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WHAT IS THE UNIT ABOUT?

Unit description

Sound and effective management and leadership require not only financial and technical expertise but also ethical competency. This unit provides a focus on ethical decision-making, and in particular introduces a series of frameworks for discerning what is right and wrong in important areas of business practice. Ethical competency is the ability to, a) perceive the ethical implications of a situation, b) engage in sound ethical reasoning, and c) develop practical problem-solving strategies.

Intended Learning Outcomes

On completion of this unit, you will be able to:
1: Describe theories and concepts of ethical reasoning
2: Use judgement to explain the ethical issues of relevance to a business context
3: Make evidence-based decisions that are informed by ethical reasoning
4: Communicate complex ethical judgements in oral and written form
Graduate Quality Statement

Successful completion of this unit supports your development of course learning outcomes, which describe what a graduate of a course knows, understands and is able to do. Course learning outcomes are available from the Course Coordinator. Course learning outcomes are developed with reference to national discipline standards, Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF), any professional accreditation requirements and the University of Tasmania’s Graduate Statement.

The University of Tasmania experience unlocks the potential of individuals. Our graduates are equipped and inspired to shape and respond to the opportunities and challenges of the future as accomplished communicators, highly regarded professionals and culturally competent citizens in local, national, and global society. University of Tasmania graduates acquire subject and multidisciplinary knowledge and skills, and develop critical and creative literacies and numeracies and skills of inquiry. They demonstrate the ability to apply this knowledge in changing circumstances. Our graduates recognise and critically evaluate issues of social responsibility, ethical conduct and sustainability, are entrepreneurial and creative, and are mindful of their own wellbeing and that of the community. Through respect for diversity and by working in collaborative ways, our graduates reflect the values of the University of Tasmania.

Alterations to the unit as a result of student feedback

Students are no longer able to post anonymous questions in the Discussion area of MyLO during or after the live lecture for the lecturer to address.

All students undertaking the peer-evaluation tasks now have 24 hours to complete their work before submitting it for marking.

There is now a Peer-Evaluation pro-forma answer sheet available for students to use in Assessment task 2.

Prior knowledge &/or skills

N/A
### HOW WILL I BE ASSESSED?

#### Assessment schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment task</th>
<th>Date due</th>
<th>Percent weighting</th>
<th>Links to Intended Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Task 1: Team Case Analysis</td>
<td>Weeks 4, 5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>10 marks</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Task 2: Peer Evaluations x 3</td>
<td>Weeks 4, 5, 6 &amp; 7</td>
<td>15 marks</td>
<td>1, 2, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment Task 3: Live Case Analysis</td>
<td>Monday March 30th at 2pm</td>
<td>25 marks</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assignment task 4: Take-Home Examination</td>
<td>Sunday May 3rd at 11:59pm</td>
<td>50 marks</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Assessment details

**Assessment task 1 & 2: Team Case Analysis & Peer-Evaluations**

**Task description**

ALL Students are required to form teams in their tutorials for the case analysis presentation assessment task. Teams are required to complete ONE (1) case analysis presentation task worth 10 marks (with the content assessed by their tutor).

ALL Students witnessing the team’s case analysis presentations are required to perform THREE (3) peer-evaluations individually, worth 5 marks each.

**NOTE:** Students DO NOT submit a peer-evaluation in the same week that they submit their team case analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Number</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
<th>Measures Intended Learning Outcome:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Describe ethics theories and concepts.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Explain how ethics theories can be applied to identify and address business problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Describe the application and limitations of ethics theory.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Identify ethics issues.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Apply ethics theories and concepts to business scenarios.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task</td>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Reflect on the analyses and recommendations of others.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Apply ethics theories and concepts to identified issues and justify recommendation.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communicate using the lexicon/language/logic of ethics analysis.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task length**

Case Analysis Presentation: 20 minutes minimum – 30 minutes maximum

Peer-evaluations must be submitted in MS Word or PDF word-processed format to the relevant MyLO Drop-Box within 24 hours of the completion of the team’s presentation.

**Make sure that you specify the tutorial time you are in as part of your peer-evaluation submissions.**

**Due by date**

Weeks 4, 5, 6 & 7.

---

**Team Case Analysis Information**

Please find below the Team Case Analysis Tasks for Weeks 3 to 6.

Please also find the peer-evaluation questions on the next page – addressing these questions will assist you in your team’s presentation preparations.

**Week 4: Utilitarianism.**

Download the Utilitarianism Case from the unit’s MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Utilitarian theory of ethical obligation. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake a Utilitarian analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Utilitarian analysis of the ‘Ford Pinto - An amazing true story’ case study. Detail and justify the decision you would recommend (as an Act Utilitarian) in this case.

**Week 5: Kantianism.**

Download the Kantianism Study from the unit’s MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Kantian theory of ethical obligation. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Kantian analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Kantian analysis of the ‘Termination of a Work Colleague and Friend’ case study. Detail and justify the decision you would recommend (as a Kantian) in this case.

**Week 6: Rights**
Download the Rights Case from the unit’s MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Rights theory of ethical action. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Rights analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Rights analysis of the ‘Contentious Issue of Smoking versus Non-Smoking’ case. Detail and justify the decision you would recommend (as an Ethical Rights advocate) in this case.

**Week 7: Distributive Justice**
Download the Distributive Justice Case from the unit’s MyLO page, and use it as the basis for your tutorial presentation.

**TASK:** Define the elements of the Distributive Justice theory of ethical action. In your definition, be sure to outline the steps required when attempting to undertake an effective Distributive Justice analysis. Using the case available on MyLO, provide a Distributive Justice analysis of the ‘Case of the Plant relocation’. Detail and justify the decision you would recommend (as a Distributive Justice advocate) in this case.

**Peer-Evaluation Information**

**Questions for the peer-evaluation assessment task:**

1. Did the team define the ethics theory correctly?
   a) To what extent was the team’s definition of the ethics theory accurate and comprehensive?
   b) What additional information should the team have included in their definition?

2. Did the team explain the steps in the application of the theory to an ethical dilemma?
   a) Were all of the steps correctly identified?
   b) Were the steps correctly and completely defined?
   c) What additional information should the team have included?

3. Did the team apply *case analysis process* to the case in an accurate manner?
   a) Were any relevant case facts missing from the team’s analysis of the case?
   b) Were any irrelevant case facts included in the team’s analysis?
   c) Did the team identify the correct decision-maker in the case?
   d) Did the team identify the correct ethical dilemma in the case?
   e) Did the team correctly define the punishments for each of the ethical dilemma options? If not, why not?
   f) To what extent did the team accurately apply the ethics theory to their ethical dilemma?
4. Did the team present a logical recommendation to the ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in this case?
   a) Did the team specifically state which ethical dilemma option they would recommend to the decision-maker in the case?
   b) Was the team’s ethical dilemma recommendation correct? If not, why not?
   b) To what extent did the team’s Final Recommendation avoid the specific punishment(s) attached to the ethical dilemma option?
   b) Could the team have included any additional recommendations to help the decision-maker avoid the punishments?

Please note: there is a pro-forma answer sheet available in MyLO for students to use.
BAA310 CASE ANALYSIS PRESENTATION MARK ADJUSTMENT FORM

Your team’s presentation will be marked out of a score of 10. In conjunction with the Teamwork Agreement Form (available on MyLO), this document enables you to provide guidance as to what percentage of the mark you believe individual members of your team should receive given their contribution. NB: if no forms are submitted, all members will receive 100% of the team’s designated mark.

If you feel that a team member has not contributed as detailed in the Teamwork Agreement Form, please place a value of between 0% and 100% next to that team member’s name that reflects their level of input. NB: You DO NOT need to include the signatures(s) of the team member(s) whose mark you are requesting be adjusted downward.

The mark that students receive from their team’s presentation will equal:

(The team’s overall score) multiplied by (the individual’s “contribution score”).

For example: Team A consists of John, Adam, Mary, and Jane. Their tutor awarded the team a score of 8/10 for their presentation. Because John and Jane did not contribute as agreed, Adam and Mary both filled in the Mark Adjustment form. After speaking to John and Jane about their input, the unit coordinator altered the marks allocated as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Team’s Overall Score x “Agreed Contribution”</th>
<th>Student’s Individual Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John</td>
<td>8 x 50%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam</td>
<td>8 x 100%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>8 x 100%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jane</td>
<td>8 x 75%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the section provided below, please write the names of your fellow team members and the percentage of the score you believe that individual deserves.

Student Names

% Contribution

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Signed:-

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Assessment task 3: Live Case Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The ‘Boeing 737-MAX’ Case</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In 2019, Boeing was sued in a class action lawsuit by over 400 pilots accusing the company of covering up known design flaws in their 737-MAX aircraft. Your task is to research the facts underpinning the ‘Boring 737-MAX’ Case, and to provide a written report* detailing your ethical analysis of the case.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OR

| **The ‘US College Admissions’ Case** |
| In 2019, multiple lawsuits were filed against prestigious US universities concerning the preferential enrolment of students from wealthy families. Your task is to research the facts underpinning the ‘US College Admissions’ case, and to provide a written report* detailing your ethical analysis of the case. |

OR

| **The ‘Israel Folau Employment Termination’ Case** |
| In 2019, the National Rugby League (NRL) controversially sacked Israel Folau for breach of his employment contract. Your task is to research the facts underpinning the ‘Israel Folau Employment Termination’ case, and to provide a written report* detailing your ethical analysis of the case. |

*Your report must include a discussion of the following:

1. Describe the facts that underpinned the ethical dilemma in the case.
2. Who was the decision-maker in the case, and what conflicting demands did they have to accommodate?
3. What was the initial ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in this case?
4. Using the Utilitarian, Kantian, Rights, and Distributive Justice approaches to ethical decision-making, provide an analysis of the ethical dilemma.
5. Present and justify the final recommendation you would have made to the decision-maker in this case had they asked you for advice on how to resolve their initial ethical dilemma.

NOTE: You are not required to define any of the ethical theories in your report. You are required, however, to fully reference the case facts you use in your report.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Number</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
<th>Measures Intended Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify ethics issues.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apply ethics theories and concepts to business scenarios.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflect on the analyses and recommendations of others.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct independent research on contemporary strategic issues.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Identify and analyse a business issue in current business-based case.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Apply ethics theories and concepts to identified issues and justify recommendation.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communicate using the lexicon/language/logic of ethics analysis.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task length**

2500 words (maximum) – no 10% leeway!

The Live Cases analysis assignment must be submitted in MS Word or PDF word-processed format to the relevant MyLO Drop-Box.

**Due by date**

Monday, March 30th at 2pm
LIVE CASE ANALYSIS PREPARATION SHEET: SUMMARY OF COMMON ISSUES

Case Facts:
- The Case Facts section was incomplete and did not support the Ethical Dilemma sufficiently well.
- The Case Facts section was poorly written and confusing to read.
- The Case Facts section was insufficiently referenced (and therefore unconvincing to read).

Case Issues:
- The Case Issues section did not identify the decision-maker in the case ("if there is no specific name available, then the position that they held needs to be identified – e.g. CEO, CFO, employee etc.").
- The Case Issues section did not describe the competing demands faced by the decision-maker.

Ethical Dilemma (incl. Case Facts and Case Issues, 6 marks):
- The Ethical Dilemma was illogical.
- The Ethical Dilemma was NOT expressed as two exactly opposite statements.
- The punishments associated with the Ethical Dilemma were not linked to the decision-maker specifically.

Utilitarianism (4 marks):
- The list of consequences was illogical and/or poorly expressed.
- The list of consequences was incomplete/far too brief to be useful to the reader ("more problematic if the assignment is under the word count").
- The list included non-sequences.
- The justification of the Greatest Good was poorly explained.
- The link back to the Ethical Dilemma was not present.

Kantianism (4 marks):
- The party to whom the decision-maker owes their primary duty was not identified accurately.
- The maxims included consequential considerations.
- The Universalisation test was not applied accurately.
- The Respect for Persons test was not applied accurately.
- The Respect for Autonomy test was not applied accurately.
- The link back to the Ethical Dilemma was not present.

Rights (4 marks):
- The list of relevant “Rights at Play” was incomplete ("i.e. relevant stakeholders were not included in the analysis").
- The list of relevant “Rights at Play” did not include the attached obligations.
- The “Clash of Rights” was not correctly identified.
- The resolution of the Clash of Rights was poorly explained.
- The link back to the Ethical Dilemma was not present.

Justice (4 marks):
- The list of potential “worst-off parties” was incomplete ("includes relying on consequences").
- The selected “worst-off party” was not logically justified.
- The outcomes for the “worst-off party” included reference to consequences.
- The link back to the Ethical Dilemma was not present.

Final Recommendation (2 marks):
- The Ethical Dilemma was not resolved specifically.
- The punishment associated with the Ethical Dilemma alternative is not dealt with specifically.

Presentation Standards (1 mark): NB: any error here results in the loss of the 1 mark available
- The text is not double or 1.5 line spaced.
- Incorrect or inaccurate referencing standards applied in the text AND/OR the final reference list.
- Exceeded the word limit.
Assessment task 4: Take Home Examination

**Task description**

The take-home examination will comprise TWO (2) parts. Part A consists of a compulsory 2000-word MAXIMUM case analysis (worth 20 or 30 marks – depending on how many essays are attempted in Section B). Part B consists of TWO (2) or THREE (3) 1000-word MAXIMUM essays from a choice of at least FOUR (4) questions (worth 10 marks each).

**Part A:** The compulsory case study will be chosen from a suite of cases available on MyLO – these cases will be made available to the students from Week 1 of the study period. Once the take-home examination case is selected by the Unit Coordinator, students must complete the following tasks:

1. Describe the facts that underpinned the ethical dilemma in the case.
2. Who is the decision-maker in the selected case, and what conflicting demands did they have to accommodate?
3. What was the initial ethical dilemma faced by the decision-maker in this case?
4. Using the Utilitarian, Kantian, Rights, and Distributive Justice approaches to ethical decision-making, provide an analysis of the ethical dilemma.
5. Present and justify the final recommendation you would have made to the decision-maker in this case had they asked you for advice on how to resolve their initial ethical dilemma.

**Part B:** The essay questions will be focused on the lecture material delivered from Week 5 onwards, and students are required to answer TWO (2) or THREE (3) questions from at least FOUR (4) alternatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion Number</th>
<th>Criterion Description</th>
<th>Measures Intended Learning Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Identify ethics issues</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Apply ethics theories and concepts to business scenarios</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Reflect on the analyses and recommendations of others.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Conduct independent research on contemporary strategic issues.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Identify and analyse a business issue in current business-based case.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Apply ethics theories and concepts to identified issues and justify recommendation.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Communicate using the lexicon/language/logic of ethics analysis.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Task length**

- Section A: 2000 words MAXIMUM
- Section B: 1000 words MAXIMUM for each essay
The take-Home Examination paper will be released on Wednesday April 29th by 12pm.

The Take-Home Examination must be submitted in MS Word or PDF word-processed format to the relevant MyLO Drop-Box.

Your answers to the take-home Examination paper is due by Sunday May 3rd at 11:59pm.

**NOTE: There is NO POSSIBILITY for extensions to be granted for this assessment task FOR ANY REASON.** If you are unable to submit the assessment task for a medical or compassionate reason ONLY, you may apply for a Deferred Take-Home Examination Paper.

---

**How your final result is determined**

To pass this unit, you need to demonstrate your attainment of each of the Intended Learning Outcomes.

Your grade will be determined in the following way:

Your overall mark in this unit will be determined by combining your results from each assessment task. These marks are combined to reflect the percentage weighting of each task. You need to achieve an overall score of at least 50% to successfully complete this unit.

If you are unclear about the requirements for an assessment task, it is expected that you will seek help (from the Unit Coordinator in the first instance), well before the due date.

- PP (pass) at least 50% of the overall mark but less than 60%
- CR (credit) at least 60% of the overall mark but less than 70%
- DN (distinction) at least 70% of the overall mark but less than 80%
- HD (high distinction) at least 80% of the overall mark

All grades are provisional, until confirmation by the Assessment Board at the end of the study period.

---

**Submission of assignments**

The act of submitting your assignment will be taken as certification that it is your own work and that you are familiar with the University of Tasmania’s Academic Integrity and Misconduct guidelines [https://www.utas.edu.au/curriculum-and-quality/academic-integrity-and-misconduct](https://www.utas.edu.au/curriculum-and-quality/academic-integrity-and-misconduct)
All assignments must be submitted electronically through the relevant assignment tab in MyLO unless otherwise stated in the assessment instructions.

You must ensure that your name, student ID, unit code, tutorial time and tutor’s name (if applicable) are clearly marked on the first page. If this information is missing, the assignment will not be accepted and, therefore, will not be marked.

Assessments submitted via email will not be accepted.

Where relevant, Unit Coordinators may also request you to submit a paper version of your assignment. You will be advised by the Unit Coordinator of the appropriate process relevant to your campus.

Please remember that you are responsible for lodging your assessment items on or before the due date and time. We suggest you keep a copy. Even in a perfect system, items sometimes go astray.

Requests for extensions

In this Policy:

1. (a) ‘day’ or ‘days’ includes all calendar days, including weekends and public holidays;
   (b) ‘late’ means after the due date and time; and
   (c) ‘assessment items’ includes all internal non-examination-based forms of assessment

2. This Policy applies to all students enrolled in TSBE Units at whatever Campus or geographical location.

3. Students are expected to submit assessment items on or before the due date and time specified in the relevant Unit Outline. The onus is on the student to prove the date and time of submission.

4. Students who have a medical condition or special circumstances may apply for an extension. Requests for extensions should, where possible, be made in writing to the Unit Coordinator on or before the due date. Students will need to provide independent supporting documentation to substantiate their claims.

Penalties

Late submission of assessment items will incur a penalty of 10% of the total marks possible for that piece of assessment for each day the assessment item is late unless an extension had been granted on or before the relevant due date.

Assessment items submitted more than five (5) days late will not be accepted.

Academic staff do NOT have the discretion to waive a late penalty, subject to clause 4 above.
Review of results and appeals

Review of Assessment is available to all students once the University has released the final result for a unit. If you are dissatisfied with your final result, you may apply to have it reviewed. Applications for a review of assessment are due within 10 working days of the release of the final result in the unit. If you have passed the unit you must pay a $50 fee.

If you wish to have a piece of internal assessment reviewed as part of the review process, please state this clearly on the application form referred to above and include that assessment item with your application.

Please read and follow the directions provided by the University at:

Academic referencing

In your written work you will need to support your ideas by referring to scholarly literature, works of art and/or inventions. It is important that you understand how to correctly refer to the work of others, and how to maintain academic integrity.

The University library provides information on presentation of assignments, including referencing styles and should be referred to when completing tasks in this unit.

Please read the following statement on plagiarism. Should you require clarification please see your unit coordinator or lecturer.
\begin{boxedtext}

**Plagiarism**

Plagiarism is a form of cheating. It is taking and using someone else’s thoughts, writings or inventions and representing them as your own; for example, using an author’s words without putting them in quotation marks and citing the source, using an author’s ideas without proper acknowledgment and citation, copying another student’s work.

If you have any doubts about how to refer to the work of others in your assignments, please consult your lecturer or tutor for relevant referencing guidelines. You may also find the Academic Honesty site on MyLO of assistance.

The intentional copying of someone else’s work as one’s own is a serious offence punishable by penalties that may range from a fine or deduction/cancellation of marks and, in the most serious of cases, to exclusion from a unit, a course or the University.

The University and any persons authorised by the University may submit your assessable works to a plagiarism checking service, to obtain a report on possible instances of plagiarism. Assessable works may also be included in a reference database. It is a condition of this arrangement that the original author’s permission is required before a work within the database can be viewed.

For further information on this statement and general referencing guidelines, see the Plagiarism and Academic Integrity page on the University web site or the Academic Honesty site on MyLO.

\end{boxedtext}

\begin{boxedtext}

**Academic misconduct**

Academic misconduct includes cheating, plagiarism, allowing another student to copy work for an assignment or an examination, and any other conduct by which a student:

a. seeks to gain, for themselves or for any other person, any academic advantage or advancement to which they or that other person are not entitled; or

b. improperly disadvantages any other student.

Students engaging in any form of academic misconduct may be dealt with under the Ordinance of Student Discipline, and this can include imposition of penalties that range from a deduction/cancellation of marks to exclusion from a unit or the
Details of penalties that can be imposed are available in Ordinance 9: Student Discipline – Part 3 Academic Misconduct.

### Student Behaviour

The University Behaviour Policy sets out behaviour expectations for all members of our University community including students and staff.

The aim in doing so is to ensure that our community members are safe, feel valued and can actively contribute to our University mission.

It is expected that community members behave in a manner that is consistent with our University values – respect, fairness and justice, integrity, trust, responsibility and honesty. There are also certain behaviours that are considered inappropriate, such as unlawful discrimination, bullying and sexual misconduct.

The accompanying University Behaviour Procedure sets out the process and avenues that University community members can access to resolve concerns and complaints regarding inappropriate behaviour by a University community member. Wherever possible, the focus will be on early intervention and a ‘restorative’ approach that creates awareness of inappropriate behaviour and its impact on others. However, in some cases, students who engage in inappropriate behaviour may be subject to disciplinary proceedings, which may impact upon continuation of their studies.

Students can seek support and assistance from the Safe and Fair Community Unit SaFCU@utas.edu.au or ph: 6226 2560.

Matters are dealt with in confidence and with sensitivity.
WHAT LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES ARE THERE?

MyLO

MyLO is the online learning environment at the University of Tasmania. This is the system that will host the online learning materials and activities for this unit.

Getting help with MyLO

It is important that you are able to access and use MyLO as part of your study in this unit. To find out more about the features and functions of MyLO, and to practice using them, visit the Getting Started in MyLO unit. For access to information about MyLO and a range of step-by-step guides in pdf, word and video format, visit the MyLO Student Support page on the University website. If something is not working as it should, contact the Service Desk (Service.Desk@utas.edu.au, phone 6226 1818), or Request IT Help Online.

Resources

Required readings

There is no prescribed text for this unit. See MyLO for access to the required readings in this unit.

Recommended readings (Academic publications)


Morrison, J 2015, Business ethics, Palgrave, UK.


Trevino LA & Nelson, KA 2013. Business ethics: Straight talk about how to do it right, John Wiley & Sons, USA.

Recommended readings (Professional publications)

In addition to the texts recommended above, you are also expected to be familiar with the key professional publications in the discipline from which useful insights may be
derived. In particular, you are encouraged to review regularly the relevant papers that are published in:

- *Business & Professional Ethics Journal*
- *Business & Society*
- *Business Ethics Quarterly*
- *Business Ethics: A European Review*
- *Journal of Business Ethics*
- *Journal of Business Education*

**Reading Lists**

Reading Lists provide direct access to all material on unit reading lists in one place. This includes eReadings and items in Reserve. You can access the Reading List for this unit from the link in MyLO, or by going to the [Reading Lists page](#) on the University Library website.
Learning expectations

The University is committed to high standards of professional conduct in all activities, and holds its commitment and responsibilities to its students as being of paramount importance. Likewise, it holds expectations about the responsibilities students have as they pursue their studies within the special environment the University offers.

**Students are expected to participate actively and positively in the teaching/learning environment. They must attend classes when and as required, strive to maintain steady progress within the subject or unit framework, comply with workload expectations, and submit required work on time.**

Details of teaching arrangements

The unit’s teaching schedule commences in the week beginning February 3rd, 2020.

There will be a series of 12 lectures (weeks 1 to 12 inclusive) and 11 tutorials (weeks 2 to 12 inclusive) held weekly throughout the study period.

Specific attendance/performance requirements

In this unit, your active engagement will be monitored in the following way:

1. Attendance at/viewing of weekly lectures
2. Attendance at/viewing of weekly tutorial sessions
3. Completion of assessment tasks

If you do not demonstrate evidence of having engaged actively with this unit by the means described above by Week 4 of the study period, you may be withdrawn from the unit.
Please note that the tutorial program does not begin until Week 2

**Week 2—Introduction: Ethics and Business**

1. Using the article by Arnott (2018), define the difference between ‘doing ethical things’ and ‘doing things ethically’. What are the implications of this distinction for the role of ethics in business?
2. Using the article by Tindall (2014) identify the ‘current hotspots’ of unethical behaviour in business. Why are these behaviours considered unethical?
3. Using the article by Petje (2018), define what is meant by the terms ‘ethical leadership’, ‘ethical followership’ and ‘ethical culture’ in the business context.
4. Define what is meant by the term ‘ethical relativism’? What are the arguments for and against this concept? Given these arguments, does the concept offer a useful guide to action?

**Week 3 – Case Analysis and Presentation**

Case: The ‘Case of the Collapsed Mine’.

1. Describe the case facts as they occurred in chronological order. At what point in the list of case facts does the initial ethical dilemma occur?
2. Who is the decision-maker facing the ethical dilemma in the case?
3. What competing demands did the decision-maker have to contend with at the point of the ethical dilemma?
4. What was the ethical dilemma in the case? How does the ethical dilemma need to be expressed?
5. What punishments would the decision-maker expect to receive for each ethical dilemma alternative?

**Week 4 - Team 1 Presentation and Peer-Evaluation activity**

**Week 5 - Team 2 Presentation and Peer-Evaluation activity**

**Week 6 - Team 3 Presentation and Peer-Evaluation activity**

**Week 7 - Team 4 Presentation and Peer-Evaluation activity**

**Week 8—Safety, Risk & Environmental Protection**

Case: The McDonald’s Polystyrene Case (Available on MyLO)

1. What are the relevant case facts in the assigned cases?
2. Who is the decision-maker in the assigned case, and what competing issues or duties did they face?
3. What was the ethical dilemma in the case?
4. Briefly describe how each of the ethical theories covered in this unit would be applied to resolve the ethical dilemma.
Week 9—Whistle-Blowing

Case: The “Quality Management: Signing Off on a Substandard Product” Case (on MyLO)
1. What are the relevant case facts in the assigned cases?
2. Who is the decision-maker is in the assigned case, and what competing issues or duties did they face?
3. What was the ethical dilemma in the case?
4. Briefly describe how each of the ethical theories covered in this unit would be applied to resolve the ethical dilemma.

Week 10—Marketing, Truth & Advertising

Case: The Nestlé Infant Formula Case (Available on MyLO)
1. What are the relevant case facts in the assigned cases?
2. Who is the decision-maker is in the assigned case, and what competing issues or duties did they face?
3. What was the ethical dilemma in the case?
4. Briefly describe how each of the ethical theories covered in this unit would be applied to resolve the ethical dilemma.

Week 11—Privacy at Work

Case: Drug and Polygraph Testing at Company X (Available on MyLO)
1. What are the relevant case facts in the assigned cases?
2. Who is the decision-maker is in the assigned case, and what competing issues or duties did they face?
3. What was the ethical dilemma in the case?
4. Briefly describe how each of the ethical theories covered in this unit would be applied to resolve the ethical dilemma.

Week 12—Discrimination & Affirmative Action

Case: The Weber Case (Available on MyLO)
1. What are the relevant case facts in the assigned cases?
2. Who is the decision-maker is in the assigned case, and what competing issues or duties did they face?
3. What was the ethical dilemma in the cases?
4. Briefly describe how each of the ethical theories covered in this unit would be applied to resolve the ethical dilemmas.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Week</th>
<th>Week Beginning</th>
<th>Topic/Module/Focus Area</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Resources/Readings/Further Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>February 3rd</td>
<td>Introduction to Ethics &amp; Business</td>
<td>Readings 1.1 &amp; 1.2, Videos 1.1 to 1.4, Audio 1.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>February 10th</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Reading 2.1, Video 2.1 &amp; 2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>February 17th</td>
<td>Kantianism</td>
<td>Reading 3.1, Video 3.1, Lecture Case 3.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>February 24th</td>
<td>Ethical Rights &amp; Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Reading 4.1 &amp; 4.2, Video 4.1 &amp; 4.2, Lecture Case 4.1 &amp; 4.2</td>
<td>Case Analysis Presentation #1 Wednesday 2th February: Launceston Cup holiday. Please check with your lecturer if there are alternative arrangements for your class.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>March 2nd</td>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)</td>
<td>Readings 5.1 to 5.3, Videos 5.1 &amp; 5.2, Audio 5.1 &amp; 5.2, Lecture Case 5.1</td>
<td>Case Analysis Presentation #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>March 9th</td>
<td>Trade Secrets, Conflicts of Interest &amp; Insider Trading</td>
<td>Readings 6.1 to 6.4, Videos 6.1 to 6.3</td>
<td>Case Analysis Presentation #3 Monday 9th March: Eight Hours Day holiday</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>March 16th</td>
<td>Safety, Risk &amp; Environmental Protection</td>
<td>Readings 7.1 to 7.4, Audio 7.1</td>
<td>Case Analysis Presentation #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>March 23rd</td>
<td>Whistle-Blowing</td>
<td>Readings 8.1 &amp; 8.2, Video 8.1, Lecture Cases 8.1 &amp; 8.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>March 30th</td>
<td>Marketing, Truth &amp; Advertising</td>
<td>Readings 9.1 &amp; 9.2, Audio 9.1</td>
<td>Live Case Analysis Due</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>April 6th – 8th April 16th – 17th</td>
<td>Privacy at Work</td>
<td>Readings 10.1 to 10.3, Videos 10.1 &amp; 10.2</td>
<td>Please note: this week is a short week as Friday 10th April is the Good Friday holiday and the second day of mid-semester break</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mid-semester break: Thursday April 9th to Wednesday April 15th, inclusive of the Easter public holidays
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Readings</th>
<th>Videos</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11 April 20th</td>
<td>Discrimination &amp; Affirmative Action</td>
<td>11.1 &amp; 11.2</td>
<td>11.1 &amp; 11.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 April 27th</td>
<td>Take-Home Examination (tutorials only this week)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Take-home Examination Due</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Exam Period:** 3rd to 9th May (inclusive)

**Take-Home Examination Released on Wednesday April 29th at 12pm, and is due to be submitted on Sunday May 3rd at 11:59pm.**

**NO EXTENSIONS ARE POSSIBLE for the Take-Home Examination – if you are unable to submit for a medical or compassionate reason, you can apply for a Deferred Take-Home Examination paper.**
The Tasmanian School of Business and Economics (TSBE) is currently in the process of applying for business accreditation with the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) – the lead program for accrediting business schools globally. AACSB seeks to connect educators, students, and business to achieve a common goal – to create the next generation of business leaders.

By joining AACSB and going through the accreditation process, TSBE is joining a global alliance committed to improve the quality of business education around the world, and to share the latest innovations in business education. Gaining Business Accreditation with AACSB is a multi-year process involving TSBE demonstrating our performance against the 15 accreditation standards.

Once complete, TSBE will join a select community of accredited business schools, with only 7% of all business schools globally having completed the AACSB process. This will further enhance the reputation of TSBE, and further enhance the global recognition of your qualifications. To find out more about AACSB click [here](#).