

**INSTRUCTIONS:** Read the following case study and respond to the two questions at the end. Please do not use more than **1 full page (single spaced)** to respond to the questions. You are free to use your textbook or notes, but this is NOT a team project – each student must work alone, and I will consider it a serious violation of Chapman’s academic integrity code if students collaborate on the questions (or discuss the questions or answers with each other prior to submitting them to me). **Please e-mail it to me in a Word document by the due date.** This assignment is worth 10% of your final grade.

**FACTS:** Susan Helm was the school superintendent in Atlanta, Georgia, in 2014, and she believed that market system values and a data-driven business approach could save public education in depressed areas. She set accountability measures for the entire school district by creating performance objectives that were higher than those required by federal programs such as the “No Child Left Behind” initiative. Teacher evaluations are what dictate a teacher’s salary, pay raises and whether they get to keep their job. School evaluations are what dictate whether the school closes or stays open. Helm required all teacher and school evaluations to be linked to students’ performance on standardized tests. Schools whose students did not make appropriate progress toward the test goals received escalating sanctions that culminated in the replacement of faculty (or, at least, a reduction in pay) and/or the closing of the school.

In 2014, Stephen Lewis was a teacher at the Sparks Middle School in Atlanta. The school was in a run-down section of town that was plagued by high unemployment as well as murders, armed robberies, drug dealing and other serious crimes. Lewis was himself the product of a similar neighborhood in Dallas, Texas, and he empathized with his students and was devoted to their success. He was universally acknowledged as a “star teacher” and a “very hard worker who will go the extra mile”.

Unfortunately, the Sparks Middle School was in a bad situation in 2014 because the Atlanta School Board had classified it as “a school in need of improvement” for the past five years. Unless 58% of students passed the math portion of the standardized test and 67% passed the language portion, the school could be closed down. Its students would then be separated and shipped across town to different schools, and the impact would create an even more desperate situation for the local community.

Marty Banks, the principal of the Sparks Middle School, knew that teachers in the elementary schools that fed into Sparks had changed their students’ answers on the standardized tests to increase the pass rate at the elementary school level. Banks asked Lewis to do the same for his middle school students to ensure an acceptable pass rate at Sparks. If he did not change their scores, Lewis feared his students would lapse into a “Why try?” attitude, the neighborhood school would be shut down, the neighborhood itself would sink further down, etc. He also feared he would lose his job. Thus, Lewis found the exams of the students who needed to get a few more questions right in order to pass, and he changed many of their incorrect answers.

As a result, the Sparks students did better than ever before on the standardized tests and far surpassed the required minimum performance rate. When news of this broke, the attitude and morale of the students skyrocketed, and they could finally hold their heads high with confidence. This process of changing answers continued at the Sparks school for the next five years. However, in October 2019, fifty agents from the Georgia Bureau of Investigation visited the Sparks school and confiscated documents and began interviewing witnesses. The ensuing investigation uncovered the cheating scheme – Banks and Lewis were terminated immediately, and everyone else at Sparks ultimately lost their job when the School Board closed the school.

Lewis clearly was doing what he thought was best for the students, the school, the community and himself. Using the information in Chapter 2, please analyze and answer the following questions:

- A. [70 points] From the perspectives of (1) a deontologist, (2) a consequentialist/utilitarian and (3) a virtue ethicist, was it ethical for Lewis to do what he did?
- B. [20 points] Would it change or influence your opinion under any of the three approaches if you were able to prove that the students' increased confidence and morale resulted in the students being able to perform satisfactorily in high school without cheating? If so, why? If not, why not? For this question, you may assume that this ultimately results in more students graduating from high school legitimately and leads to improvements in the unemployment and crime rates of the community.

**NOTE:** Be sure to explain your reasoning as to each theoretical approach. Please also answer each part of the question only on the basis of ethical principles – not on the basis of whether you think Lewis might have broken any laws.

[10 points] While the bulk of what you will be graded on in this assignment is substantive, I also expect it to be a professionally-written document. In other words, I expect it to be well written, concise and contain no grammatical mistakes. As such, 10% of your grade on this assignment depends on this.