ACADEMIC

An Applied Approach to Ethics: Lessons Learned Along the Way

Kirk Hanson, Former Executive Director of the Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, Santa Clara University

Interviewed by: Douglas Lindsay

Lindsay: If you don't mind, can you tell us a little bit about your journey? Lessons you've learned along the way, how you got into this field, and why you stayed in it for so long, just to give a little background?

Hanson: I was an undergraduate student at Stanford in the 1960s. I had written, as other baby boomers had, about my disgust for bad business behavior. David Packard, later to be Deputy Secretary of Defense, and his protégé John Young, who was to become CEO of Hewlett Packard, invited me to come to Hewlett Packard for the summer and discuss, argue, explore the ethics of business first hand. That introduced me to business and managerial ethics and it caught on. I became fascinated with the dilemmas that people who were leaders and had authority, who had opportunities to create very positive social benefit, but also opportunities to do harm. When I graduated from Stanford, I did a year at Yale Divinity School on a Rockefeller Fellowship and focused on organizational ethics. I studied with Chris Argyris, a noted figure in organizational theory.

Kirk Hanson was previously the Executive Director of Santa Clara University's Markkula Center for Applied Ethics, one of the leading global centers for the study of applied ethics, where he held the John Courtney Murray, S.J. University Professorship in Social Ethics for 17 years. Prior to that, he taught business ethics at the Stanford Business School for 23 years and is recognized as one of the founders of the academic field of business ethics. He has been an emeritus faculty member at Stanford since 2001. Hanson writes and has published widely on managing the ethical and public behavior of corporations and their leaders. His current research interests include the design of corporate ethics programs and the responsibilities of boards for the ethical culture of organizations. He was the founding president of The Business Enterprise Trust, the Honorary Chair of the first business ethics center in China, and the first Chair of the Santa Clara County Political Ethics Commission in Silicon Valley. He currently serves on several foundation and non-profit boards, has been honored by the Aspen Institute's Center for Business Education and the American Leadership Foundation Silicon Valley, and has received honorary doctorates from Santa Clara University and the University of Portland for his work on business responsibility.

I came back to Stanford the following year and started an MBA. From day one, I tried to focus on ethics in business strategy and business behavior. I headed a student group called the Committee for Corporate Responsibility. Then on graduation, I helped form a national organization called the Concerned Business Students, which sought to make the study of ethics a part of MBA education. That organization came to be funded by 40 corporations, and had some 50 chapters at business schools around the United States. I've always been an organizer, and I traveled the country to put together this broad coalition of interests. After several years of working with students and faculty at business schools, I decided that I wanted to teach as well. I went to Harvard Business School, and studied and did research as a research fellow. Before I finished my studies, I got hired at the Stanford Business School. They were ready to run with ethics as a part of the Stanford MBA. I taught for 23 years at Stanford. I headed a required course on business and society, introduced elective ethics courses, and helped introduce ethics into established fields like marketing and accounting. I worked with faculty in those fields.

By 2001, I had been at Stanford for 23 years and was eligible for early retirement. I was approached by a friend, the president of Santa Clara University to build an ethics center there. It would represent one of the key values of Santa Clara, which is a Jesuit Catholic University. Therefore, I retired from Stanford, where I have been an emeritus faculty since 2001. I was at Santa Clara for 17 years building The Markkula Center for Applied Ethics from six people to 26 people; from a budget of about $400,000 to $4 million. During this time, the Markkula Center became probably the most active university-based ethics center in the country, working in the fields of business ethics, medical ethics, government ethics, engineering ethics, technology and ethics, and so on - nine fields in all.

The strategy of that center was to work with the academic departments so that they would introduce ethics into their courses. We had 71 faculty fellows from across the university who each had ethics as a subspecialty in their academic field. We also worked with professionals in the community. Among the 26 people on the center staff, were former senior executives in medicine, business, and Ph.D.s - each of whom developed an approach to applied ethics and taught it to students and professionals. This was done initially on the campus, then in the local community, then California-wide, and finally nationwide and even globally.

...my approach to ethical theory has always been with an eye to how do we make this useful for students who are going to be out there in the real world, to the practitioners who are in the real world and need to put this to work tomorrow morning.

Along the way, we published many papers and launched many initiatives. Our main task, however, was to build applied ethics into the curriculum, and to offer these perspectives on applied ethics to professionals in the community.

When I reached 72 years of age in 2018, I decided that I would retire and do other things. Today, I write a newsletter called *Ethics Megatrends*, do occasional articles and interviews such as we're doing here, and I consult with universities on the formation of their own ethics initiatives.

Throughout my career I've always had a bias toward how ethics can be applied to the work of real people, of practitioners. I think a good theory has to be practical and has to be something that's actionable.

So, my approach to ethical theory has always been with an eye to how do we make this useful for students who are going to be out there in the real world, to the practitioners who are in the real world and need to put this to work tomorrow morning.

Lindsay: It's fascinating that you've stayed in this kind of academic world in the business schools, but your work is so very applied. Why the decision to stay on that academic side and not maybe as many people do, transition to more the consulting side? Was it to invest in the future of the field? What was it the draw for staying in that one versus the other?

Hanson: I actually considered becoming a full-time consultant. There was a point about five years after I started to teach at Stanford that I had to decide. I cut back at Stanford to halftime and started a consulting firm called the Hanson Group. We did ethics consulting from 1986 to 1991. This was the time when the Defense Industry Initiative on Business Ethics and Conduct (DII) had been created. The DII was created partially on the basis of an approach I had developed with General Dynamics and McDonald Douglas in the early 1980s.

I was deeply involved in those early days of the DII. I was the keynote speaker for the first two years of the DII annual conferences. The Hanson Group, which I had formed, did ethics consulting for 15 defense contractors and about 25 other firms. But I really enjoyed the academic world and I enjoyed challenges of combining the two. At that point, I was promoted to Senior Lecturer at the Stanford Business School which gave me longevity there.

I had a second temptation to leave academia in 1990. Norman Lear, the television producer, and Jim Burke, who was chair of Johnson & Johnson, and several other leading business, entertainment, government and labor figures decided to form a national awards program for exemplary behavior in business. I was hired as the chief executive of that organization, the Business Enterprise Trust. I held that position while also keeping a foot in Stanford. I ran five years of the awards program, of awards ceremonies, modeled on the Nobel Prize and other big global prizes. We created cases that were taught widely in business schools and each of the awards resulted in a video and a case that we could then promote for educational purposes. I was able to tie the awards program to benefit business education. After five years, I made the choice to go back to academia full time, and stayed at Stanford until my early retirement there in 2001.

Lindsay: I imagine you could see the direct impact daily, but it does take a toll in terms of just the prep, and the moving, and the doing all of that.

Hanson: Consulting and running the national awards program demanded that I be on the road much of the time. I had three young children and a spouse who was as active professionally as I was. When I returned to academia full time, my wife had the opportunity to work with the Clinton administration on the Presidential Commission on the Information Infrastructure Ahead, the so-called Gore commission on the information superhighway. She was traveling to Washington and the stability of going back to academia was a good idea if we were going to survive as a family.

Lindsay: I imagine that took some work to figure that balance out, but it sounds like you were able to find the perfect seam between really bringing that applied nature. That's one of the things that I noticed as I was going through my educational experience. It was not hard to find someone who was well steeped academically. It was also not hard to find someone who was well steeped in the practical. However, somebody that could really bring that together, and really talk about why both are important, was actually really, really hard to find. There were just a handful of people that I remember that could really do both and be able to speak both languages.

Hanson: I was extremely fortunate to have the opportunity to develop my knowledge and skill in both academia and the world of practice. I had enough academic background from several years of study at Harvard and Yale to get the job at Stanford. Later, I was given an endowed chair at Santa Clara University, and since have been given two honorary doctorates from universities. I had the MBA and did lots of consulting. I held administrative jobs at Stanford in the dean's office.

It's very hard to find somebody who has that combination of academic and practitioner credibility who can introduce applied ethics in a practical way. When I was being interviewed at Santa Clara, the philosophy department asked to interview me separately and I prepared very thoroughly. I was able to answer their first three questions with philosophical references and categories, and demonstrate academic ease in response. I never got another question in my 17 years at Santa Clara University about my academic credentials.

Lindsay: Because you've done your homework. I think that hits on a really important aspect of being able to be competent as well as confident in both domains. It's a different skillset, I think. Being able to be credible enough, where you know what you know, but you also are aware of what you don't know. To be able to be able to speak in that way of understanding the value of, where you give deference to the academic work and the study and the research that's been there, but you're able to synthesize it in a way where a CEO goes, "Look, I don't have three days to dig through an article and understand all the little nuances that go in there. What does this really tell me about my people and how I show up as a leader?"

I think conceptually, everybody gets it and goes, yeah, we know it needs to happen, but what was that like, trying to build that idea into an already, probably, robust curriculum, a robust mindset about, no, this is how we do business education? This is really what we need to focus on. Was it met with open arms or was there some, some give and take?

Hanson: Business education has been slow to integrate ethics into the curriculum, though much progress has been made in the most recent years. There was a perceived ethics crisis in business when I was hired in 1978 at Stanford. Business had been deeply embarrassed by two scandals during the 1970s. The first was the Nixon reelection campaign in 1972. About one hundred companies had given illegal political contributions to the Nixon campaign, washing the money through accounts in Mexico or elsewhere. There were many questions why companies were willing to do that. Wasn't big business the conscience and strength of the county? The second scandal was, as they were called, "unusual payments abroad," overseas bribery. That scandal broke in 1977-1978 with charges against Lockheed for bribing Japanese politicians to sell aircraft. Some 200 of the largest companies in the country were prosecuted for instances of overseas bribery. In both scandals, interestingly, there were prominent graduates from Stanford involved. Arjay Miller, Stanford Business School Dean at the time, felt something had to be done in the curriculum.

I was a known commodity to Miller, having been a corporate responsibility activist in the early 1970s in the Stanford MBA program, and then nationally with the Concerned Business Students. Arjay engineered my hiring. When I arrived, Arjay said to me, "You're the 'it' person now for ethics. Anytime anybody sends me something pleading for us to deal with ethics, I'm sending it to you." It was a challenge to be a change agent, and I loved that challenge.

Over the first two years, I convened national research conferences involving all of the academics around the country who were in this emerging field of business ethics. Those first two research conferences laid out the key issues that later we dealt with in business ethics.

It also built for Stanford and for me, a network of academics. This helped me get some of the academic credibility I needed. Then I began to build courses and respond to requests from other faculty who wanted some help for a case or a session on business ethics - in accounting, marketing, decision sciences, or other fields.

Publishing in business ethics exploded in this period. Several of the first textbooks in business ethics were published in 1978, the year I came to Stanford. In the prior 10 years, there might have been five books on business ethics published. In 1978, there were 10 books on business ethics published. It escalated from there. The first professors of business ethics were appointed in 1978. One of my friends got the call to join the Harvard Business School faculty. I left Harvard where I'd been doing research and he was hired at Stanford. At Wharton, they asked the person doing business law to do business ethics as well. It was the time that the major business schools all moved in unison to deal with business ethics.

Lindsay: There aren't many periods of time where there's such a call to arms, so to speak, on a particular topic to move. Academia does not move often and certainly not often in unison. With the idea of business ethics in mind, I know you recently wrote this book on corporate misconduct called, Rotten: Why Corporate Misconduct Continues and What to Do About It. You talk a bit about, there are certainly rotten apples, which can spoil a barrel. You can also have a rotten barrel, which can spoil the apples, and then you can have kind of a combination of both. So, as businesses or as universities, how are we doing with this notion of really thinking about ethics, where we're at and the progress that you've seen, or where are some challenges we're still facing?

Hanson: I'm both optimistic at the progress we've made in business ethics and pessimistic that we still have so many scandals. The pessimistic side of me is captured in the title of this book but the text presents a very upbeat tone. We address all the things we can do to limit the misconduct.

I think there's been tremendous progress in academia, and in business, and other institutions in addressing ethics. In academia, business schools all have an accreditation requirement now to deal with the ethical and social environment of business. More than half deal with that by having a business ethics course. Stanford Business School made "Ethics in Business" a required MBA course after I left, and it is now being retitled "Values and Leadership." There are business ethics faculty positions at virtually every business school now. In fact, there's a great shortage of business ethics assistant professors. So, it's a good field for someone to go into at this point.

So I do believe the academic world has taken many positive steps to introduce ethics across the curriculum. In other applied fields like engineering ethics, medical ethics, and legal ethics, there are many new initiatives. In military ethics, you've had interest in it all along, but my understanding is that there's a greater commitment at the service academies to ethics and character development. But academia has sometimes not had as much of an applied focus as it might. Most academics are trained as theorists and researchers. The challenge is to have faculty teaching in professional schools, business schools, engineering schools, and medical schools who can talk about the practical aspects of making ethical decisions.

In the corporate world, there has been substantial progress, accelerated in 1986 when the DII came into existence. There was a series of guidelines that called for an ethics program and an ethics officer. Then in 1991, the first version of the United States Sentencing Guidelines was adopted, whereby judges could take into account if the company had a good ethics program and reduce fines for misconduct. The presumption was that if the company had a good ethics

program, the misconduct was more likely due to a "bad apple" and not to a bad corporation. Suddenly, every corporate general counsel said, we got to have an ethics program and ethics officer to protect us at the point of sentencing and setting fines. From 1991 on, the Sentencing Guidelines had been made more explicit in terms of what constitutes a good ethics program. Also, the Department of Justice has given prosecutors the ability not to charge a company in the first place, if the company had a good ethics program. This has greatly encouraged the creation of corporate ethics programs.

Lindsay: So, they were trying to narrow down the responsibility to where the action really happened. Was it a toxic culture? Was it an independent actor? That kind of thing?

Hanson: It was the 'bad apple' versus 'bad barrel' debate. They said, if you can show us that it was a good barrel that had a good ethics program, we won't charge the company (the barrel) with a crime. We will presume an individual has engaged in the misbehavior. Companies rushed to expand their ethics programs. Today, you have quite a global enterprise around ethics and compliance programs. The remaining problem, as documented in our book, *Rotten*, is that ethics programs were taken over by people who were more compliance oriented. Ethics programs became ethics and compliance programs. In many companies now, they are just compliance programs. They're aimed only at black and white, legally defined regulations and laws. Today, too many of the programs are aimed at simply fulfilling the requirements of the prosecutorial guidelines and the sentencing guidelines, and not genuinely trying to create an ethical culture in organization.

... ethics programs were taken over by people who were more compliance oriented. Ethics programs became ethics and compliance programs.

Lindsay: Which we know from the leadership side of things is a very impactful thing in terms of how the leader sets the culture of what's going to be established, what's going to be allowed, what's going to be done. But if you'd end up being in a compliance reactive phase versus a proactive developmental phase, you're going to get a different look. How do I stay out of trouble versus how do I bring this out in the culture where it stops it before we ever get to that point in the first place, right?

Hanson: Exactly. So you have a continuing problem, which during the 1960s came to be called the "GE wink." The phrase originated in a trial sometime early in the 1960s, in which General Electric was accused of price fixing. One of the GE witnesses was asked, "Didn't you get a briefing from your general counsel not to engage in price fixing?" He said, "Yes, but then he winked at us as he gave the briefing." So that came to be known as the "GE wink", and companies giving lip service to ethics. That's still a problem today. Companies will often go through the formal briefings but will not take them seriously. Company trainers may make derisive comments about how we have to do this because of some compliance requirements and not because it is really important.

Lindsay: No, I appreciate your comments about being optimistic and pessimistic, and being able to see both because clearly, I think there are some people who say, organizations today are no worse than they've always been. We're still having the same issues that we have ever had. There tends to be a little bit of a narrative out there of like, oh, maybe it seems like it's getting worse than it ever has been. I'm more on the former - I think it's always been there to some degree. I think some people manage that a little bit better than others.

Hanson: In our book, *Rotten*, we did not take a stand on the question of whether business behavior is better or worse today. All we observed was that profit scandals continue. Given the huge investment corporate America has made in addressing ethics and compliance, it's discouraging to see scandals continuing at least the same rate.

Lindsay: I don't know the ethics numbers, but if we look at leader development, it is a $60 to $70 billion a year enterprise, which sometimes subsumes ethics as part of that. It is a bit disheartening that there is such a heavy investment in that domain and yet we still see these, often-independent actors, but sometimes-corporate entities, engaging in these practices.

Hanson: Maybe it'd be useful to put on the record, my sense of what have been the major contributions to an applied approach to business ethics.

Lindsay: Absolutely. That would be great.

Hanson: So, if the question is, "What have been the milestones in the last 50 years in trying to come up with an applied approach to ethics?" I would point to six critical lessons we have learned.

The first lesson is how ethical reasoning applies in practice. The philosophers believed that one was either a utilitarian or a justice theorist. In practice, the pragmatic American approach to ethical decision making combines multiple approaches to ethics. The early work I did at Stanford and the work that was done at Santa Clara, came up with an ethical decision model which encouraged people to ask at least five different types of ethical questions in making an ethical decision. The first question addresses utilitarian concerns. What action produces the greatest good, and the least harm? The second question addresses the rights and duties of all involved - do individuals affected by my decision have certain rights I should respect? And, do I have certain duties, for example as a military officer that apply in this situation? The third question is about justice, what's fair here? The fourth question is about the common good. Does the action that you're proposing to contribute to the health of the community in general? And, the fifth question is the virtues approach. Does my decision model honesty, integrity, compassion, and other core virtues that characterize humans at their best? To make a practical ethical choice, the decision maker asks all of these questions. There are occasionally conflicts between the answers to these five questions, but they're all valid ethics questions and ought to be asked for a full understanding of the problem. This first lesson emerged in the early 1980s.

The second lesson was that we are influenced by the context and by the culture that we operate in. We began to ask questions about how did this particular behavior come about? Was it influenced by things that your commander or your boss said? Did it happen because "that's the way we do things around here?" Interest in corporate culture increased in academia, and those in organizations who wanted to improve ethical behavior began to put a spotlight on the ethical culture. This lesson emerged in the late 1980s and spread from corporate culture to culture in all large organizations including the military.

The third lesson was an understanding of personal character. The military had more of an understanding of the importance of character than other institutions of society. While some religious institutions had focused on character, the practice of business ethics and medical ethics had not focused on character. There was a renewal, or perhaps a discovery amongst many of us who were working in business ethics, of how important individual values and character are to behavior. Are your values strongly held? Can you resist a request to do the wrong thing? Character education became the theme that spread down into the K-12 years as preparation for a life in business or the military.

The fourth lesson was the importance of moral formation and moral development, a theme strongly related to character. Lawrence Kohlberg, a Harvard ethicist and philosopher, argued that you start out as a young child with a pleasure-pain kind of morality, and progress through levels of moral maturity. Some never progress above "whatever makes me feel good." Others reach a level that believes morality is defined by laws and regulations. Finally, Kohlberg said the most advanced among us come to be guided by "principles" even if they conflict with the law or what an authority tells us. So, we began to teach applied ethics a bit differently, and cases became more standard in ethics education. Kohlberg put a huge emphasis on cases, believing that you had to grapple with real situations of increasing complexity to mature morally.

The fifth lesson was is the importance of roles, and the ethical obligations that come with specific roles. I think two things happened in the 1990s and 2000s that led to this. One was an understanding of everyday ethics - that we make ethical choices continually. If we are a platoon leader or first level supervisor, there are day-to-day decisions regarding performance evaluation, discipline, and fair treatment that steadily come to us. Similarly, there are unavoidable and daily choices which accompany every role we play – as spouses, parents, voters, and volunteers. For the manager, it's how can you be compassionate and build a culture of acceptance with your individual employees, but at the same time, have high standards of performance and render discipline when needed? The concept of unavoidable ethical choices in particular roles allowed us to build courses around the dilemmas that accountants face, dilemmas that doctors face, dilemmas that nurses face, and so on. It also helped stimulate the growth of applied fields like medical ethics, engineering ethics, and military ethics. And this has had a big impact on how we teach applied ethics – addressing the unavoidable ethical dilemmas in a field or role.

The sixth lesson is what is being called behavioral ethics. People may know the "right" thing to do, but don't always do it. Paralleling development in behavioral economics, ethics scholars have developed many insights in the 2010s about behavioral ethics. The first insight was "bystander theory" which emerged earlier. People will intervene to help another in need if others do so as well, or even if they are alone. But often groups of people will stand by idly while someone suffers if others are not intervening. Many other insights, including when reminders and "nudges" can result in more ethical behavior, have been developed. We are all subject to behavioral biases that influence how we make ethical choices. Today behavioral ethics is the most active field of academic research in ethics.

Lindsay: I like the focus on behavioral because it gets into things like here is what I do, what my role requires me to do. There is also what I want to do, my intent, my purpose, and all of that at, but then there's what I actually do. We have to rectify that discrepancy, that gap between what I say I do and what I actually do, and understanding what is it of my role that's requiring to pull me in one way versus what I say. It gets into things like my identity. How I see myself, who do I want to be? How do I want to show up? From an education side, if I know that 99% of accountants are going to face these very predictable things, it's almost naive or disingenuous of me not to introduce that and say, you're going to face this. I like that notion of saying, here's what we know you're going to face in a general sense, but no kidding, here are six things that you're going to wrestle with in your first two years as a CFO that you need to not be naive about. Right?

Hanson: And that approach has been the core commitment in my teaching at Stanford. As I began to understand the notion of unavoidable dilemmas, I built my ethics course around the set of unavoidable ethical dilemmas in a business career. I did a lot of surveying of my consulting clients about what dilemmas you most

frequently encountered? I've have many thousands of surveys about what their dilemmas were. It allowed me, for my MBA course, to develop a list of 20 most common ethical dilemmas in business. These became the 25 sessions in the course. I also had some theoretical reading and a case to go with each one.

I am now writing a book on unavoidable ethical dilemmas in a managerial career, which may end up being three small books. I would like for people to read the three at different stages in their career. The first will address the ethical dilemmas of a newly hired employee or someone in their first five years of work. When you are a subordinate, not a manager, you have characteristic ethical dilemmas. You have other ethical dilemmas as a supervisor or manager. , It's the first time you're supervising people, leading a small team or platoon. What are the unavoidable ethical choices involved in that role? You have an alcoholic employee, or the non-performer, or a conflict between two of your subordinates. The third small book will focus on the ethical dilemmas facing senior executives, the manager who manages other managers. The ethical dilemmas that I've been teaching sort well into those three stages. I hope to communicate, as you said, that everyone who works in an organization faces certain dilemmas. Anyone who becomes a boss or a manager faces other dilemmas, and those who take senior leadership positions face other specific ethical dilemmas. I am thinking of titling the series *"It Comes With the Territory."*

Such a theme could address many other roles. You could do a book for the young employee in accounting, for employee in engineering, for young lawyers, for young military officers, and so on.

Lindsay: I like that because it makes me think of two things. One is, that idea of these ethical dilemmas that occur are not a sign of weakness or challenge or lack of character or anything like that. They are just predictable events that everyone's going to face. So, when you feel challenged as a leader or in that dynamic, it's not a matter of, oh, there's something wrong with me or I'm not doing something right. They are predictable and they are consequential. I like that explicitness of, no, I doesn't matter who you are, it doesn't matter where you work, these are things you're going to come into contact with. Now, you may not pay a lot of attention to it, or you may ruminate on it for a long time, but it will hit you at some level. Then, the other part that you talked to out that I think is critically important is, across the entire lifespan of a leader.

Hanson: Business corporations have always recognized that when one becomes a manager for the first time, you need specialized training. There is generally extensive training for first time supervisors and managers. And yet few of those organizations include ethical dilemmas of those first time managers into those programs. That is badly needed. Similarly, a lot of companies now have training for people to become division general managers, but very few of them deal with the specific ethical dilemmas that face those division general managers. You could have a guide for beginning officers and enlisted personnel, for more senior who take on supervisor roles.

The best book on unavoidable ethical dilemmas in the military that I have read was by a platoon commander, an Army second Lieutenant who wrote up all of the dilemmas he faced in his first deployment in Iraq. It is fascinating because it's just dilemma after dilemma that are predictable and unavoidable. It's exactly what a platoon commander actually faces. He came and did a presentation of selected cases at Santa Clara for our ROTC units that was very well received. They were spell bound by stories of these unavoidable dilemmas. He presented the dilemmas and gave them a chance to argue about them in small groups before giving his own views. His name is Nathaniel Fick, and the book is *One Bullet Away: The Making of a Marine Officer* (2005). Fick is now CEO of a cybersecurity software company.

There is an important lesson I have learned that goes beyond how ethics is taught in universities and military academies. Each job an individual takes in an organization has slightly different unavoidable ethical dilemmas. Someone joining a research group has one set of unavoidable dilemmas; one joining a marketing group has another set. When one switches from a technical job to being a supervisor, he or she needs coaching about the dilemmas to be faced. Bosses therefore have an obligation to prepare every new employee to address such ethical choices.

I moved from nonprofit management to being a professor early in my career. The senior associate dean sat down with me one-on-one and said, "Let me tell you a little bit about what it's like to be a professor and what it's like to have the obligations of a professor." He was a natural ethics educator. He took me through five or six dilemmas that I'd face in the first year. I did face them. He was right. And I was able to handle them much better because I recognized them and had thought them through in advance. Among the dilemmas were: how to be fair to a student who gets sick or has a death in the family; how to deal with an emotional student; how to handle an appeal from a student who may flunk out if you don't raise his or her grade; how much time to dedicate to the student who imposes on your time; how to balance your obligations to the university with your life as a consultant – or a member of a close family.

I have come to believe it is model behavior on the part of a boss to help new employees see the unavoidable ethical choices they will face. It is also an essential obligation of an organization to help those who get promoted to understand the unavoidable ethical obligations of the next level of management. Those of us in professional education, including those teaching in service academies, have an obligation to prepare people for their roles and for the ethical obligations, they will take on.

◆ ◆ ◆

I have come to believe it is model behavior on the part of a boss to help new employees see the unavoidable ethical choices they will face.