions that an individual believes are correct for living in the respective society.*** Below is a framework and definition for ethics.

Defining Ethics

McCollough (1991), Solomon (1996), and Dewey and Tufts (1908) indicate that ethics were derived from the Greek work "ethos," meaning custom or character. As the word ethics developed, it came to mean both a set of rules (custom), as well as the aggregate ideas of a group (character assimilation). Seth (1899) suggests that the word ethics is also based on the Greek word "good," relative to customs and character of life.

Ethics is partly about what one ought to do, what is right, and what is the right conduct within some form of theoretical framework (Catalano, 1995; Corey, Corey & Callanan, 1993; Dewey & Tufts, 1908; Durant, 1962; Ferrel & Fraedrich, 1997; Garret, Baillie and Garret, 2001; Harris, 1999; Hoffman & Moore, 1990; Paul & Elder, 2003; Pfeiffer & Forsberg, 1999; Shaw & Barry, 1998). Additional authors indicate that ethics is about knowing why society makes decisions, and hopefully to make the "correct" decisions for a "good life" (Beauchamp & Bowie, 1997; Edge & Groves, 1999; MacKinnon, 1998) and "justification" for that life (Solomon, 1996). These authors stress that ethics is a means of helping with the ends of decisions; with the different ethical theories stressing a specific portion of a decision, the process, the end, or both process and end. An overall ethical decision should consider both the process and the end or outcome.

Another perspective of ethics is pragmatic or applied, whereby conflict is resolved or at least is attempted to be resolved. As Hinderer and Hinderer (2001) indicate, ethics is "the study and practice of reasonably resolving situations [where] values or interests appear to conflict" (p. 7).

Paine (1997) suggests that the practice of ethics helps "human interactions"—ideally without conflict. Benjamin and Curtis (1981) believe that ethics should be used to help resolve questions, and Thompson and Thompson (1981) believe that ethics should be used to help with problem solving.

Using the literature discussed above as a framework, the definition for ethics is: ***An aggregate of morals within a specific group used to solve conflicts, with reasons as to why a solution was chosen***. Below is a definition of laws.

Defining Laws

Ethics is based in philosophy, while laws are codified (Paul & Elder, 2003) and have civil and criminal consequences. Ethics and laws do overlap when the spirit of the law is in question. As O'Donnell (1960) indicates, laws are based in "epikeia" or equity, whereby ethics is concerned with the spirit of the law. A person may not be in violation of the law through a strict interpretation, but that person may be in violation of an ethical framework, thus violating the spirit of the law.

Beauchamp and Bowie (1997) explain ethics and the law further when they indicate "law is the public's agency for translating morality into social guidelines and practices for stipulating punishments for offenses" (p. 4). An individual may be punished for offenses of the law, but they are rarely punished for offenses against an ethical framework (e.g., an ethical code). However, people may behave more ethically if there were punishments for "unethical" actions.

When the law is broken, individuals are held accountable for their offense by some "authority" (Darr, 1997). Garrett, Baillie, and Garrett (2001) indicate that punishment is directly related to how that offender affected the "public good." In higher education, the individuals at most significant risk—as may be interpreted by a politician or academic administrator—of offending the public good are professors; that is why we have “tenure” and protection for that risk.

The definition for law is: ***A set of codified rules, subject to change, that limits actions, and the repercussions of going beyond those limits.*** Below are additional ethical issues, beyond those discussed earlier, to better contextualize the ethical domains.

Specific Ethics Issues

There are major ethics issues discussed below that are part of all higher education operations, with ethics theories and decision-making processes that can help mitigate each of the issues. Specifically, we will discuss autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, justice, equity, resource allocation, and negligence. Each issue may be improved in relation to the Henderson Matrix—shown directly after the major ethics issues section—

by mitigating the issue to achieve as close to a legal and ethical outcome as possible.

The first issues discussed are autonomy, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice. Corey, Corey, and Callanan (1993) present these as:

> [Autonomy is] self determination or the freedom of clients [i.e., students] to choose their own direction. Beneficence, refers to promoting good for others. Nonmaleficence means avoiding doing harm, which includes refraining from actions that risk hurting clients. Justice refers to providing equal treatment to all people. (p. 9)

Balancing each of these issues is difficult for faculty members and staff, especially when conflicting moral positions are evident when guiding students towards their educational goals. Conflicts may exist due to the students' unfocused goals, family or friends' ideas for the student, and differences in support by faculty members and staff. However, one means of resolving these issues is to have the students' beliefs known through an assessment of abilities—typically with standardized tests and introductory courses aimed at developing knowledge and skills.

In addition, equity and resource allocation are paramount issues when dealing with limited higher education resources (Herlihy & Golden, 1990). Equity is a framework whereby students do not have their goals "blocked" and resource allocation is a means of "equitable" distribution of services. Several ethical theories can provide guidance for faculty members and staff striving to balance the two issues with those mentioned above (e.g., distributive justice ethics). An example of an equity and resource allocation problem is the issue of higher education at the state level. There is a significant variation in the amount and type of state funding: from significant funding for students, such as the "college promise" program of Tennessee and New York (Katsinas et al., 2021), to limited funding, such as can be found in some southern states.

The final major principle and issue discussed here is negligence. As defined by Harris (1999) negligence "[is] duty, breach of duty, causation and damages" (p. 171). Negligence is most apparent when all four of these components are present. Faculty members and staff can help alleviate "breach of duty, causation, and damages" by recognizing potential ethical issues through the use of guiding ethical theories and ethical decision-making processes discussed in this book. When these three final components are mitigated, negligence and specific potential ethical issues, indicated by Taylor and Kuntz (2021), become less possible. These potential issues are:

- controversial speakers

- intellectual rights/diversity
- inclusion on campus
- courageous leadership (or lack thereof)
- battle over free speech
- inclusive classrooms
- faculty activism
- social media use
- whistle blowing
- collegiality (or lack thereof)
- racism
- sexual misconduct
- compliance issues
- safety on campus
- feminist governance
- restorative implementation
- new Title IX regulations
- college admissions
- free tuition
- equity-driven college tuition
- community-campus relationships
- service learning
- prior convictions for students/staff/faculty members
- Pell Grants
- incarcerated students
- workforce support
- Affirmative Action
- ADA access
- college athletics
- interpersonal interactions

The Henderson Matrix (found in Graph 1) provides guidance on where faculty members, staff, and students may function within these ethical and legal issues.

Graph 1: *Henderson Matrix: Law and Ethics – Why We Need Ethics Theories and Ethics Decision-Making Processes*

Legal and Ethical "Green"	Illegal and Ethical "Grey"
Legal and Unethical "Grey"	***Illegal and Unethical "Red"***

Source: Henderson, V. (1982). The Ethical Side of Enterprise. *Sloan Management Review 23*: 37-47

To help understand how we can operate more in the "Green" (Legal and Ethical), stay away from the "Red" (Illegal and Unethical), and better operate when issues are in the "Grey" (Illegal and Ethical, or Legal and Unethical), this book presents 24 ethical theories and 14 ethical decision-making processes from the literature to help support faculty members, staff, and students in the higher education operational setting.

CHAPTER II

DECISION ETHICS: BASICS FOR ACADEMICS

The authors present the first level of Bloom et al.'s cognitive and affective domains in Table 1 to vividly illustrate for the reader that the literature is replete in providing objectives in ethics issues. The low level of domain discussion is evident in the issues we have been discussing. The first levels have been covered sparingly and higher domain levels were found even less by the authors. If the first levels of cognitive and affective objectives are difficult to find in the literature or accreditation standards, it can be assumed it would be even more challenging to find them at the more specific and higher levels. To date, there is no other text that provides objectives in ethics education for each of the cognitive and affective domain levels and sublevels, especially within the five higher education ethics domains to create a higher education ethics typology.

Table 1. Bloom et al.'s Cognitive and Affective Domains - First Level Only

> *Cognitive Domain (There are two decimal points as originally provided by Bloom et al.) 1.00 Knowledge; 2.00 Comprehension; 3.00 Application; 4.00 Analysis; 5.00 Synthesis; 6.00 Evaluation*
> *Affective Domain (There is only one decimal point as originally provided by Bloom et al.) 1.0 Receiving; 2.0 Responding; 3.0 Valuing; 4.0 Organization 5.0 Characterization by a Value or Value Complex - [Source: Adapted from Bloom et al. (1956)]*

There are at least 24 ethical theories and associated philosophers, along with 14 different ethical decision-making processes, that can be used for any particular ethical situation. All the theories and ethical decision-making processes provide direction for those who need to make ethical decisions.

Table 2 displays different ethical theories within the context of four main frameworks:

1. Normative Ethics (Prescriptive-Based Ethical Theories),
2. Teleological Ethics (Outcome-Based Ethical Theories),
3. Relativistic Ethics (Procedural-Based Ethical Theories), and

4. Communitarian Ethics (Process-Outcomes-Based Ethical Theories).

Legal? Ethical?

Balancing the law and ethics in higher education – no easy task!

Table 2. Major Ethical Frameworks and Associated Ethical Theories

Normative Ethics (Prescriptive-Based)	*Teleologic Ethics (Outcomes-Based)*	*Relativistic Ethics (Process-Based)*	*Communitarian Ethics (Process-Outcomes-Based)*
Natural Laws	*Virtue Ethics*	*Existentialism*	*Communitarianism*
Formalism	*Utilitarianism*	*Relativism*	*Normativism*
Deontology	*Positivism*	*Rationalism*	*Nominalism*
Rights/Entitlement	*Obligationism*	*Egalitarianism*	
Authoritarianism	*Distributive Justice*	*Contractarianism*	
Descriptive Ethics	*Egoism*	*Pragmatism*	
Transcendentalism		*Intuitionism*	
		Feminism	

Although several different frameworks exist in the literature to classify ethical theories (e.g., scholastic), a more organizational based framework is presented here. Therefore, the structure for an ethical framework used in this book is applied within a systems approach, rather than a more traditional ethics framework based on a non-systems approach. See the addendum for a short history on ethics from antiquity to the current use of applied ethics in higher education.

Normative, Teleologic, Relativistic & Communitarian Ethics

As indicated above, the four ethical frameworks provide a foundation for the different types of ethical theories discussed below. Each framework represents a conceptual model for the respective theories, categorizing the ethical theories for ease of use according to how an ethical theory may support an ethical issue resolution (e.g., normative ethics for prescribing

what must be versus communitarian ethics that assesses both process and outcome). We emphasize five ethical **"prime"** theories as those most useful for the majority of higher education ethical issues resolution / mitigation, and use bold type for those prime theories when discussing faculty, staff, and student situations (i.e., Deontology, Authoritarianism, Utilitarianism, Egalitarianism, and Normativism).

Normative Ethics: Prescriptive-Based Theories and What Must Be

Ethics may be normative in nature, whereby a specific action or thought is supposed to occur regardless of the situation. The process or outcome of the situation is not used to help formulate a decision process: what must occur is simply a given, a situation that "should" be done (Darr, 1997) or "must" occur.

According to Olen and Barry (1996), natural law is based on given "rights." Where natural law is specified in terms of duty, we have deontology ethics as indicated below. The universal imperative of duty is a deontology framework, while the natural law universal imperative is natural rights.

Although natural law is based on inalienable rights and is most heavily weighted in countries with the greatest freedoms of those rights, there is an applied restriction to those rights—namely limited resources. When higher education is faced with increasingly limited resources, natural law may be used to counter those decreases. The natural law for higher education is based on many models, such as those already found in elementary and secondary education, that are available for all regardless of ability to pay—namely free secondary education. Natural law could be an ethical theory used for future free higher education where we educate the "Top 100 Percent" (Katsinas et al., 2021).

The natural law prime directive is: ***All ethical decisions must ensure that individuals' natural rights are provided within universal frameworks, given limited resources.***

Immanuel Kant proposed that formalism is based on the "conscience" of individuals and that moral decisions must be purely interior (Ashley & O'Rourke, 2002, p. 4). Whereas natural rights are provided by nature, formalism is based on the individuals' own morals, defined by parameters of correct social acceptance. Through a multitude of interactions individuals create their own moral positions, and those moral positions are usually fixed after a period of time—usually as young adults. Formalism indicates that those fixed moral positions are used for most decisions, not just as a

consequential input for the decision. The reality is that most individuals will continue to change their own moral formalism as time continues; therefore, formalism is used less as an ethical theory in an operations setting, especially when the setting fluctuates significantly over a short period of time (e.g., funding sources are no longer available and different sources must be sought—as seen by gender specific colleges now needing both genders as potential income for private tuition).

The formalism prime directive is: ***All ethical decisions must be based on fixed morals that do not flow from consequences.***

Prime Ethical Theory – Deontology: The ethical theory of deontology stresses the use of "rules of right and wrong for reasoning and problem solving" (Towsley & Cunningham, 1994, pp. 5-6). Immanuel Kant is best known for his ideas on deontology. Deontology is strongest when using rationalism to make decisions. However, deontology also has at least one significant weakness as described by Seth (1899): "The error of Kant is that the real is sacrificed for the ideal" (p. 161).

Hoffman and Moore (1990) help to clarify the relationship of duty by indicating how Kant believed on this issue: "Kant holds that one ought to perform right actions not because they will produce good results, but because it is our duty to do so" (pp. 14-15). Kant emphasizes this ideal duty, whereby a bad result may occur, but it may be ethical if and only if the actions leading to the bad result were duty bound. McCollough (1991) emphasized the strong Kantian notion of duty over outcomes when he indicated that "[Kant placed] unconditional stress on the notion of obligation or duty" (p. 55).

In some higher education cases, duty may indeed be more important than the outcome, especially when that outcome falls into the gray areas within the Henderson Matrix (legal but unethical, or illegal but ethical) (1982). The consequences of the outcome must also be a weighted factor—for example, if a politician is supported by an academic administrator where the support is beneficial for the institution but would reflect poorly on the administrator within the local community.

Where deontology can be extremely helpful for mitigating ethical issues, is to ensure a balance or "appropriate" duty to all. Faculty working with students, must remember that their focus is on all students, with an appropriate duty to ensure each student is addressed with appropriate weight. That weight is dependent on the number of students each faculty member is working with. For example, a faculty member with a heavy workload of five or more courses per semester, each with 50 or more students, will have a significantly different