# Caught, Taught, and Sought as a University-wide Initiative: How Brigham Young University's Center for Teaching and Learning helped Faculty Catch the Vision of Incorporating Character Development in the Classroom

## Julie Swallow

Caught, Taught, and Sought as a University-wide Initiative:

How Brigham Young University's Center for Teaching and Learning helped Faculty

Catch the Vision of Incorporating Character Development in the Classroom

Brigham Young University is a large private research university owned by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. With over 35,000 students and 180 majors, it's no surprise that institutional change happens slowly. What is surprising, however, is that BYU has made no significant changes to its general education program for over 50 years. However, substantial changes are coming soon.

At the end of the 2024-2025 academic year, BYU President, Shane Reese, called an unprecedented all-faculty meeting that focused, in part, on the upcoming initiative to incorporate virtue education into BYU's yet-to-be-revealed new general education program. As it concluded, faculty were asked to respond to the following question: "How can I incorporate character building learning outcomes into the improved learning outcomes for my course?" As they formulated their answer, faculty were asked to "consider how the study of your discipline develops Christlike virtues in your students. And consider improvements to the ways you help your students recognize and develop more deliberately these virtues" (All Faculty Meeting Slides).

While some in attendance that day may have been surprised by the virtue initiative, a small group of faculty who had been asked to pilot a handful of new general education courses

were not. They had taken a workshop I developed with the Assistant Director of General Education, Jessica Green. In my role as a Teaching and Learning Consultant, I have been tasked with learning about virtue education and developing strategies for helping faculty incorporate it into their courses. According to the Jubilee Centre for Character and Virtue, "virtues that make up good character can be 'caught,' taught,' and sought'" within academic settings ("The Jubilee Centre" 2). Character is "caught" by students who attend an institution that has a "positive school community, formational relationships, and a clear ethos" ("The Jubilee Centre" 13). BYU certainly has a "clear ethos." The language used in its mission statement and the language that infuses the Latter-day Saint scriptural canon focuses on becoming disciples of Jesus Christ. Character is "sought" at academic institutions through "practices and initiatives which enable a school to shape a distinctive approach towards character education" ("The Jubilee Centre" 15). This is another area of strength for BYU; it has a robust service organization that makes it easy for students to give time each week to social causes, to take advantage of study abroad opportunities that focus on global wellness initiatives, and and to attend weekly devotionals that invite students to consider their values. Until the recent announcement, however, many faculty assumed that the overt teaching of character would take place in the religion courses students are required to take. In preparation for the incorporation of virtue education into the general education redesign, Ms. Green and I were asked to teach faculty piloting new general education courses how to incorporate virtue education into their curriculum. Over the last three years, sixty-eight faculty members have taken the workshop we developed. Subsequently, those faculty taught new versions of their general education class that were infused with virtue education. This paper explores the four main questions faculty have had about this initiative: "Why now?";

"Why the word 'virtue'?"; "How can virtue be measured?"; and "How will it influence student behavior?"

## Questions about Timing

Some faculty are skeptical about the timing of the virtue initiative. BYU is a religious institution, and it has never been hesitant about highlighting its Christian values. They wear their 22-year streak as the nation's top "Stone Cold Sober" campus with pride, serving free cookies and chocolate milk each year when the Princeton Review announced the list of schools where the most students refrain from using drugs and alcohol.[1] According to its website, a BYU education should be the following: "Spiritually Strengthening; Intellectually Enlarging; Character Building and Leading to Lifelong Learning and Service" ("Aims of a BYU Education"). Virtue is mentioned specifically several times in the document that outlines the administration's aspirations for its graduates entitled "Aims of a BYU Education." All those references come under the description of what it means for a BYU education to be "Character Building." This section begins with the following statement that lists specific virtues BYU graduates will have fortified during their college experience:

> Because it seeks to educate students who are renowned for what they are as well as for what they know, Brigham Young University has always cared as much about strong moral character as about great mental capability. Consequently, a BYU education should *reinforce such moral virtues as integrity, reverence, modesty, self-control, courage,*

---

[1] Past tense is correct here. Princeton Review recently rebranded their "Stone Cold Sober" designation to "Cancel the Keg." BYU has placed first in that category as well for the last two years it has been in existence. But there haven't been on campus celebrations highlighting this new designation.

*compassion, and industry*. Beyond this, BYU aims not merely to teach students a code of

ethics but to help them become partakers of the divine nature. ("Aims" emphasis mine)

However, language like this hasn't found its way into many program outcomes or into the

specific learning outcomes of individual courses. Faculty in our workshop sometimes asked,

"Why is upper administration interested in infusing GE with virtue education right now since it

didn't make steps in that direction in the 1990s when the 'Aims' were written?"

The administration's current push for the incorporation of virtues in program and learning

outcomes is clearly not a departure from the foundational documents for our institution. Yet some

faculty worry about the alignment of virtue language to the far-right cultural conservative

fascination with ancient Rome and Greece.– a fascination that extends to a hagiographic view of

America's founding fathers who lived in a neo-classical era. The ultra-conservative

understanding of "virtue" has undercurrents of white nationalism, anti-feminism, and toxic

masculinity. In a recent New York Times opinion piece, classical scholar Honor Cargil-Martin

explores how some right-wing politicians have co-opted a distorted view of history to push their

political ideologies. She writes:

> The ascendant right wing loves ancient Rome. Its adherents love its glories. They love its
>
> ideals of hard, unbending masculinity. And they love the idea that Rome pulled its own
>
> greatness apart from within. Building on a longstanding American tradition of tying its
>
> history to Rome, the right's leaders have embraced the aesthetic: a bust of Caesar for
>
> Steve Bannon, a pen name borrowed from a fourth-century B.C. Roman consul for the
>
> essayist Michael Anton, a glittering A.I.-generated image of himself as a Roman gladiator
>
> to go with the self-proclaimed title "Imperator of Mars" for Elon Musk.

Cargil-Martin points out that the "intellectual wing of MAGA" likes to suggest that the Roman Empire "collapsed under the pressure of barbarian immigration and sensual excess among the elite," making the connection that modern America is under a similar threat and, therefore, poised for destruction. She also suggests that the Roman Empire wasn't actually crumbling when politicians first began decrying the decline in Roman birthrates and the disappearance of uniquely Roman culture. The rhetoric of fear, however, allowed politicians to justify unlawful behavior and paved the way for the destruction of the republic upon Augustus' arrival as Rome's first emperor. Cargil-Martin sees a similar political strategy in Trump's "Make America Great Again" rhetoric.

However, upper administration has signaled exactly what kind of virtue education they are interested in through their thoughtful selection of forum speakers and it isn't connected to far-right fantansies about the Roman Empire. Every Tuesday, students, faculty and staff gather for a devotional or forum. Devotionals focus on religious themes; forum speakers are generally thought leaders outside the Latter-day Saint community. All speakers who address students and faculty in campus wide meetings are carefully vetted by the AVP's office. During 2025, both Yuval Levin, from the American Enterprise Institute, and Jeffrey Rosen, president and CEO of the National Constitution Center, were forum guests. Both individuals are politically conservative and both spoke about the importance of character development. However, it was clear that their understanding of virtue was not associated with hyper-masculinity or battlefield glory. Rather, their ideas were grounded in the writing of Greek and Roman philosophers such as Aristotle and Cicero. Additionally, both men indicated dissatisfaction with current political leaders who are not demonstrating good character. The choice of these speakers suggests that BYU's upper

administration is interested in character education that has nothing to do with right-wing ideologies founded in a warped understanding of Roman history.

Yuval Levin talked about the importance of institutions in social life. Institutions, for Levin, are forms that provide a structure in which people can work toward the common good. Institutions can range from small groups, like families, to large entities, such as governments. He suggests that the current distrust of institutions is a consequence of people using them as platforms rather than working within them. Integrity is developed by working within instutions for the benefit of the community. He recognizes that institutions were never perfect structures for character formation. However, if someone who works within an institution, be it a family or a hospital, asks themselves, "Given my role here, how should I behave?", they will develop an understanding of what it means to be responsible to a group and to act with integrity. Levin was clear about his dissatisfaction with the institution of the United States government. He told the students in attendance at the forum:

> What stands out about our time in particular is a distinct kind of institutional dereliction. A failure even to attempt to form trustworthy people. A tendency to think of institutions not as molds for character and behavior but as platforms for performance and prominence. When we don't think of our institutions as formative but performative, when the presidency and congress are just stages for performative outrage . . ., they become harder to trust. They aren't really asking for our trust. They are just asking for our attention.

Levin's language is reminiscent of the Greek philosopher, Aristotle, who explained that people should develop knowledge in an effort to make laws "about what one ought to do and from what one ought to refrain. . . . [T]he end of this capacity would be the human good" (2). Echoes of

Cicero can be heard in Levin's forum as well. Cicero felt that eloquence was a powerful tool, one that should only be employed by someone who possesses both "integrity and supreme wisdom" (45). He warns that "if we bestow fluency of speech on persons devoid of those virtues, we shall not have made orators of them but shall have put weapons into the hands of madmen" (Cicero 45). The virtues Levin called attention to most often were integrity, honesty, and loyalty to the common good.

Similarily, Jeffery Rosen's forum address focused specifically on character formation. The inspiration for his recent book entitled *The Pursuit of Happiness* came after noticing that many of the Founders of the Constitution made the connection between the development of virtue and a life of happiness. Additionally, many of those men were deeply familiar with the writings of Cicero and understood happiness to mean something other than simply feeling good. Rosen explains:

> The Founders believed that the quest for happiness is a daily practice, requiring mental and spiritual self-discipline, as well as mindfulness and rigorous time management. At its core, the Founders viewed the pursuit of happiness as a lifelong quest for character improvement, where we use our powers of reason to moderate our unproductive emotions so that we can be our best selves and serve others. (6)

Rosen had learned, while talking to Academic Vice President Collings before the forum, that many BYU students have memorized a specific verse of Latter-day Saint scripture that speaks specifically about the significance of virtue development for disciples of Christ. On his invitation, almost 5,000 students rose and recited section four of the Doctrine and Covenants:

Now behold, a marvelous work is about to come forth among the children of men. Therefore, O ye that embark in the service of God, see that ye serve him with all your might, mind and strength, that ye may stand blameless before God at the last day. . . .And faith, hope, charity, and love, with an eye single to single to the glory of God, qualify him for the work. Remember faith, virtue, knowledge, temperance, patience, brotherly kindness, godliness, charity, humility, diligence. Ask, and ye shall receive; knock, and it shall be opened unto you. Amen. (7)

Rosen told students they were "uniquely well-prepared for the daily cultivation of virtue because you live it." He then urged them to recognize that, while they won't become perfect as they strive to develop these virtues, they will "become more perfect in trying."

Although Rosen did not address this directly in his devotional, he makes it clear in his book that the Founders often failed to live up to their virtuous ideals. Rosen writes:

At times, of course, the Founders shamefully betrayed the moral ideals they set for themselves. Some of them spent their lives as enslavers and notoriously denied the humanity, equality, and inalienable rights of those they enslaved. At least some of the enslaving Founders were aware of their own hypocrisies. Jefferson and other enslavers from Virginia recognized that it was craven greed – following Cicero, they called it avarice – that kept them from freeing those they held in bondage, even as they called for the "total emancipation" of all enslaved people in the future. (12)

This passage could temper some faculty members' concerns that the new virtue initiative is part of an attempt to soften the history of the Founding Fathers, making them out to be men without

flaw. Instead, the messages of Levin and Rosen indicate that the adoption of virtue education at BYU can encourage honest discussion about where early American leaders fell short.

The timing of BYU's turn to virtue may reflect a larger nationwide response to the COVID pandemic. Jonathan Brant, Edward Brooks, and Michael Lamball of whom are scholars associated with the Oxford Character Project, whose mission is to cultivate responsible leaders, suggest that the current cultural climate is fueling a resurgence of interest in the incorporation of character education in universities. They write:

> The COVID-19 crisis . . . revealed the dangers of leaders who lack good character as well as the value of those who embody wisdom, empathy, and compassion. The conspicuous lack of character in some prominent leaders – and the visible presence of it in others – has created more openness among faculty who previously were skeptical of efforts to cultivate virtue in the university. (258-259)

Although administrators have not stated it explicitly, their choice of forum speakers indicates that they are interested in virtue development at BYU, not as a reflection of troubling political trends, but as a response to them.

**Questions about Semantics**

While some faculty resist incorporating virtue ethics into their curriculum due to skepticism, others are happy to do so; they just don't like the word "virtue." For them, virtue has a strong cultural connection to female chastity. And, they aren't wrong. A cringeworthy video made by young Latter-day Saint young men in Utah made specifically for the young women in their organization highlights not only how the word virtue is often code for female sexual purity but also how young women are held responsible for maintaining both their own sexual purity and

that of the men around them. The young men changed the lines from One Direction's song "What Makes You Beautiful," admonishing women that they "don't need short skirts or low-cut shirts" to attract the male gaze. They sing their re-written chorus with earnest intention: "If you only you saw what I could see, you'd understand why I need your modesty. Right now, I'm talking to you, and you must believe, you gotta know, virtue is so beautiful. That's what makes you beautiful" ("Virtue Makes You Beautiful"). Although this video does not reflect the official position of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, it does reflect a cultural tendency to conflate virtue with the idea of female sexual purity. It's no surprise that many of the faculty in our workshop, particularly male faculty, didn't want to engage in a conversation about virtue with their students.

To address faculty concerns about the cultural understanding of the word virtue, we advise faculty to take the time to define their terms and to invite students to be part of that process. When scholars Blaire Morgan and Liz Gulliford wanted to cultivate the virtue of gratitude during their courses, they found that starting with a clear definition was essential. They write:

> If we are to cultivate gratitude, we need to be clear about what gratitude is and how and why it is worth promoting. At first blush, the concept seems uncomplicated – it is, after all, an important element of everyday social interaction and politeness. "Thank you" is one of the first phrases we learn in our native tongue and when we begin to learn other languages. However, as with many concepts, once one digs beneath the surface, a number of complexities emerge. (178)

With their students, they explore the social, emotional, behavioral, and cognitive aspects of gratitude. They also ask their students to consider ways that gratitude can become a vice. In what

ways could gratitude, taken too far, put one at the risk of exploitation (186)? They feel that "in an ideal world, one might want a child to learn these complexities around gratitude as soon as they have the intellectual capacity to do so. [However,] it is quite likely that many people reach adulthood without having reflected on the conceptual contours of gratitude and the pathologies of giving that sometimes feed it" (186).  Few people take the time to explore the complexities of the attributes we call virtues, unless they have spent time in books such as Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* exploring the "conceptual contours" of gentleness, generosity, justice, and temperance among other things. Faculty should engage students in these kinds of discussions if they write learning outcomes for their courses that mention the cultivation of specific virtues.

The challenge of recuperating the word virtue is not unique to BYU faculty. In an essay entitled "The Eclipse of Virtue in the University and in Wider Society," Onora O'Neill, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy at the University of Cambridge, suggests that modern universities struggle to teach virtue because there has been a cultural shift in its meaning. She explains that "contemporary life, including university life, is shaped by a wider culture in which ethics itself has been reconfigured in ways that undermine the cultivation of virtue" (84). What she terms "reversals of perspectives" about matters such as duty and truth make it hard to suggest that anything is inherently virtuous or inherently evil (87). O'Neill articulates the challenge as follows:

> What had once been considered imperfect duties could not count as duties (of any sort)
> and were frequently seen as matters of individual choice or preference. A veneer of
> ethical concern was typically retained by referring to those choices or preferences as
> "values," but for the most part without any effort to show why they are valuable. This is
> deeply problematic: if individuals' choices and preferences automatically count as their

"values," we will have to conclude that those who choose self-enrichment or sadism

merely have different values from some of the rest of us. (87-88)

To counter the cultural relativity of values, students and faculty will need to not only define the

virtues they are trying to cultivate but also decide why and how those virtues are important,

individually and collectively.

Aristotle explains that "virtues are willing things," meaning they are things we actively

choose to do (47). Virtues help us "act well" (13). They help us "bear what fortune brings most

beautifully" (17).  They are what enable one to be "happy throughout life" (17).In our

workshops, Ms. Green and I ask faculty to identify the virtues that their disciplines cultivate and

consider how those virtues contribute to individual and social well-being.

**Questions about Measurement**

During our workshops, the first questions faculty ask about incorporating virtue

development into their courses usually revolve around measurement: "How can we possibly

measure that?" And, perhaps more importantly, "Should we be measuring that?" In the past,

faculty have been warned not to write learning outcomes that they can't quantify. In the recent

"All Faculty Meeting," however, faculty were reminded of a statement by the author of BYU's

Mission and Aims, John Tanner.[2] He states, "My deepest fear regarding assessment is that

faculty will tailor objectives to measures rather than the other way around. That is, that we will

define learning outcomes based on what is easy to measure. This would be a huge mistake

---

[2] John Tanner was a faculty member in BYU's English department from 1982 until his appointment at the president of BYU-Hawaii in 2015. He has also served in the General Sunday School Presidency, a calling that is for the world-wide church. His statements carry a great deal of gravitas. Additionally, he was in attendance during the April's training meeting (although he has since retired) and was asked to stand when the passage from one of his devotionals was referenced.

because there is often an inverse correlation between what is easy to measure and what is important" ("Building"). Although measuring character development is difficult, it is not impossible. And, because faculty are now being asked to incorporate it into their learning outcomes, they will need to think deeply about how students and outside observers will know which virtues they are attempting to cultivate in their courses and what "success" might look like.

It's generally comforting for faculty to realize that, in many ways, they are already measuring virtue development. When asked how they know if a student can accurately consider multiple perspectives as they develop an argument (the virtue of open-mindedness), faculty can usually point to specific things in student work that would provide evidence of that skill. It's harder to determine if a student has developed an intrinsic motivation to manifest that skill or if it is externally motivated by the assignment or the grade. But it is still worth making the development of those skills more apparent to the students in their classroom and helping students see the connection between the skills they are learning and the virtues outlined in the course learning outcomes.

Jason Baehr, author of *Deep in Thought: A Practical Guide to Teaching Intellectual Virtues*, offers six guidelines for faculty as they consider how to measure character development:

1. Approach the process and our findings with intellectual humility

2. Avoid doing anything that might diminish the intrinsic motivation of our students

3. Use the information we collect in ways that are positive and supportive

4. Adopt a relatively narrow and specific focus

5. Be mindful of the different dimensions of intellectual virtues

6. Incorporate input from multiple sources or perspectives. (175)

All of these suggestions are helpful for the faculty to consider as they think about how they will determine what it means to "measure" virtue development.

Perhaps, more importantly, it's helpful for faculty to consider that, while measuring character development is admittedly hard, developing the virtues themselves is harder. Aristotle articulates the challenge of virtue development as follows:

> [V]irtue of character is a mean condition, and in what way, namely because it is a mean between two kinds of vices, the one resulting from excess and the other from deficiency, and that it is such a mean condition on account of being apt to hit the mean in feelings and actions. And this is why it is work to be of serious moral stature, since in each kind of thing it is work to get hold of the mean; for instance, to take the center of a circle belongs not to everyone but to one who knows something, and so too, while getting angry, or giving and spending money, belong to everyone and are easy, to whom and how much and when and for what purpose and in what way to do these things are no longer in everyone's power, nor are they easy; for this reason what is done well is rare and praiseworthy and beautiful. (34-35)

Considering the challenges associated with character development, faculty can put in the thoughtful work needed to design assessments that will give them insight into student character development and articulate what classroom success would look like during the semester they spend with their students.

**Questions about Outcome**

One surprising faculty concern about incorporating virtue development into the university curriculum is that it would result in self-centered students. One workshop participaants asked,

"Doesn't inviting students to engage in perpetual self-evaluation run the risk of making them egocentric?" This faculty members worried that the language used in character development education encourages students to see virtues as a means to an end: I exhibit the virtue of neighborliness, and you write me a good letter of recommendation; consequently, I get into the medical school of my choice and achieve my desired standard of living. Professor of Philosophy, Brian Williams, in his article "Developing Virtue in Emerging Adults: Perspectives from Neuroscience, Psychology, and Sociology," believes that emerging adulthood (the time when most students are typically in college) is the critical moment to focus on virtue development. Students in college suddenly find themselves with more discretionary time, and they tend to use it focusing on their own interests and desires (65). From a neurological standpoint, their brains are in a transitional state. Although they are legally adults, they do not yet have the same neurochemical or anatomical brain structure as individuals just a few years older than they are (59). Williams points out that because emerging adulthood is just an intense time of self-focus, students need support to develop virtue. He worries that, unlike "emerging adults from the fourth century BCE when Aristotle made his observations, contemporary emerging adults appear to receive less personal and institutional guidance for navigating these years than their historical counterparts" (73). Modern students are immersed in cultures of individualism and consumerism. Virtue education may be an antidote to self-centeredness rather than a pathway to it.

Kristján Kristjánsson, professor of Character Education and Virtue Ethics at the University of Birmingham, feels that most forms of modern character education are "unduly individualist" and that this runs counter to the Aristotelian understanding of virtue (58). He writes: "For Aristotle, there is simply no way one can exercise one's personal virtue without benefitting others at the same time" (58). Michael Lamb et al agree. They believe that "virtues

help to shift attention away from narrow self-interest toward the common good and the character required for significant impact in a pluralistic society" (118). For Lamb and his colleagues, universities ought to be actively teaching virtue development because so many of them have "programs that identify social impact and public service among their explicit educational aims" (118).

Kristjánsson and Lamb are calling for virtue education programs at universities that are overtly Aristotelian, specifically because Aristotle saw individual virtue as a collective good. For example, Aristotle calls justice a "complete virtue" because "the one who has it is also capable of putting it to use in relation to someone else, and not just by oneself, for many people are able to put virtue to use among those at home but unable to do so in situations that involve someone else" (81). While Aristotle does call "complete good" "self-sufficient," his understanding of self-sufficiency is not individualistic (10). He explains that "by the self-sufficient we mean not what suffices for oneself alone, living one's life as a hermit, but also with parents and children and a wife, and friends and fellow citizens generally, since a human being is by nature meant for a city" (10). Aristotle felt that virtue encouraged people to be self-sacrificing rather than self-centered: "a person of serious worth . . . does many things for the sake of his friends and his country, and if necessary, dies for them" (174). As faculty in our workshops gained a better understanding of way virtue education is meant to turn students outward rather than inward, they generally became more receptive to the idea.

**Conclusion**

In reality, virtue is always being taught on every university and college campus. It just isn't necessarily being communicated clearly to students. Nigel Biggar, Professor at the

University of Oxford, agrees. He explains why a unified and well-defined approach to virtue education is important on a college campus as follows:

> University teachers often do promote moral virtues in the classroom. . . . But in thirty years of teaching in three universities, I have never heard a single colleague speak of what they do in those moral terms. Why is that a problem? Why is it not enough to promote virtue, without talking about it? The reason that public silence is a problem... is that it results in haphazard success at best and outright negligence at worst. Insofar as the promotion of virtue is not a confessed, articulated, publicly owned aim of university education, professors will not go about it self-consciously and deliberately. When they do it, it will be inadvertent and, being inadvertent, it will be weaker, less systematic, and more invisible. One professor might tactically reward courage in the face of alien ideas, but not justice, far less charity, toward them; another might care little for fidelity to logic and evidence, and much more for rhetorical flourish and ideological compliance. And students, observing that no one ever talks about virtue in the classroom, might reasonably infer that it is a matter of no importance. (106)

After taking our workshop, most faculty agree that incorporating virtue education is important for many of the same reasons Biggar highlights above. During our workshop, we ask faculty to respond anonymously to the following question: "What are your initial thoughts about incorporating virtue into your curriculum?" We get responses that range from concern to enthusiasm. One faculty member wrote, "Trying to do this already, but not sure how successful I am yet!" Faculty members who are "successful" at incorporating virtue education in the classroom are intentional rather than "inadvertent." Our workshops are intended to help faculty

think of incorporating virtue into their curriculum systematically, making it visible for students throughout the semester.

Teaching small groups of faculty about incorporating virtue development into their courses has been both challenging and rewarding. I was surprised by many of their concerns and gratified by their good faith effort to try something new. Ms. Green and I did focus groups with students who had taken courses from the faculty who had attended our workshops. One instructor asked the students to choose a virtue to focus on throughout the semester; they final papers explored what they learned about that virtue through the assigned literature in the course and their own research. One of her students chose temperance and found out that it is "really cool. I actually bought one of the books that I read in the library because it was so interesting."[3] A student in another class said that, although they don't think they will remember too much of the specific details of the course, "I will remember the personal growth that happened to me during that class. Our deep discussions about virtues and the way that the class changed my life." Another student said, "I just felt like my life was enriched by this class, by the discussions of virtues in all of the readings and also in writing the paper." Obviously, students responded well to the changes the faculty made to their courses. They found the material engaging and personally satisfying.

The efforts we have made to pilot courses that incorporate character development into a handful of existing general education courses have taught us that it is a meaningful addition to the classroom, both for faculty and students. The Jubilee Centre Framework for Character Education in Schools makes the best and most succinct rationalization for incorporating virtue

---

[3] All student quotes are taken from transcripts of the focus groups. These transcripts are not publicly available and so I have decided not to include them in the works cited. The students all signed release forms prior to the focus groups and gave us permission to use any of their comments for academic use.

education in curriculums: "Schools should help prepare pupils for the tests of life, rather than

simply a life of tests" (10).

Works Cited

All Faculty Meeting Slides. April 28, 2025. Available upon request.

Aristotle. *Nicomachean Ethics*. Translated by Jos Sachs. Hackett Publishing Company. 2002.

"Aims of a BYU Education." https://aims.byu.edu/aims-of-a-byu-education.

Baehr, Jason S. *Deep in thought.* Edited by ProQuest (Firm). Harvard Education Press,

    Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2021, https://search-lib-byu-

    edu.byu.idm.oclc.org/byu/record/cat.7587328.

Biggar, Nigel. "Can Theology Help?" *Cultivating Virtue in the University*. Edited by Jonathan

    Brant, Edward Brooks, and Michael Lamb. Oxford University Press, 2022, 97-111.

Brant, Jonathan, Edward Brooks, and Michael Lamb. "Character Education in the University:

    Challenges and Opportunities." *Cultivating Virtue in the University*. Edited by Jonathan

    Brant, Edward Brooks, and Michael Lamb. Oxford University Press, 2022, 253 – 277.

Cargill-Martin, Honor. "The Roman Empire Loved by Elon Musk and Steve Bannon Never

    Existed." New York Times, Opinion. April 2, 2025.

Cicero. *On the Orator: Book 3 On Fate Stoic Paradoxes Divisions of Oratory*. Translated by H.

    Rackham. Harvard University Press. Cambridge, Massachusetts. 1942

Collings, Justin. "Believe in Him to Come." BYU University Conference. August 26, 2024.

    https://speeches.byu.edu/talks/justin-collings/believe-in-him-to-come/

Doctrine and Covenants. Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Salt Lake City, UT. 1981.

Kristjánsson, Kristján. "There is Something About Aristotle: The Pros and Cons of

    Aristotelianism in Contemporary Moral Education." *Journal of Philosophy of Education*,

    vol. 48, no. 1, 2014, pp. 48–68. *Academic Search Ultimate; EBSCOhost*, https://research-

    ebsco-com.byu.idm.oclc.org/linkprocessor/plink?id=8a72da36-0811-3c62-8474-

    7f20cc60a160, doi:10.1111/1467-9752.12047.

Lamb, Michael, Jonathan Brant, and Edward Brooks. "Seven Strategies for Cultivating Virtue in

    the University." "Character Education in the University: Challenges and Opportunities."

    *Cultivating Virtue in the University*. Edited by Jonathan Brant, Edward Brooks, and Michael

    Lamb. Oxford University Press, 2022, 115-156.

Levin, Yuval. "Why Institutions Matter." BYU Forum Address. February 25, 2025.

    https://speeches.byu.edu/talks/yuval-levin/why-institutions-matter/

Morgan, Blair, and Liz Gulliford. "The Beneficial Effects of Cultivating Gratitude in the

    University." *Cultivating Virtue in the University*. Edited by Jonathan Brant, Edward

    Brooks, and Michael Lamb. Oxford University Press, 2022, 178-195.

O'Neill, Onora. "The Eclipse of Virtue in the University and the Wider Society." *Cultivating*

    *Virtue in the University*. Edited by Jonathan Brant, Edward Brooks, and Michael Lamb.

    Oxford University Press, 2022, 83 – 96.

Plato. Plato's Symposium and Phaedrus. Translated by Joe Sachs. Paul Dry Books. Philadelphia,

    Pennsylvania. 2023.

Rosen, Jeffrey. *The Pursuit of Happiness.* Simon & Schuster, New York, NY, 2024.

Rosen, Jeffery. "The Pursuit of Happiness." BYU Forum Address. January 28, 2025.

https://speeches.byu.edu/talks/jeffrey-rosen/the-pursuit-of-happiness/

Tanner, John S. "Building a Better House of Learning." BYU University Conference, August 29,

2006. https://speeches.byu.edu/talks/john-s-tanner/building-better-house-learning/

"The Jubilee Centre Framework for Character Education in Schools." Third Edition. University

of Birmingham. https://www.jubileecentre.ac.uk/character-education-/the-jubilee-centre-

framework-for-character-education-in-schools/

"Virtue Makes You Beautiful." Long Peak Stake Young Men. 2013.

https://gye.vids.io/videos/a09bd1b9181ee7c628/01-virtue-makes-you-beautiful

Walch, Tad. "BYU again No. 1 in Princeton Review's 'Cancel the Keg' Rankings: See all the

lists with Utah schools." Deseret News, August 27, 2024.

https://www.deseret.com/education/2024/08/27/byu-again-no-1-in-princeton-reviews-

cancel-the-keg-rankings-see-all-the-lists-with-utah-schools/

Williams, Brian A. "Developing Virtue in Emerging Adults: Perspectives from Neuroscience,

Psychology, and Sociology." *Cultivating Virtue in the University*. Edited by Jonathan

Brant, Edward Brooks, and Michael Lamb. Oxford University Press, 2022, 57 - 79.