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Course Description and Objectives

As public confidence in business continues to decline, expectations for responsible behavior are on the rise. Businesses have several areas of responsibility in which they need to focus, grow, and develop – those being economic, legal, ethical, and philanthropic. Numerous topics and case examples will be examined as we learn to develop a social responsibility framework. Throughout the semester we will focus on all company stakeholders; discuss legal, regulatory, and political issues; move into ethics and ethical decision making; examine corporate governance; reflect on consumer, community, and employee relations; and address environmental and technology issues. The issues will become more complex as we discuss those with global significance.

Our goal will be to openly discuss many of the problems businesses face today, and prepare for addressing those problems in a way that builds and restores trust and confidence with our stakeholders. In addition there will be open debates on many controversial topics we face today. If this course feels like it is heavily laden in ethics, good – that is the intent.

The expectation is that you have read the textbook material in advance. We will discuss the chapter briefly and spend a considerable amount of the class time on supplemental information (video reviews, discussion scenarios, topic debates, current events and trends, etc.). I will ask questions, and encourage you to do likewise, as it pertains to the material in our textbook. Please be prepared to offer your opinion, as this will be more of a discussion than a lecture for the many controversial topics addressed. By the end of the course, the student should be able to:

- Research and debate a highly controversial business impact situation on society.
- Identify ethical issues in a business context;
- Identify multiple stakeholders and present their expected positions
- Prioritize stakeholder needs in addressing them with limited company resources.
- Actively engage in discussions about unique business dilemmas.
**Grading**

Class Debate = 30 points
Project Paper = 15 points
D2L Project = 15 points
6 WWYD submissions = 60 points
Total = 120 points

**Grading Scale**

111 - 120 A
105 – 110.99 AB
99 – 104.99 B
93 – 98.99 BC
87 – 92.99 C
Below 87 F

**College of Business Administration Assessment Statement**

The fundamental mission of the College of Business Administration is to provide a quality education grounded in Catholic, Jesuit intellectual values. Students are expected to learn how to function effectively in a diverse and global economy so that they may develop into ethical and socially responsible global leaders and responsible members of their organizations and communities. As one of many methods of assuring that the goals of our educational mission are successfully met, the college regularly and systematically engages in the assessment of these competencies.

Students in the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration program are assessed on their ability to reason ethically, communicate effectively, analyze critically, and understand local, national and global business and cultural issues. Students in our MBA programs are also assessed on their competency to communicate effectively, reason ethically and apply critical thinking, as well as their capacity to comprehend the global strategic issues of firms and perform fundamental activities of business managers. Students in our other graduate programs are assessed on specific competencies related to their disciplines.

Assessment takes place each semester in all programs and settings using quantifiable measures; that information is gathered and analyzed information to help continuously improve the educational process. The College of Business Administration is dedicated to successfully providing a quality education for all students. Assessment is the continuous improvement process of evaluating our success. More information on assessment can be found at [http://www.marquette.edu/assessment/](http://www.marquette.edu/assessment/) or in the assurance of learning tabs under [http://business.marquette.edu/academics/assurance-of-learning-undergrad](http://business.marquette.edu/academics/assurance-of-learning-undergrad) or [http://business.marquette.edu/academics/assurance-of-learning-graduate](http://business.marquette.edu/academics/assurance-of-learning-graduate)
**Debates:** Early in the semester, each student will be paired with another student and given a topic to debate in class. (Even though you may receive a position you don’t personally support, know that others do support that position so do your best to explain that perspective. At the end of each debate, students will be allowed to claim their actual position if they desire.) The actual debate should take approximately 20-25 minutes with a few minutes allowed for classmate questions/comments. (Use PowerPoint for your presentation.) As valuable as your opinion is, make sure actual facts are separated and identified as such, so collect appropriate information and derive relevant conclusions from that data. A well written position paper (hard copy) supporting your stance will also be required in class on the day of your debate. Points will be deducted for late submissions (1 point per calendar day, including a late submission on the same day of presentation). The report should be clear and succinct. All audience students will confidentially evaluate each debater, and those collective evaluations will account for half of the student’s “debate” score, however, if the intent is to merely rate everyone high (quid pro quo), I reserve the right to throw out those evaluations and score the debaters exclusively, so it is in your best interest to grade the students fairly. A grading evaluation form will be provided illustrating the guidelines. Critical, but fair grading will help you prepare for your future managerial positions, so don’t take this duty lightly. Note: The grading scale for the debates run from 1 to 5, however the following scale equalizes the grading: a “1” will equate to 11 points; a “2” will equal 12 points; a “3” will equal 12.75 points; a “4” will equal 13.95 points; and a “5” will equate to 15 points. Partial averages will be adjusted accordingly (i.e. the percentage between the two grades). This will be reviewed in class and is meant to equate the description of the review to an equivalent numerical value.

**Project Paper:** Each student will identify and evaluate a current international business situation/major event that is legal but has the appearance of being questionable (i.e. unethical); identify ethical issues in a business context; identify all stakeholders and present their expected positions; and submit a clear and concise report (3-5 pages) on your findings, along with your recommendation (and why). Properly give credit via footnotes, and if your opinion is offered, separate it from the facts. This paper is due on April 18th at the beginning of class – no exceptions or excuses. Please do not submit this electronically – I will only accept hard copies. Any paper submitted late will lose 1 point each day (weekends excluded) after that date. Additionally, a late submission on the due date will also lose 1 point. Points will be deducted if the subject is illegal, the subject is not unethical, or if all stakeholders and their impact has not been defined. (Note: Please do not approach me for subject approval, since that is part of the grade.)

**What Would You Do? (WWYD) Papers**
At the end of each chapter there is a short ethical dilemma entitled “What Would You Do?” Six of these cases will be assigned to you. Hard copies (no longer than 2 pages) will be collected in class at the beginning of the session. Each case will be worth 10 points. These are not group projects – work exclusively on your own. Be sure to properly (and completely) identify the problem, before offering your potential solution. Grading will be as follows:

- Exceptional review – all points covered = 10 points
- Very good assessment (only 1 point missed) = 9 points
- Good review, however a number of points missed = 8 points
- Fair review, with key points missing and poorly written = 7 points
- No submission = 0 points
Note: Late submissions will lose 1 point per calendar date, including an electronic copy submitted later on the evening they are due. Note: I am looking for the best approach, not merely what you feel you would do. If the latter, everyone would get all the points.

**D2L Project**

The topic for the D2L project has to do with “breastfeeding” vs. “bottle-feeding” babies. If your debate number is odd, you will support the breastfeeding position. If it is even, you will defend the bottle-feeding position. Please don’t be misled by the topic – it may be more complex than you think.

Remember it’s not about your opinion or personal choice, but on the factual information surrounding each position. That means thinking globally, evaluating the suppliers of infant formula, and considering the laws and ethics involved in the conflict.

**Your charge is to write a clear and succinct position paper which can be uploaded into the D2L “dropbox” anytime between now and 11:55PM on March 15th (make sure it is properly saved after uploading).** Failure to do so will result in you not getting any points for the project, as the D2L “dropbox” will close at that time. You will not be able to view any of your classmates’ submissions up to that time either.

Starting at 12:02 AM on March 16 you MUST re-submit your paper but this time in the “discussion” box (make sure once again it is saved after uploading). **You must however upload within 48 hours as the “discussion” box will not allow submissions after midnight on March 18th.** Failure to make this deadline will also result in you not getting credit for the project. Within the “discussion” box you will see two folders – “Pro” and “Con”. If you are supporting “breastfeeding”, upload into the “Pro” folder. If you are defending the “bottle-feeding” option, upload into the “Con” folder.

If everything goes right, all papers will be available for viewing starting the morning of March 19th. If you submitted a “Pro” paper, read all the “Con” submissions, and if you submitted a “con” paper, read all “Pro” papers. After reading them, choose the two (2) strongest opposing positions to your own. **Email me the names of those two students (no later than noon on March 29th) and briefly tell me why you liked them.** I will then tally the names. The top four (4) students will receive 15 points for the project, the next five (5) students will receive 13 points, and the remaining students will receive 12 points.

In writing your position paper, think about your audience. Will you be penalized or rewarded for a very long submission? What about references – will they help garner creditability? Does my position paper represent my opinion, or is it factually based?

**Please don’t forget the deadlines!** – They’re no different than important deadlines at work. Also, if you are unfamiliar with the D2L uploading procedures, ask you classmates. I cannot accept any excuses for improper or incomplete submissions. Remember, it’s not only the content but the correct delivery as well – no different than the expectations executives have on their subordinates in executing contracts.
**Attendance**

While it is understood that business travel commitments will occur, please make the best effort to be in class if possible. Two absences are allowed, however neither should occur on your debate day, nor on the last day of class. Any absence beyond that may result in a grade reduction. Missing more than three classes (20% of the course) will result in a course withdrawal.

**Academic Integrity**

Students, faculty, and staff at Marquette University developed a [Statement on Academic Integrity](#) that recognizes the importance of integrity, both personal and academic, and includes an Honor Pledge and Honor Code applicable to all.

**The Honor Pledge**

*I recognize the importance of personal integrity in all aspects of life and work. I commit myself to truthfulness, honor and responsibility, by which I earn the respect of others. I support the development of good character and commit myself to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity as an important aspect of personal integrity. My commitment obliges me to conduct myself according to the Marquette University Honor Code.*

**Student Obligations Under the Honor Code**

1. To fully observe the rules governing exams and assignments regarding resource material, electronic aids, copying, collaborating with others, or engaging in any other behavior that subverts the purpose of the exam or assignment and the directions of the instructor.
2. To turn in work done specifically for the paper or assignment, and not to borrow work either from other students, or from assignments for other courses.
3. To give full and proper credit to sources and references, and to acknowledge the contributions and ideas of others relevant to academic work.
4. To report circumstances that may compromise academic honesty, such as inattentive proctoring or premature posting of answers.
5. To complete individual assignments individually, and neither to accept nor give unauthorized help.
6. To accurately represent their academic achievements, which may include their grade point average, degree, honors, etc., in transcripts, in interviews, in professional organizations, on resumes and in the workplace.
7. To report any observed breaches of this honor code and academic honesty.

**Definitions of Academic Dishonesty**

Academic dishonesty applies equally to electronic media and print and involves text, images and ideas. It includes but is not limited to the following examples:

**Cheating**

1. Copying from others during an examination.
2. Communicating exam answers with other students during an examination.
3. Offering another person’s work as one’s own.
4. Taking an examination for another student or having someone take an examination for oneself.
5. Sharing answers for a take-home examination or assignment unless specifically authorized by the instructor.
6. Tampering with an examination after it has been corrected and then returning it for more credit.
7. Using unauthorized materials during an examination.
8. Allowing others to do the research and writing of an assigned paper (including use of the services of a commercial term-paper company).

Dishonest conduct

1. Stealing or attempting to steal an examination or answer key from the instructor.
2. Changing or attempting to change academic records without proper sanction.
3. Submitting substantial portions of the same work for credit in more than one course without consulting all instructors involved.
4. Intentionally disrupting the educational process in any manner.
5. Allowing another student to copy off of one's own work during a test.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is intellectual theft. It means use of the intellectual creations of another without proper attribution. Plagiarism may take two main forms, which are clearly related:

1. To steal or pass off as one's own the ideas or words, images or other creative works of another, and
2. To use a creative production without crediting the source, even if only minimal information is available to identify it for citation.

Credit must be given for every direct quotation, for paraphrasing or summarizing a work (in whole, in part, in one's own words) and for information that is not common knowledge.

Collusion

Any student who knowingly or intentionally helps another student perform any of the above acts of cheating, dishonest conduct or plagiarism is subject to discipline for academic dishonesty.

Consequences of Academic Dishonesty

Regardless of how alleged acts of academic dishonesty are brought to light, faculty and instructors retain the responsibility and the authority to investigate all allegations, although, as outlined below, university administrators may lead these investigations. Because the consequences for academic dishonesty can be severe, the decision to penalize a student for such infractions must be the result of a thorough review. The procedures to be used for adjudicating suspected acts of academic dishonesty are determined by the nature of the misconduct and the seriousness of the offense.

Grade Appeals: Grading disputes may arise. If you feel that your work was graded unfairly, you must discuss it with me within two weeks following the return of the materials. Otherwise, the grade will stand as originally recorded.

Weather Related Cancellations

The Office of the Provost will make the decision to cancel classes. If for some reason classes are cancelled during the last week, students will receive the grade to date.
**Special Needs**

Please inform me during the first week of class if you have any conditions that may limit or affect your ability to participate in this course so that we can make necessary arrangements. You may also contact the Office of Student Disability Services, in 5th Floor of the 707 Building, Room 503 (8-1645) for more information (see also: [http://www.marquette.edu/disability-services/](http://www.marquette.edu/disability-services/)).

**Emergency Plan**

Every Marquette University campus building has emergency shelter and evacuation plans. Please familiarize yourself with the plans of each building in which you take classes or attend meetings. Make sure to note the routes to the lowest level of the buildings for shelter during inclement weather, as well as exits from the buildings in the event of fire or other emergency.

**Class Schedule**

January 25  
Introduction  
Chapter 1 - Social Responsibility Framework

February 1  
Chapter 2 – Strategic Management of Stakeholder Relationships  
**WWYD (page 38) paper submission**

February 8  
Chapter 4 – Legal, Regulatory, and Political Issues  
**WWYD (page 72) paper submission** (list primary and secondary stakeholders only)

February 15  
Chapter 5 – Business Ethics and Ethical Decision Making  
**WWYD (page 149) paper submission** (1. What mistakes, if any, were made? 2. What do you do now?)

February 22  
Chapter 6 – Strategic Approaches to Improving Ethical Behavior  
**WWYD (page 183) paper submission** (1. What are the areas of concern? 2. Who do you bring your concerns to and how are they presented?)

February 29  
Chapter 3 – Corporate Governance  
**WWYD (page 220) paper submission** (Start at the beginning of the case, assume you are Robert, what would you do?)

March 7  
Chapter 7 – Employee Relations  
**WWYD (page 258) paper submission** (1. What are the areas causing friction? 2. List the mistakes to date by John and Terry.)
March 14  
D2L Project workday

March 15  
**Download D2L paper into the drop box** by 11:55PM

March 16  
**Resubmit your D2L paper into the discussion box**

March 18  
**Discussion box closes at midnight**

March 19  
**D2L project papers available for viewing**

March 21  
Spring/Easter Break – no class

March 28  
Chapter 8 – Consumer Relations
**Debate**

March 29  
**Email responses to D2L project papers due to me by noon**

April 4  
Chapter 9 – Community Relations and Strategic Philanthropy
**Debate**

April 11  
Chapter 10 – Technology Issues
**Debate**

April 18  
Chapter 11 Sustainability Issues
**Project Paper due**
**Debate**

April 25  
Chapter 12 – Social Responsibility in a Global Environment
**Debate**

May 2  
**Debates**
**Closing comments**