

COURSE: BUSA 5200 **TITLE:** Business, Society & Ethics **SEMESTER:** Sep-Dec'00

INSTRUCTOR: Ike Hall, BEng, MSc, MBA, PEng.
Telephone 463-4623 (H)
 412-7409 (BCIT) Rm SE6 315
 291-4728 (SFU) Rm WMX 4319
e-mail ihall@bcit.ca

TEXT: Weiss, J.W, Business Ethics,
Baetz, M.C., Readings and Cases in Business, Government and Society

EVALUATION:

Final Examination (Case)	35 %
Mid-term Examination (Essay/M.C.)	20 %
Group Projects	25 %
Current Events (10 Min Presentation)	10 %
Student Participation in Labs	10 %

TUTORIAL REQUIREMENTS 10.0%

TUTORIAL ATTENDANCE IS COMPULSORY The 10% attendance rule applies (see student handbook – page 12)

The Tutorial Requirements (10.0% of the overall grade) is based on class participation.

Excellent participation is defined as a student consistently participating and moving ahead in class discussions. Volunteering high quality analysis and action plans. Assisting other class members in development and understanding of course objectives.

Satisfactory participation is defined as a student being prepared with good analysis and action plans when called upon. Understanding assigned readings and being able to explain the concepts put forward by the authors.

Unsatisfactory is defined as often not being prepared when called upon, missing classes, presenting poorly reasoned analysis and poor action plans. Student is not familiar with assigned readings.

TEAM WRITTEN CASES 25%

The team *written cases* are due on the dates indicated

The team written case will follow the format as outlined below (i.e. symptoms/problem statement; problem analysis/application of theory; and recommended solutions/action plans. The cases should run about 5 typed, double spaced pages (1500 words).

There is a two-page description of a "Case Analysis Method" attached to this package that you may find useful.

Students will be assigned to teams within their tutorials. Each team will prepare, in written format, an analysis of the assigned cases.

The written analysis must discuss the three main components of a case analysis - symptoms and problems; problem analysis/application of theory (including discussion of alternatives); and recommendations, complete with action plan(s).

Symptoms and Problem Statement - The team must identify the main symptoms in the case and be able to succinctly describe the problem/opportunity being faced. The problem identification must use Marketing concepts to effectively link facts in the case to the main symptoms, state the root causes, and not overlook key problems.

Problem Analysis and Application of Theory - The team must analyze the problem from an Marketing point of view and apply "Ethics and Business" theory to various feasible alternatives that may address the stated problem. The pros and cons of each alternative should be clearly derived from the appropriate Marketing theory.

Recommended Solutions - The extent that the recommended solutions resolved the root causes identified in the problem analysis section. The recommendations must include a plan (or plans) of action - Who is going to do What, and When, and How (the Why should have already been established).

The problem analysis will receive the most evaluation weight, followed by the recommendation. However, this assignment will also be evaluated on the quality of presentation. This includes the clarity of the presentation – including grammar, style, and spelling.

This course package includes a copy of the *rating form* used to evaluate the team case written submissions.

The first team write-up is due on the 17th of October. The assigned case is "The Slade Company" - Harvard Handout

The second team written case is due on the 21st of November. The assigned case is "Case # 16 - Tetra Pak Inc" - the Baetz text page 454

PEER EVALUATION AND INDIVIDUAL GRADES

An unfortunate reality of team projects is that some members do not contribute sufficiently to the team's effort. Consequently, team members will evaluate each other using a standard form that will be submitted to the tutorial instructor, or to me, in confidence. **The peer evaluation form is attached and must be turned in before the final evaluation (grade) is released.**

The peer evaluation will consider each member's work effort, goal achievement, leadership, and other relevant performance factors. Based on these evaluations, individual team members will receive a grade that may be up to 15 percentage points above or below the "project grade".

I encourage you to schedule - in advance - several frank discussions in your teams about individual contributions to the team effort. Constructive performance appraisals, including feedback on each person's strengths and weaknesses, can help each person develop more confidence in areas of strength and pinpoint areas where improvement may be needed. The peer evaluation system is designed so that the average individual grade equals the project grade.

The peer evaluation grade is based on information from students, so an appeal to the professor will consist mainly of double-checking the accuracy of calculations from the student evaluation forms. However, all students have the right to the standard university appeal process. Students should be aware that peer evaluations are a sensitive matter and that attempts to influence or harass team members after the grades are posted may have severe consequences for a student's standing in the course or BCIT.

MID-TERM EXAM	20%	October 24th
----------------------	------------	---------------------

This will be a multiple-choice, short essay answer, closed book exam, written in class, on October 24th.

The midterm exam is closed book.

Final Exam	35%	12 Dec 00
-------------------	------------	------------------

The final exam will be a multiple choice, short essay answer, and case exam. The case study will form 60% of the exam mark, and the short answer questions/multiple choice portion will form 40% of the exam mark. **The final exam will be open book.**

BUSA 5200

PEER EVALUATION

YOUR NAME _____

Please write in the names of all team members, *including yourself*. Beside each name, assign a value ranging from a low of -15 to a high of +15, based on your assessment of each individual's contribution to the project. A value of -15 would indicate that the group member should receive 15% below the team grade (e.g., the individual gets 60% if the project receives 75%). The values you assign to the team **must total 0**. Therefore, points lost to one person must be distributed to the other members and vice versa.

These ratings will be seen only by myself and will be interpreted by us in determining each individual's grade. This form must be submitted to the Instructor before the final examination.

We will assume that students who do not submit evaluations want all members to receive the team project grade (i.e. all zeros on this form).

NAME (including yourself)	ASSIGNED VALUE (between -15 and +15)
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

TOTAL 0

Please submit this form to Ike Hall before the final examination.

BUSA 5200 WRITTEN TEAM CASE

EVALUATION FORM

TEAM MEMBERS 1. _____ 2. _____ 3. _____

4. _____ 5. _____

SYMPTOMS AND ROOT CAUSES

Specific symptoms reflect root causes

10 8 6 4

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Deals with all major issues and explains or evaluates the problem(s)

10 8 6 4

PROBLEM ANALYSIS

Key terms are used correctly and alternatives are discussed

10 8 6 4

Advantages and Disadvantages of the alternatives are analyzed

10 8 6 4

Problems and theory from the text are clearly linked

10 8 6 4

Application of Theory is correct and complete

10 8 6 4

RECOMMENDATIONS

Details actions to correct the identified problems

10 8 6 4

Recommendations cover the Problem(s) identified

10 8 6 4

Action plan(s) are complete (Who, When, Where, How)

10 8 6 4

PRESENTATION

Message is presented clearly:

concise writing style

grammatically correct

diagrams and tables are effective

10 8 6 4

TOTAL _____/100

COMMENTS

BUSA 5200 CURRENT EVENTS EVALUATION FORM

Content: Symptoms and Issue Statement

The extent that the team identified the main symptoms and succinctly summarized the main issue

Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
1 2 3	4 5 6	7 8 9 10	11 12 13	14 15

Content: Problem Analysis and Evaluation of Alternatives

The extent that the current events analysis used Business Ethics theory and concepts effectively to link facts in the case to the key problem(s) and analyzed various feasible alternatives. Text book theory **must** be applied

Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
5	6 7 8 9 10	16 17 18 19 20	24 25 26 27	31 32 33 34 35

Content: Recommended Solutions

The extent that the recommended solutions resolved the root causes identified in the problem analysis section. The extent that the discussion presented specific and reasonable recommendations that solve the stated problem. The Plan of Action must contain specifics on Who, What, Where and How the solution will be applied.

Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
5	8 9 10	16 17 18 19 20	24 25 26 27	31 32 33 34 35

Presentation: Clarity

The extent that the written presentation followed a logical sequence (i.e., the reader did not get confused about what the presenters were discussing), and made it easy for the audience to understand the information. Sentence Structure, Grammar, and Spelling were correct.

Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
1 2 3	4 5	6 7	8 9	10

Presentation: Maintaining Interest

The extent that the written presentation motivated reader to pay attention to the information by maintaining their interest.

Very Poor	Poor	Acceptable	Good	Excellent
1	2	3	4	5

TOTAL ____/100