Abstract

Engineering ethics is being taught to Environmental Engineering students at Tennessee State University (TSU) in context with the broader aspects of environmental justice issues. The content regarding engineering ethics and environmental justice issues is presented in case studies as part of a required environmental engineering course titled Environmental Impact Analysis. The case studies also present the implementation of Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) via the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations”, was accompanied by specific guidance from the president regarding recognizing the importance of procedures under NEPA for identifying and addressing environmental justice concerns. In this regard case studies that facilitate the interpretation of NEPA naturally extend to engineering ethics and environmental justice issues. Traditionally, engineering ethics have been taught only in terms of micro-ethics – the individual ethical decision-making of the engineering professional. However engineers are more and more expected to be moral agents responsible for helping to develop solutions to societal ethical problems. Unfortunately, macroethics problems don’t fit neatly into traditional engineering education and the unavoidable fact that there are no concise “right answer” that can be imposed by the individual engineer challenges the typical engineering student’s worldview. In this regard we need to change the way engineers think about ethics and a change in pedagogy is needed. Furthermore, an element of critical pedagogy is indicated to correct the worldview of engineers regarding ethics. Critical reflection is key to significant shifts of frames of reference. In this context the goal of encouraging students to view engineering ethics through the lens of environmental justice issues is motivated by transformation learning theory. During the first half of the semester lectures covered NEPA and EIA in the conventional manner and research papers were assigned for EIA case studies. Beginning at midterm the relationship of environmental justice issues to NEPA and EIA were introduced and subsequent case study assignments also involved environmental justice issues. For these case studies, the student’s role played the various stakeholders on both sides of the case study issues. Anecdotally the impact of the intervention was immediately reflected by an increased level of class participation and discussion of ethical dilemmas posed by the case studies. To assess the impact on student outcomes regarding engineering ethics a survey was administered at the end of the semester regarding the engineering ethics content of the student’s previous technical engineering courses. For comparison purposes the survey included several questions similar to questions from a survey at Stanford University over a three year period. Relative to the Stanford results, the survey indicated a dramatic increase in the interest and awareness of the EIA course students regarding the role of engineering ethics in society. The survey results excluding the impact of the EIA course are very similar to the Stanford results and indicate that almost all the students expect to face ethical issues during their careers, but less than one-third say they have discussed an ethical issue in any of their technical engineering courses.

1.0 Introduction
The ethical and societal aspects of engineering practice are the subjects of several ABET 2000 outcomes. ABET 2000 criterion 3(f) states that "Engineering programs must demonstrate that their graduates have an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility." Criterion 3(h) states – "Engineering programs must demonstrate that their graduates have the broad education necessary to understand the impact of engineering solutions in a global and societal context." And, Criterion 4 requires that program graduates have design experience...that includes most of the following considerations: economic, environmental, sustainability, manufacturability, ethical, health and safety, social, and political" 1, 2. Notwithstanding ABET requirements, a recent survey indicates that 80% of engineering graduates attend schools that have no ethics-related course requirements. Even at schools that have courses with ethics-related content, the courses are usually in philosophy or religion and have no specific engineering ethics component 3. Notwithstanding these deficiencies, the American Society for Engineering Education’s (ASEE) Statement on Engineering Ethics Education sets a high bar for engineering educators. It states 4:

“...To educate students to cope with ethical problems, the first task of the teacher is to make students aware of ethical problems and help them learn to recognize them. A second task is to help students understand that their projects affect people for good or ill, and that, as “moral agents” they need to understand and anticipate these effects. A third task is to help students see that, as moral agents, they are responsible for helping to develop solutions to the ethical problems they encounter...”

These directives on inclusion of ethics in engineering education have garnered a great deal of interest in formulating exactly what elements of ethics belong in the engineer’s ethics education. Traditionally, engineering ethics have been taught only in terms of micro-ethics. Micro-ethics pertain to the individual ethical decision-making of the engineering professional. However engineers are more and more expected to be moral agents responsible for helping to develop solutions to societal ethical problems. Consequently engineering education must include elements of macro-ethics. Micro-ethics pertain to the ethics of the broader collective and social decision-making. Responding to macro-ethics issues requires individual engineers to understand ethics in a social context and address these issues with leadership and communication skills 5. This skill set for solving ethical problems is paramount to environmental engineers since environmental engineering designs often incorporate elements for the input and representation of diverse societal groups. As a matter of fact, the goal of EIA is to develop a framework for implementing an action or project while addressing societal issues in a structured way.

Unfortunately, macroethics problems don’t fit neatly into traditional engineering education and the unavoidable fact that there are no concise “right answer” that can be imposed by the individual engineer challenges the typical engineering student’s worldview (student’s perceived “common sense”). In this regard a change is needed in the way engineers think about ethics and a change in pedagogy is needed. Furthermore, an element of critical and transformative pedagogy is indicated to encourage critical thinking by engineering students regarding ethics 6.

At TSU the content regarding environmental justice issues is presented in case studies as part of a required environmental engineering course titled Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA). The case studies also present the implementation of EIA via the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Executive Order 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations”, was accompanied by specific guidance from President Clinton regarding recognizing the importance of procedures under NEPA for
identifying and addressing environmental justice concerns. In this regard case studies that facilitate the interpretation of NEPA naturally extend to environmental justice issues. In Environmental Engineering practice, ethical concerns are intrinsically tied to social and political environmental justice issues. Case studies that demonstrate failures implementing NEPA and resulting in environmental injustice, intrinsically involve ethical conflicts for engineers involved in the cases. Engineering ethics issues that arise in this manner are intrinsically embedded in overall impact on society. Role playing simulation of the ethical conflicts was especially effective in exposing the students to macro-ethics problem solving.

2.0 Methodology

Environmental Justice Content

A fair treatment of all the social and political aspects of environmental justice is not possible in the limited amount of time available in an environmental engineering curriculum. Nevertheless, TSU as an urban based HBCU has an obligation to prominently incorporate environmental justice issues into teaching environmental engineering. Environmental engineers are key decision makers in the NEPA process and often serve as liaisons between the public and industry/government. Furthermore environmental justice issues are an integral part of environmental engineering education and should be addressed to some degree in environmental engineering courses such as solid/hazardous waste management and regulatory oriented courses such as Environmental Impact Analysis.

There is a general consensus that minorities and low-income people experience disproportionate exposure to hazardous waste and pollution from waste management facilities. The intent behind environmental injustices aside, the fact is that the poor, working class, and minorities have historically been a disproportionately high share of environmental risks associated with waste facilities. This societal problem persists today in spite of Executive Order 12866 signed by President Clinton in 1993 officially incorporating risk assessment into the U.S. regulatory process. USEPA responded to the Executive Order 12866 with its own Environmental Justice initiative and its own definition of Environmental Justice. Parsing the “legal ease” of EPA’s definition of environmental justice reveals that community residents can influence regulatory decisions that will affect their environment or health by being “meaningfully involved”. Experience often shows that lower income communities are not as well informed especially in the earlier stages of the decision making process regarding the environmental impact of proposed projects or actions. In this regard, the lack of involvement of poor communities in the public vetting process is often due to a failure of government to adequately inform the public. Specifically and in particular for proposed actions that fall under the auspices of NEPA this represents a failure to interpret and implement federal regulations to achieve the goals of NEPA.

Engineering Ethics Content

Engineering ethics refers to those morally permissible standards of conduct that every engineer expects every other engineer to follow. Engineering ethics applies to engineers and no one else. The particular standards that constitute engineering ethics are what ABET requires to be taught to engineering students (not just the philosophical aspects of ethics in general). These
standards consist of formal codes of ethics and informal practices passed on to each new generation of engineers. It is important for engineers to be familiar with these codes and standards and it is equally important for engineering students to be taught the intent of the standards and the nuances of ethical engineering practice. The basic intent of ethics standards is to provide a structured environment for the resolution of ethical conflicts associated with engineering practice. Here the “conflict” is meant to describe the situation where an engineer is drawn in different directions over an issue due to competing considerations. Consequently, an excellent way to teach engineering ethics is to simulate ethical conflict via case studies and challenge students to resolve conflicts within the confines of ethics standards. As depicted in Figure 1 the core of the course remains the technical aspects of EIA. The methodology for delivering the engineering ethics content did not detract from the core technical content of the course. The incorporation of case studies for implementation of NEPA that involve environmental justice issues naturally leads to learning engineering ethics as a related subject. These case studies not only expose the students to ethical conflict resolution but serve to heighten interest and awareness in engineering ethics in general. Studies suggest that stressing the social aspects of engineering can leverage the interest of students that otherwise may lack motivation to study engineering ethics 14, 15.

**Figure 1: Leveraging Interest in Engineering Ethics in an Engineering Course By Incorporation of Environmental Justice Related Case Studies.**

**Pedagogy**

The call for engineers to be moral agents in helping to solve society’s ethical problems may result in an increase in practice based engineering education reminiscent of medicine and nursing education 16. This approach to teaching professional responsibility is at the core of the pedagogy for this course and an integral part of most engineering design courses. In the process of “learning by doing” students are encouraged to develop conscientious habits and the importance of ethical issues to their work is reinforced at every opportunity. Unfortunately as pointed out below the ethics education of engineering students is still severely lacking. There are many reasons for this deficit but one primary reason is the failure to foster critical thinking on the part
of students regarding the application of engineering ethics principles in the context of competing positions of various stakeholders. The worldview ("common sense") of a typical engineering student is strongly influenced by their perceived hierarchy of engineering knowledge and epistemological assumption that the authority lies with the professor and textbook to determine what is correct and incorrect. This worldview applied to engineering ethics is reinforced by the way that micro-ethics are taught to engineers. For example the Fundamentals of Engineering Exam offers multiple choice ethics questions suggesting that ethics problems can be solved in an analytical fashion like other engineering problems. This worldview is problematic for learning macro-ethics where there is often no single, precise “right answer” and where the power to decide what is right or wrong lies in the broader society. This worldview left unchallenged largely precludes critical thought and reflective judgment regarding macro-ethics because it shores up the paradigm that “technology is neutral” and this leads inexperienced engineers to believe that engineering principles can be applied in abstraction and separate from the larger societal picture. Experienced engineers know that this is the realm of abstract science and have learned to negotiate the societal aspects of the larger role of the engineer. In this context it becomes clear that the goal of the pedagogical approach in practical terms is to teach student’s aspects of this particular skill-set that experienced engineers learn in the “school of hard knocks”. A valid pedagogical approach to encouraging critical thought and reflective judgment is to use a critical lens for looking at the world. This approach has its roots in critical pedagogy and in this case the critical lens that challenges the world view of engineering students regarding macro-ethics is the case studies presented that involve environmental justice issues. The EIA course case studies and associated assignments are fashioned to espouse a transformative learning experience for students by challenging their perceptions of themselves and their future profession. This approach can be explained in terms of transformational learning theory (TLT). Mezirow, 2000 describes TLT as follows: “The focus of TLT is on how we learn to negotiate and act on our own purposes, values, feelings, and meanings rather than those we have uncritically assimilated from others—to gain greater control over our lives as socially responsible, clear-thinking decision makers.” This pedagogical approach is a practical response in light of the short comings of traditional engineering education and a growing awareness that engineers need an expanded skill set regarding engineering ethics that allows them to participate in providing solutions to society’s ethical issues.

**Example Case Study Assignment:** Claiborne Enrichment Facility, Homer, Louisiana

During the first half of the semester lectures covered NEPA and EIA in the conventional manner and research papers are assigned for EIA case studies. Beginning at midterm the relationship of environmental justice issues to NEPA and EIA is introduced and subsequent case study assignments also involve environmental justice issues. For these case studies, the students role play the various stakeholders on both sides of the environmental justice issues. One of the case study assignments is based on the proposed Claiborne Enrichment Facility in Homer, Louisiana.

In 1989, Louisiana Energy Services (LES), a British, German and American conglomerate, applied for a government permit to build a privately owned uranium enrichment plant in the United States. A national search was undertaken by LES to find the “best” site for a plant that would produce 17 per cent of the nation’s enriched uranium. LES supposedly used an objective scientific method in designing its site selection process. However lawsuits ensued and dragged on for more than eight years when a three-judge panel of the NRC’s Atomic Safety and Licensing Board ruled that “racial bias played a role in the site selection process”. It was found
that the environmental impact statement prepared by the NRC underestimated the hazards and costs imposed on the nearby low income, minority community and overestimated proposed benefits. Besides that, alternative sites to this location were not analyzed, which is generally required as part of standard NEPA procedures. It appeared that this process favored the corporation trying to build the facility above the stated goal of NEPA to promote the public good. It was further found that in a more affluent community the inequity in burden could have been fought, yet these individuals in their socioeconomic state were uninformed and uninvolved unable to detect and fight flawed EIS for the licensing of a plant that would result in unjustified discrimination. From a technical point of view it was determined that the NRC used a deterministic evaluation process rather than a probabilistic one standard to the industry. In other words, they indicate that contaminants will be limited as much as possible, but do not provide quantitative guidelines for the maximum amount of contaminants that can be released. Basically, the statement speaks in qualitative and subjective terms and is very vague as to actual regulations on emissions.

**Required Reading:** Claiborne Enrichment Facility, Homer, Louisiana

American Society of Civil Engineering (ASCE) Code of Ethics.


**Supplemental Sources:** Claiborne Enrichment Facility, Homer, Louisiana


The written assignment is a 2000 word report describing the projects failure to implement C E Q regulations to accomplish the stated goals of NEPA. The report will cite appropriate regulations from 40 CFR 1500-1508

**Role Playing Exercise:** Claiborne Enrichment Facility, Homer, Louisiana

The role playing exercise extends over a three hour period (two class periods). During the role play the instructor, T.A.s and selected students play the roles of elected official, corporate
official, concerned citizens and environmental activists. The remaining students role play as engineers from a firm representing LRC. The simulation (if successful) results in an agreement between the engineering group and the other stakeholders on how to address issues with the original EIS and reach an agreement to re-consider siting the plant at Claiborne

3.0 Results and Discussion

Below the responses to the survey questions that correlate with McGinn, 2003 are presented and discussed.

Q1: Do you think it might be useful to study such (ethical) issues and conflicts as part of your engineering education?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIA Course</th>
<th>McGinn Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 (94.1%)</td>
<td>1 (5.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69 (100%)</td>
<td>0 (0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.a: Has any engineering-related ethical issue ever been discussed (not just mentioned) in any of your technical engineering classes?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Including EIA Course</th>
<th>Excluding EIA Course</th>
<th>McGinn Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (52.9%)</td>
<td>8 (47.1%)</td>
<td>4 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (76.5)</td>
<td>20 (29.9%)</td>
<td>47 (70.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q2.b: If you answered yes to 2.a, what issue in what course?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>This (EIA) Course</th>
<th>Other Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 (29.4%)</td>
<td>8 (23.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percent of total responses.
Q3: Have any of your engineering instructors ever conveyed anything specific to you about what is involved in being an ethically or socially responsible engineering professional in contemporary society?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIA Course</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 (82.4%)</td>
<td>3 (17.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>McGinn Survey</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 (13.2%)</td>
<td>59 (86.8%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2: Response to Q2.a and Q2.b- Indicating student perception of the ethical content of the EIA course relative to other engineering courses.

Figure 3: Response to Q3-Indicating a dramatic impact of the EIA course on awareness of ethical issues.
Q4: How much has your undergraduate education helped prepare you for coming to grips thoughtfully and effectively with engineering ethical challenges that you might encounter in your career?

0-Not at all
1-Little bit
2-somewhat
3-good deal
4-great deal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EIA Course</th>
<th>McGinn Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5.9%</td>
<td>0-15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-11.8%</td>
<td>1-54.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-29.4%</td>
<td>2-22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-47.1%</td>
<td>3-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5.9%</td>
<td>4-1.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4: Response to Q4-Indicating a dramatic impact of the EIA course on awareness ethical issues.

Q5: In the course of your engineering education have you gotten the message to the effect that there is more to being good engineering professional in today’s society than being a state of the art technical expert?
Robert McGinn, professor of engineering at Stanford University surveyed engineering students regarding the engineering ethics content of their technical engineering courses over a three year period. The survey data revealed that most engineering students expected ethical issues to arise in their future careers but at the same time the data indicated only a superficial and infrequent exposure of students to ethical issues in their technical engineering classes. Research by Shuman, 2004 supports McGinn’s conclusion that engineering students’ ethical learning is inadequate and suggest that an important reason for these low scores is that only a small percentage of students had taken an ethics course (17 out of 120) and none had taken an engineering ethics course. To make matters worse research on the impact of different college majors suggests that engineering education is significantly less effective than other majors in instilling qualities of responsible citizenship and cultural sensitivity.

A survey was conducted at the end of the semester to assess the impact of the course on student interest and awareness of the engineer’s role in societal ethical issues. The responses to questions fashioned after McGinn, 2003 are presented below and compared to McGinn. The response to Q1 by the EIA course students is borne out by the observations by McGinn indicating that most engineering students recognize the importance of engineering ethics in their engineering education. The responses to Q 2.a show a significantly larger fraction of the EIA course students have the perception that engineering ethics was addressed in a significant way in any of their courses. The responses to Q2.b indicated that a significant fraction the students that answered yes to Q2.a attributed their positive response to the EIA course. Excluding the EIA course responders that attributed a “yes” answer to Q2.a to the ethics content in the EIA course show a response very similar to the generic McGinn results. The survey results excluding the impact of the EIA course indicate that almost all the students expect to face ethical issues during their careers, but less than one-third say they have discussed an ethical issue in any technical engineering course. The responses to Q3 and 4 show a dramatic difference in the perception of the EIA course students and the results of the McGinn survey. It is likely that the specific mentioning of social responsibility and the inclusion of environmental justice issues in the course attributed to this result. These positive responses suggest that, at a minimum, the course succeeded in increasing awareness and interest in engineering ethics. The responses to Q5 suggest that students believe more needs to be done to emphasis the importance of ethics in engineering.
4.0 Conclusion

The survey results show that almost all the students expect to face ethical issues during their careers, but less than one-third say they have discussed an ethical issue in any technical engineering course. Furthermore, most students report that they believe it is just as important to be “professional” as it is to be technically expert but very few had learned anything specific from their engineering courses about what this entails. This worldview left unchallenged largely precludes critical thought and reflective judgment regarding macro-ethics because it leads inexperienced engineers to believe that engineering principles can be applied in abstraction and separate from the larger societal picture. The pedagogical approach used in this course to encouraging critical thought and reflective judgment was to use a critical lens for looking at the world. This approach has its roots in critical pedagogy and in this case the critical lens that challenges the world view of engineering students regarding macro-ethics is the case studies presented that involve environmental justice issues. The EIA course case studies and associated assignments are fashioned to espouse a transformative learning experience for students by challenging their perceptions of themselves and their future profession. Anecdotally the impact of the intervention was immediately reflected by an increased level of class participation and discussion of ethical dilemmas posed by the case studies. The survey results indicate a dramatic increase in the interest and awareness of the EIA course students regarding the role of engineering ethics in society. The survey results excluding the impact of the EIA course are very similar to McGinn and indicate that almost all the students expect to face ethical issues during their careers, but less than one-third say they have discussed an ethical issue in any technical engineering course.
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