

**BA 8100 / LAW 7339: Managing Corporate Integrity
Fall 2009**

Professors:	Linda DiSantis, J.D. Steven Olson, Ph.D. John Truslow, M.A.
Class:	Mondays, 6:00 – 8:45 Law School Building, Room 325A
Office:	Center for Ethics & Corporate Responsibility 34 Broad St. (Commerce Bldg.), Suite 1402
e-mail:	lkdisantis@gsu.edu solson@gsu.edu tsijwt@langate.gsu.edu
Phone:	DiSantis: 404-281-2298 (cell) Olson: 404-413-7423 Truslow: 404-413-7422
Office Hours:	3:00 p.m. – 4:00 Tuesdays Other hours by appointment
Withdrawal:	October 15, 2008 (for non-hardship withdrawal)
Texts:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Reading packet (on-line through Study.net)

A. Prerequisites

- Law Students: 7101 Corporations, 6020 Professional Responsibility (preferred)
- Business Students: MBA 8000, MBA 8030, or by special permission from the instructors
- CSP: 1, 6, 7

B. Course Description

The course exposes business and law students to fundamental issues and current best practices in managing legal/ethical compliance, corporate social responsibility and business ethics issues. Course topics cover both domestic and international business issues, including child labor, environmental sustainability, anti-corruption, and human rights. Special attention is given to preparing law and management students to understand and manage the demands on U.S and international corporations making complex business decisions in the face of increasing expectations for transparency and accountability. Structured around real-world cases that simulate the challenges of today's domestic and global markets, the course equips students to manage and integrate the differing perspectives of lawyers and managers.

C. Course Objectives

1. Knowledge of, and practical skills for dealing with, the legal and management issues regarding compliance with the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act and OECD Convention on Combating Bribery of Foreign Public Officials. Assessed by reflection papers, written examination and expert executive feedback.
2. Knowledge of international anti-corporate campaign tactics and counter-tactics. Assessed by reflection papers, written examination and expert executive feedback.
3. Knowledge of legal, managerial, and ethical dimensions of international environmental management. Assessed by reflection papers, written examination and expert executive feedback.
4. Knowledge of corporate sustainability strategies. Assessed by reflection papers and written examination.
5. Knowledge of, and practical skills for dealing with, the legal, management, and ethical issues regarding international child labor practices. Assessed by reflection papers, written examination and expert executive feedback.
6. Knowledge of, and practical skills for dealing with, the legal, management, and ethical issues regarding ethics hotlines, whistleblower protection, and non-retaliation in international business. Assessed by reflection papers, written examination and expert, executive feedback.
7. Knowledge of the legal, management, and ethical issues regarding gender discrimination in international business. Assessed by written examination and expert-panel feedback.
8. Knowledge of the management competencies required for international managers and legal counsel. Assessed by written examination.

D. Grading: Letter Grade Assignments/ Percentage Points/ GPA points

GRADE	PERCENTAGE	GPA POINTS
A	93% - 100%	4.0
A-	90% - 92%	3.7
B+	87% - 89%	3.3
B	83% - 86%	3.0
B-	80% - 82%	2.7
C+	77% - 79%	2.3
C	73% - 76%	2.0
C-	70% - 72%	1.7
D	60% - 69%	1.0
F	0% - 59%	0.0

E. Course Requirements

The course requirements are as follows:

1. **Four (4) Ethics Position Papers.** Students are required to write four (4) papers using the stipulated format (see “Example of Ethics Position Paper Format,” page 5, below). Each paper is worth twenty-five (25) points. Grades will be assigned according to the zero-based point system detailed in the written guidelines and criteria outlined in “Developing a Well Reasoned Response to Ethical Problems in Business.”
2. **Group Project: Case-Study Scenario Write-Up of a Current Legal-Ethical-Responsibility Issue in Business.** Students will form cross disciplinary (Law & Business) teams of at least two (2) people per team that will work together to create a challenging case scenario drawn from or based on current issues in the business press, legal press, or media. Students are encouraged to read relevant publications and media. Sign ups for issues are done on a “first come, first served” basis by notifying the instructors. Project ideas are due in week 7 and drafts due in week 11. The scenarios will be written according the prescribed format (see “Group Project Format and Criteria,” page 6, below). Students will present their case studies and critique other groups’ work.
3. **Homework Assignments.** Students will be required to submit copies of their homework assignments on the assigned date. Assignments due on the day of class must be submitted at the start of class.

4. **Participation.** This course relies heavily on team participation and peer learning. To that end, class **attendance and participation are required**. Students will be graded on the quantity and quality of their participation according to the class criteria, using a 4 point scale of the degree to which they fulfilled the criteria: 0 = not at all; 1 = to a small extent; 2 = to a moderate extent; 3 = to a great extent; 4 = to a very great extent.
5. **Participation Merit Points.** Two (additional) bonus points will be available for two (2) students in each class session and will be assigned according to the peer recognition process of students whose contributions best exemplify and contribute to reflective thinking (see “Criteria for Merit Participation Points,” page 7, below).
6. **Final Exam.** The final exam will be open book, take home, and will consist of four hypothetical questions requiring you to define and discuss key course concepts (students will respond to two of the four hypotheticals). Each concept discussion answer is worth twenty-five (25) points.

F. Grading Points and Percentages

Requirement	Points	Percentage
Ethical Position Papers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 4 papers x 20 points each 	80	27%
Group Project <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 80 points for form & content • 20 points for scoring guide 	100	33%
Participation: Quantity & Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 sessions X 5 points per class 	70	23%
Participation: Merit Points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 14 sessions X 2 points per session 	(up to 28)	(up to 9%)
Final Exam	50	17%
Total	300	100%

Ethics Position Paper Criteria

Side 1 should discuss each of the first 4 items: Issues, Interested Parties, Consequences and Obligations.

Side 2 should be your reassessment of your Side 1 after class discussion.

The following format and criteria will be used in assessing the twenty (20) points available for each Ethical Reflection Paper:

1. The author argues a clear Ethical position, demonstrating that he/she has a clear point of view (Side), 1 and
2. Demonstrates a willingness and ability to reassess his/her own ethical arguments in light of others' viewpoints and input (Side 2).

Criteria	Points
Issues	3
Interested Parties	5
Actions/Consequences	4
Duties/Obligations	5
Reassessment	3
Total	/20

Ethics Position Paper Format

Side 1

Case Title: *Case Title Goes Here*

Name: _____

Date: _____

Start by giving a clear, unequivocal answer to the decision point question.

For example: Should the Chief Legal Counsel cooperate with the Department of Justice request to disclose the requested information? Yes No

Then, briefly describe the issues, interested parties and their interests, possible actions and likely consequences, and relevant duties and obligations of the protagonist.

Side 2

Case Title: *Case Title Goes Here*

Name: _____

Date: _____

Based on Class discussion and (if applicable) further reading, I have:

1. Kept the same conclusion (Why?)
2. Changed my conclusion (Why?)

Group Project Format and Criteria

The following format and criteria will be used in assessing the one hundred (100) available points regarding the form and content of the group project case study:

1. Length— The case is comprehensive enough to cover adequately the above criteria.
2. Format— The case is written according to the criteria below and is accompanied by a “scoring guide” that identifies the relevant issues, parties/interests, possible actions, and duties/obligations.
3. Protagonist—The case contains a protagonist facing a dilemma.
4. Decision point—The case clearly states the decision that has to be made.
5. Ethical dimension— The case dilemma and decision involve ethical issues.
6. Compelling-- The ethical issues possess a compelling quality (personal, organizational, or social) and have not been “settled” by existing corporate practice or law.
7. Background information—The case provides sufficient information on:
 - The internal players, their roles, goals, pressures, backgrounds, or past experiences with issues
 - The company and its industry
 - The history of how the dilemma occurred or evolved
 - The relevant financial data
 - The relevant legal data
 - The relevant company policies, statements, codes, or agreements
 - The legitimate stakeholders, their goals, interests, and needs
8. Ethical Reflection and Learning through Case discussion— The case authors promote ethical reflection and learning among their colleagues through the case presentation and discussion.

Class Participation Criteria: Using the scale below, please rate your participation by circling a number.

5 Points = Outstanding Contributor: Contributions in class reflect exceptional preparation. Ideas offered are always substantive, provide one or more major insights as well as direction for the class. Challenges are well substantiated and persuasively presented. Reasoning, beliefs and assumptions are made transparent to others. Observes the “rule of 3” in class discussions. If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished markedly.

4 Points = Good Contributor: Contributions in class reflect thorough preparation. Ideas offered are usually substantive, provide good insights and sometimes direction for the class. Challenges are well substantiated and often persuasive. If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished.

3 Points = Adequate Contributor: Contributions in class reflect satisfactory preparation. Ideas offered are sometimes substantive, provide generally useful insights but seldom offer a new direction for the discussion. Challenges are sometimes presented, fairly well substantiated, and are sometimes persuasive. If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would be diminished somewhat.

2 Points = Low-to-Poor Participant: This person says little or nothing in class. Hence, there is not an adequate basis for evaluation. If this person were not a member of the class, the quality of discussion would not be changed.

1 Point = Unsatisfactory Contributor: Contributions in class reflect inadequate preparation. Ideas offered are seldom substantive, provide few if any insights and never a constructive direction for the class. Integrative comments and effective challenges are absent. If this person were not a member of the class, valuable air-time would be saved.

Why did you assign yourself the number you did? Briefly explain

Criteria for Participation Merit Points

1. Speaks from his/her own experience and perspective, making his/her own reasoning and assumptions explicit.
2. Publicly tests her/his reasoning and assumptions, encourages others to do the same.
3. Acknowledges and explores multiple perspectives and experiences.
4. Focuses on multiple aspects of issues, experiences and situations.
5. Perceives conflicting goals both among and within individuals involved in an issue or situation.
6. Recognizes the “situational dependent” nature of decisions and actions and understands many of the factors which affect the decisions and/or choices.
7. Suspends assumptions in exploring and searching for creative solutions.
8. Forms judgments on the basis of reason and evidence; modifies judgments and actions based on new evidence.
9. Synthesizes and extends concepts, makes novel applications of them.

Write down the full name **of up to two (2) people**, other than yourself, who you think exhibited the characteristics of reflective judgment listed above in their class participation (large and small groups). **If no one exhibited these characteristics, then leave the entries blank.**

Name _____

Name _____

**BA 8100 / LAW 7339: Managing Corporate Integrity
Course Syllabus**

Class Content	All	Reading for Business Students	Readings for Law students
Pre-reading	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chris Argyris, “Teaching Smart People How to Learn,” <i>Harvard Business Review</i> (May-June 1991) reprint #91301 (packet) ▪ U.S. Federal Sentencing Guidelines¹, ▪ Report of the Ad Hoc Advisory Group on the Organizational Sentencing Guidelines, October 7, 2003. (Executive summary is only required reading; additional reading at your discretion)² 	<p>Review of applicable Codes of Professional Responsibility in Business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • American Marketing Association³ • Public Relations Society of America⁴ • It’s Time to Make Management a True Profession”, by Rakesh Khurana and Nitin Nohria, <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, October 2008 (packet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Review of Rules of Professional Responsibility <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ABA Model Rules <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Rule 1.6, 2. Rule 1.13 3. Rule 2.1⁵ ▪ <i>In re Caremark, Intl, Inc.</i>, 698 A.2d 959 (Del. Ct. Chan. 1996) ▪ <i>Executive Summary, Report of the New York City Bar Association Task Force on the Lawyer’s Role in Corporate Governance</i> (November 2006), pp. 1-18.⁶

Week I: Course Introduction August 17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Course objectives ▪ Syllabus review ▪ Assessment ▪ Course mechanics ▪ Lecture – Professional Responsibilities of Managers and Attorneys and Overview of the Federal Sentencing Guidelines and their impact on corporate behavior
---	--

¹ <http://www.ussc.gov/2007guid/GL2007.pdf> , Chapter 8, Sentencing of Organizations, pp. 487-528.

² <http://www.ussc.gov/corp/advgrprpt/execsum.pdf>

³ <http://www.marketingpower.com/AboutAMA/Pages/Statement%20of%20Ethics.aspx>

⁴ http://www.prsa.org/aboutUs/ethics/preamble_en.html

⁵ Available on Westlaw

⁶ www.abcny.org/CityBarReport.htm

Class Content	All	Reading for Business Students	Readings for Law students
Homework for Week 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ M. Bebeau & S. Olson, “Developing a Well Reasoned Response to Ethical Problems in Business” ▪ Case study: “Becton Dickinson: Ethics and Business Practices (A)” (<i>Harvard Business School Publishing</i>, reprint #9-399-055). (packet) ▪ Case-Study: Becton-Dickinson Scenarios (packet) ▪ Prepare Ethical Position Paper Side I for one of the nine scenarios. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ J. Hinsey & G. Subramanian, “Global Approaches to Anti-Corruption,” <i>Harvard Business Review</i>, Nov. 14, 2001. (packet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>U.S. v. Kay</i>, 513 F. 3d 432 (C.A. 5 (Tex.)), Section I (pp. 439-441), Section III (pp. 446-451), Section IX (pp. 459-461). ▪ <i>Metcalf & Eddy</i> permanent injunction⁷ and consent order⁸

Week 2: Foreign Corrupt Practices Act August 24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group discussion of scenarios. ▪ Group Reflection. ▪ Guest Executive: Bob Gordon, former compliance manager for United Parcel Service
--	---

⁷ [http://www.usdoj.gov/criminal/fraud/fcpa/append/ix/appendixe\(iii\).pdf](http://www.usdoj.gov/criminal/fraud/fcpa/append/ix/appendixe(iii).pdf)

⁸ [http://www.usdoj.gov/criminal/fraud/fcpa/append/ix/appendixe\(ii\).pdf](http://www.usdoj.gov/criminal/fraud/fcpa/append/ix/appendixe(ii).pdf)

Class Content	All
Homework for Week 3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Travis, T. “Maintain High Ethical Standards” <i>Doing Business Anywhere: The Essential Guide to Going Global</i>, J. Wiley & Sons, Inc. pp. 77-106 (packet) ▪ Prepare draft of Ethical position paper Side 2 ▪ Policy recommendations for the questions regarding the “One Company Operations Group, “Becton-Dickinson, p. 12.

Week 3: Debrief of FCPA Case- Study August 31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Debrief of Ethical Position Paper, Side 2 reports ▪ Group discussion of FCPA and the role of managers and lawyers ▪ Video: Black Money (Shown in class)
---	---

September 7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Labor Day No Class
-------------	--

Class Content	All
Homework for Week 4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Case-study: <i>Georgia Power: Job Discrimination and Corporate Integrity</i> (to be distributed in class on week 3). ▪ Deval Patrick, "Crisis as a Platform for Change," in <i>Leaders on Ethics</i>, J. Knapp, ed. (Bridgeport, CT: Praeger, 2007), pp. 4-11. (packet) ▪ Prepare Ethical Position Paper, side 1.

Week 4: September 14 Job Discrimination	<p>Guest Executives:</p> <p>Frank McCloskey, VP for Diversity, Georgia Power Co. Shelton Goode, Diversity Action Manager, Georgia Power Company</p>
--	--

Class Content	All	Reading for Business Students	Readings for Law students
Homework for week 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare Ethical Position Paper, side 2 on Georgia Power case ▪ Case-Study: Environmental Case: Hazardous Waste Treatment & Disposal (to be distributed in class) ▪ Prepare Ethical Position paper Side 1 on Environmental case. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “People or Penguins: The case for optimal pollution,” by William F. Baxter, as reprinted in <i>Business Ethics</i> (Snoeyenbos, Almeder and Humber) (packet) ▪ “Morality, Money and Motorcars” by Norman E. Bowie, from <i>Ethics and the Environment: The Public Policy Debate</i> edited by Hoffman, Frederick and Petry (pp. 89-97) as reprinted in "Business Ethics" (Snoeyenbos, Almeder and Humber) (packet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>U.S. v. Hayes</i>, 786 F.2d 1499 (11th Cir. 1986) ▪ <i>U.S. v. Hong</i>, 242 F.3d 528 (4th Cir. 2001) ▪ U.S. Federal Sentencing Guidelines § 2Q1.3 (USSG @ 2Q1.1 to 2Q1.6)

Week 5: Handling the Environmental Crisis September 21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group discussion of Ethical Position papers and readings ▪ Discussion of prosecution of environmental crimes and civil enforcement
--	---

Class Content	All
Homework for week #6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare Ethical Position Paper Side 2 ▪ Southwire Company Sustainability Report⁹ ▪ Ambec, Stefan; Lanoie, Paul. <i>Does it Pay to Be Green? A systematic overview. Academy of Management Perspectives</i>, Nov. 2008, Vol. 22, Issue 4, pp. 45-62 (packet)

Week 6: Debrief of Environmental Case Study September 28	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guest Executives, Stanley Tate, former GC and sustainability manager, Southwire; ▪ Presentation of Ethical Position Paper #2, Side 2 reports/discussion with executive
---	---

▪ ⁹ http://www.southwire.com/Southwire/StaticFiles/Text/SustainabilityReport_final_6-5-07.pdf

Class Content	All	Reading for Business Students	Readings for Law students
Homework for class #7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case Scenarios: Whistleblowing, and Hotline, (to be distributed in class) ▪ Section 806 of Sarbanes Oxley 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alan F. Westin, <i>Loyalty and Dissent in the Corporation</i>, (NY: McGraw Hill, Inc., 1981) pp. 133 -36. ▪ <i>Whistleblowing</i>, The Blackwell Encyclopedia of Business Ethics, ed. Patricia H. Wehane & R. Freeman, (Oxford: Blackwell, 1997) pp. 654-56. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ U.S. Dept. Of Justice, <i>Memorandum regarding Principles of Federal Prosecution of Business Organizations</i> December 12, 2006,¹⁰ (McNulty Memo revising the Thompson Memo of Jan. 20, 2003).¹¹ ▪ <i>Statement of Barry M. Sabin before the Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, and Homeland Security, United States House of Representatives, Concerning the Right to Counsel in Corporate Investigations</i> (March 8, 2007), pp. 1-7.¹²

Week #7: Whistleblower Issues/Self Disclosure October 5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Group discussion of scenarios. ▪ Class discussion about how to handle reports, the implications for the company and its executives, self reporting and attorney/client privilege. ▪ Guest Executive Mark Snyderman, former Chief Ethics and Compliance Officer, Coca-Cola Co. ▪ <u>Group project ideas presented to instructors, drafts due for Week 11</u>
---	---

¹⁰ http://www.usdoj.gov/dag/speeches/2006/mcnulty_memo.pdf

¹¹ (http://www.usdoj.gov/dag/cftf/corporate_guidelines.htm) (You do not need to read Thompson memo. This reference is here in case you are interested in the changes)

¹² http://www.usdoj.gov/criminal/pr/testimony/2007/03/2007_5048_03-08-07bmsabin-statement.pdf

Class Content	▪ All	▪ Reading for Business Students	▪ Readings for Law students
Homework for Week #8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case-study: Georgia Power and fear of Retaliation: Managing Corporate Culture (to be distributed in class on week 7). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ (to be distributed in class on week 7) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Burlington Northern & Santa Fe Railway Co. v. White</i>, 126 Sup. Ct. 2405 (2006) ▪ <i>CBOCS West, Inc. v. Humphries</i>, -- U.S. --, 128 S. Ct. 1951 (2008)

Week #8 Retaliation October 12	Follow up on Georgia Power case and discussion of retaliation Guest executives: Frank McCloskey and Shelton Goode
---	--

Class Content	All
Homework for class #9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case-study: Apparel Manufacturing in Latin America (to be distributed in class) ▪ Selections from Christopher Stone, <i>Where the Law Ends</i> (Waveland Press, 1975), pp. 3-7, 71-121. (packet) ▪ Norms on the Responsibilities of Transnational Corporations and Other Business Enterprises with Regard to Human Rights, U.N. Doc. E/CN.4/Sub.2/2003/12/Rev.2 (2003).¹³ ▪ Richard M. Locke and Monica Romis, "Improving Work Conditions in a Global Supply Chain," <i>Sloan Management Review</i> Winter 2007, Vol. 48, No. 2, pp. 54-62 Reprint #48212 (packet) ▪ George Psacharapoulous, "Child Labour versus Educational Attainment: Some Evidence from Latin America," <i>Journal of Population Economics</i>, vol. 10(4), 377-386. (packet) ▪ Kaushik Basu, "Child Labor: Cause, Consequence, and Cure, with Remarks on International Labor Standards," <i>Journal of Economic Literature</i>, vol. 37(3), 1083-1119. (packet) ▪ Prepare Ethical Position paper Side I

Week #9: Child Labor and Brand Reputation October 19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Discussion of Side I ▪ Discussion of reading materials
--	---

¹³ <http://www1.umn.edu/humanrts/links/norms-Aug2003.html>

Class Content	All
Homework for class #10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Hitting the Wall: Nike and International Labor Practices</i> (HBS case study) reprint # 9-700-047. (packet) ▪ Mihaly, Gene & Massey, Joseph (October 17, 1997) "Dartmouth Professors Speak on Cost of Living Study" Transcript of conference call with two Dartmouth Amos Tuck School of Business professors; retrieved November 25 2007 from the World Wide Web: (packet): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part I of call: http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/Niktuck1confcall.html Part II of call http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/Niktuck2confcall.html Supporting documents: http://business.nmsu.edu/~dboje/nikeworkers.html ▪ Play SimSweatshop: http://www.simsweatshop.com/game/ ▪ Dara O'Rourke, "Monitoring the Monitors: A Critique of PriceWaterhouseCooper's (PWC) Labor Monitoring, Dept. of Urban Studies and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, September 28th 2000, retrieved November 25, 2007 from the world wide web: http://web.mit.edu/dorourke/www/PDF/pwc.pdf ▪ Prepare draft of Ethical Reflection paper Side 2
Week #10 Labor Practices and Brand Reputation October 26	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Executive Guest Lecturer Jack Ward, former CEO, Russell Corp. ▪ Discussion of Ethical Position Paper side 2. ▪ Class discussion

Class Content	All	Reading for Business Students	Readings for Law students
Homework for class #11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case-study: “Coca-Cola’s Business Practices—Facing the Heat in a Few Countries,” S. Tejomoorula and R. Fernando (ICFAI Center for Management Research, 2006) (packet) ▪ Jarol Manheim, <i>The Death of a Thousand Cuts: Corporate Campaigns and the Attack on the Corporation</i> (Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 2001), pp. vii-xi, xiii-xvii, 191-230, 255-284. (packet) ▪ E. Dexenhall, <i>Damage Control</i> (New York: Penguin, 2007), pp. 23-38 (“Knowing the Difference Between a Nuisance, a Problem, a Crisis, and a Marketplace Assault”) (packet) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Codes of Ethics (review from Pre-reading list) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ American Marketing Association ▪ Public Relations Society of America 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review Rules of Professional Responsibility from Pre-reading list

Week 11 Crisis Management November 2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guest Executive: JR Hipple, Principal, Hipple Reputation Management ▪ Discussion of conflicting roles of business managers, lawyers, and communications professionals in managing the organization’s reputation ▪ Discussion of handling the media

Class Content	All	Reading for Business Students	Readings for Law students
Homework for class #12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Case Study – Employment Issues for International Corporations 	Thomas DeLong, A Framework for Pursuing Diversity in the Workplace, Harvard Business School, 2007. (packet)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Fernandez v. Wynn Oil Co.</i>, 653 F.2d 1273 (9th Cir. 1981) ▪ <i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i>, 539 U.S. 306 (2003) (section III only, pp. 327 to 344) ▪ Ericka Collins, <i>Extraterritorial Application of U.S. Employment Law</i>, ABA Section on International Law, April 2008¹⁴ ▪ Optional: Brief of General Motors in <i>Grutter v. Bollinger</i>, 2003 WL 399096 (U.S.)

Week #12: Discrimination November 9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Guest Executive: To Be Determined ▪ Discussion of Case Study
---	---

▪ ¹⁴ http://www.abanet.org/intlaw/calendar/spring2006/papers/THURS9451100COLLINS_30.DOC

Class Content	All
Homework for class #13 Case Study Presentation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare presentation on group project. ▪ Read and prepare response to classmates' case.

Week 13: November 16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each group presents project, classmates respond. ▪ Each group serves as "Executive Team" to the other group's decision.
--------------------------------	--

Class Content	All
Homework for week 14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prepare presentation on group project. ▪ Read and prepare response to classmates' case.
Week 14: Case Study Presentations November 23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Each group presents project, classmates respond. ▪ Each group serves as "Executive Team" to the other group's decision.