



SYLLABUS

Name of Institution: Mahidol University International College
Division: Business Administration Division

GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Course Code and Course Title

Thai	ICMB 311 จริยธรรมทางธุรกิจ และ การพัฒนาอย่างยั่งยืน
English	ICMB 311 Business Ethics and Sustainability

2. Number of Credits: 4 credits

3. Credit Hours/Semester

Lecture or Other In-class Activity Hours	Laboratory/ Field Trip/ Internship Hours	Self-Study Hours
48	0	96

4. Degree: Bachelor of Business Administration

5. Faculty Members:

Name: Dr. Bablu Kumar Dhar (Dr. BK) --- Sec. 2 & 3
Email: bablu.kum@mahidol.edu
Webpage: <https://dharbk.weebly.com/bes.html>
Telephone: +66 (0) 2700-5000, Ext. 4491
Office Hours: Tuesday and Thursday 12.00-14.00
Line ID: @drbkdhar

6. Trimester/Academic Year: T3/2023

7. Pre-requisites:

For ICMB 311 Business Ethics and Sustainability:
ICMB 215 Business Finance
ICMB 237 International Business Management
ICMB 310 Business Law

Due to the complexity of the subject it is strongly recommended that only 3rd and 4th year students attend this course.

DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

8. Course Description

Thai	ความเข้าใจ การวิเคราะห์ห้มนโนคติของจริยธรรม ความเกี่ยวข้องของจริยธรรมในการตัดสินใจทางธุรกิจภายใต้สภาวะการณ์ทางสังคมและธุรกิจที่เกี่ยวข้อง การนำหลักการทางจริยธรรมมาปรับใช้กับประเด็นที่เกี่ยวข้องกับจริยธรรมภายในองค์กรและภายนอกองค์กร
English	An understanding, analysis of ethical concepts, and the implications of ethics in business decisions under different social and other business-related environments, an application of ethical principles to ethical issues within the organization and the external environment.

b) Course Objectives ICMB 311

Course Learning Objective (CLO)	Program Learning Objectives (PLO)
CLO1 Describe how businesses can affect and are affected ethically by various stakeholders.	PLO1 Students can assess the ethical implications of business practices
CLO2 Describe the relevance of corporate social/environmental responsibility and corporate governance for business sustainability.	
CLO3 Describe the relevance of sustainability concepts and sustainable development for businesses.	PLO2 Students can describe the concepts of sustainability in business contexts
CLO4 Analyze ethical issues in specific business contexts.	

Academic Dishonesty

Academic dishonesty is prohibited at MUIC. It is a serious offense because it diminishes the quality of scholarship and makes accurate evaluation of student progress impossible. Please refer and adhere to the rules and regulations regarding an academic dishonesty stated in the Student Handbook.

Copyrights on Online Learning Content

Unless allowed by Mahidol University, the user shall not copy, modify, or exploit, neither in part nor as a whole, the copyrighted materials on the platform, other than for the enrolled students' personal individual study. Copying, modifying or communicating the copyrighted materials to the public will be inflicted with a fine between 20,000 THB and 200,000 THB. If the offence is committed with a commercial purpose, the offender will be inflicted with imprisonment for a term between 6 months and 4 years or a fine between 100,000 THB and 800,000 THB or both, imprisonment and fine.

TEACHING AND EVALUATION PLAN

9. Teaching Plan

Week	Topics & Slide Sets (tentative, subject to change)	Hours	CLO	Teaching Methods	Assessment	Rubric	Book Chapter	Instructor
1	BE&S-01: Introduction: Business & Ethics - Contradiction & Success Story	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	1	BK
2	BE&S-02: Ethics & Business – Down the Philosophical Rabbit Hole BE&S-03: 3.1-3.2 Normative Ethical Foundations for Business Ethics: Values, Happiness, Virtues	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	2/3	BK
3	BE&S-03: Normative Ethical Foundations for Business Ethics: The Big Five: Deontology, Utilitarianism, Justice, Care, Capability	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	3	BK
4	BE&S-04: Trash & Treasures: Sustainability and Business' Environmental Responsibility	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	4	BK
5	BE&S-04: Trash & Treasures: Sustainability and Business' Environmental Responsibility BE&S-05: Ethical Stakeholder Analysis and SWOT Analysis	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	4/5	BK
6	BE&S-06: Technology & Business Ethics	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	6	BK

Week	Topics & Slide Sets (tentative, subject to change)	Hours	CLO	Teaching Methods	Assessment	Rubric	Book Chapter	Instructor
7	BE&S-07: Ethics in Media / Marketing / Fashion	2	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	7	BK
8	BE&S-08: Intercultural Business Ethics BE&S-09: Systemic Issues / Current issues in business ethics	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	8/9	BK
9	BE&S-09: Systemic Issues / Current issues in business ethics FINAL TEAM CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Concept Presentations, Thought Experiments, Case studies, Lecture	Individual concept & team case presentations, discussion	Yes	1-9	BK
10	Current issues in business ethics FINAL TEAM CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Case studies	team case presentations, discussion	Yes	1-9	BK
11	Current issues in business ethics FINAL TEAM CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Case studies	team case presentations, discussion	Yes	1-9	BK
12	Current issues in business ethics FINAL TEAM CASE STUDY PRESENTATIONS	4	CLO 1-4	Self – study, Q&A, Discussions, Case studies	team case presentations, discussion	Yes	1-9	BK

10. Evaluation Plan

Methods/ Activities	Description	Week	Percentage = Points
In class participation & contribution during Individual Concept Presentations Q&As	See Appendix	1-9	10%
Individual Concept Presentations			27%
Team Case Presentations		9-12	51%
Audience contributions to discussions during Team Case Presentations Q&As			9%
Regular participation & contribution during ICP & TCP Q&As in a significant way: quantitatively, but especially qualitatively		1-2	1-3%

Assessment Type	Points	Submission Dates: Each late submission will result in 1 point deduction
Individual Concept Presentation: Slides	6	at least 48 hours before you present (exception: presentation in the first week)
Individual Concept Presentation: Executive Summary	9	Date will be informed in the class
Team Case Presentation: Slides	3	at least 48 hours before you present
Team Case Presentation: Executive Summary	6	Date will be informed in the class

11. Course Assessment

Note: Course assessment between all sections may be statistically normalized.

Grade	Score	Achievement	GPA
A	90-100	Excellent	4.0
B+	85-89	Very Good	3.5
B	80-84	Good	3.0
C+	75-79	Fairly Good	2.5
C	70-74	Fair	2.0
D+	65-69	Poor	1.5
D	60-64	Very Poor	1.0
F	<60	Fail	0.0

- **TEACHING MATERIAL AND RESOURCES (Further reading: see appendix)**

Textbook: Meinhold, Roman. 2022. ***Business Ethics and Sustainability***. New York: Routledge

eBook: <https://www.routledge.com/Business-Ethics-and-Sustainability/Meinhold/p/book/9780367650605>

CU Book Store: THB 760 (official list price THB 930, but for MUIC students THB 760).

Order the textbook at Chula Books: <https://lin.ee/PXD1bMA>

enquiries: Khun Udom, Tel: 081-621 4597 udom.r@cubook.chula.ac.th

APPENDIX

In case you have questions regarding Mahidol email accounts or access to online meeting platforms. Visit the online learning resources site <https://muic.mahidol.ac.th/eng/online-learning-resources/>

I. Text Book

Meinhold, Roman. 2022. *Business Ethics and Sustainability*. New York: Routledge

- is your most important tool. You may also want to listen to the book with the tools provided by your e-reader.
- will direct you to online sources, internet searches, study questions, etc. Please follow these instructions and study in a self-directed and responsible way to make the best out of the provided and linked material.
- is the main source for class discussions, individual concept presentations, and final team case project.
- eBook options can be found here: <https://www.routledge.com/Business-Ethics-and-Sustainability/Meinhold/p/book/9780367650605>
- https://www.amazon.co.uk/Business-Ethics-Sustainability-Roman-Meinhold-ebook/dp/B09KXC2S8H/ref=tmm_kin_swatch_0?encoding=UTF8&qid=&sr=
- Paperback at the CU Book Store:
official list price THB 930, but for MUIC students THB 780.
enquiries: udom.r@cubook.chula.ac.th Khun Udom, Tel: 081-621 4597

II. Line Group

Join the line group of this course: <https://line.me/R/ti/g/E0yiUX7CqS>

III. Google Classroom

In case of emergency the meeting link will be posted in the line group.

IV. WebEx / Google Meet:

In case of emergency the meeting link will be posted in the line group.

V. Further References

- Apichai Puntasen: Buddhist Economics and Ecology. http://roman-meinhold.com/img/Meinhold-Roman-2014-Ecological_Social&Economic_Sustainability-Perspectives%20_for_Thailand&ASEAN.pdf
- Binswanger, Hans Christoph: Plato's Concept of a Sustainable Economy: http://roman-meinhold.com/img/Meinhold-Roman-2014-Ecological_Social&Economic_Sustainability-Perspectives%20_for_Thailand&ASEAN.pdf
- Carroll, A. & Buchholtz, A. (latest ed.). *Business and Society: Ethics and Stakeholder Management*. Mason: South-Western Cengage Learning.
- DesJardins, J. (latest ed.). *An Introduction to Business Ethics*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hartman, L. P. & DesJardins, J. R. (latest ed.). *Business Ethics: Decision-Making for Personal Integrity and Social Responsibility*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Meinhold, R. (2022) **Business Ethics & Sustainability**. Routledge, Earthscan, T&F.
- Meinhold, R. (2016) (ed.) Energy Ethics. Intergenerational Perspectives in and for the ASEAN Region. Guna Chakra Research Center. Assumption University & Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation. Bangkok. ISBN: 978-616-279-918-1. Bangkok.
<http://repository.au.edu/bitstream/handle/6623004553/18879/AU-Book-18879.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y>
- Meinhold, R. (2014). Ecological, Social & Economic Sustainability – [Perspectives for Thailand and ASEAN](#). Bangkok: [Guna Chakra Research Center](#), Assumption University & Konrad-Adenauer-Foundation. http://roman-meinhold.com/img/Meinhold-Roman-2014-Ecological_Social&Economic_Sustainability--Perspectives%20_for_Thailand&ASEAN.pdf
- K. Praveen Parboteeah, John B. Cullen (2018) *Business Ethics*. Routledge
- Sivaraksa, S. (2009) *The Wisdom of Sustainability: Buddhist Economics for the 21st Century*. Chiang Mai: Silkworm Books.
- Teays, W. (latest ed.) *Business Ethics through Movies. A Case Study Approach*. Oxford et al.: Wiley Blackwell.
- Velasquez, M. (latest ed.). *Business Ethics: Concepts and Cases*. New Jersey: Pearson.
- Weiss, J.W. (latest ed.). *Business Ethics: A Stakeholder and Issues Management Approach*, San Francisco: BK Publishers.

Additional encyclopedia articles for CER (by RMM):

- Ecological Economics. In: Encyclopedia of Environmental Issues, Revised Edition, 2011. Salem Press/EBSCO, Ipswich, Mass. and Hackensack, New Jersey, p 406-7
- Ecotopia. In: Encyclopedia of Environmental Issues, Revised Edition, 2011. Salem Press/EBSCO, Ipswich, Mass. and Hackensack, New Jersey, p 420-1
- Overconsumption. In: Encyclopedia of Environmental Issues, Revised Edition, 2011. Salem Press/EBSCO, Ipswich, Mass. and Hackensack, New Jersey, p 944-5
- Subsistence Use. In: Encyclopedia of Environmental Issues, Revised Edition, 2011. Salem Press/EBSCO, Ipswich, Mass. and Hackensack, New Jersey, p 1186

Online Resources:

- ✓ Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy: iep.utm.edu
- ✓ Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: plato.stanford.edu
- ✓ Globethics: globethics.net
- ✓ English writing: ludwig.guru --- googlefight.com

VI. Course policy (cont.)

- Electronic devices such as mobile phones, tablets, laptops etc. must be used for research and learning purposes only.
- All students need to reserve the regular scheduled class period for classes, individual concept and team case presentations and cannot take other exams during the regular scheduled individual concept and team case presentation period.
- All students need to be present and participate actively.
- According to the college policy students who have been absent more than five times cannot be allowed to partake in the individual concept and/ or final team case presentations. Students must attend at least 80% of the total classes of this course.
- Your attendance may be recorded; absenteeism will lead to point deduction: one percentage point may be deducted from the total course percentage per recorded no-show.
- Read carefully the presentation guidelines for individual concept and team case presentations.

VII. Point system for in-class participation: 22% (13% + 9%) of the total course grade

Evidenced cheating of students will set the participation score for the entire course to 0 (nil / zero).

- Points can only be awarded to students who **speak up sufficiently** (listeners need keep down the noise level)
- Measurement: **ONLY meaningful context relevant contributions will be awarded with one point**
- **During Individual Concept Presentations a maximum of 13 points** can be earned. **Two valid responses during the Q&A of the individual concept presentations counts for one point** of your total grade
- Asking **questions during student Team Case Presentations** can earn you another 9 points; during student team case presentations you need to make **9 meaningful contributions for the remaining 9 participation points**
- **Missing participation points during the Individual Concept Presentations cannot be compensated by additional points during the Team Case Presentations**
- **During the trimester, all students are regularly informed about their participation points score**
- If a class has more/less than 40 students the number of participation points may differ.
- **Participation points will ONLY be awarded for:**
 - ✓ **answering questions meaningfully**
 - ✓ **making meaningful context-relevant contributions that deepen the understanding of an issue**
 - ✓ **asking meaningful context-relevant questions that deepen the understanding of an issue**
 - however, no points are given for just “saying something” or
 - for purely clarifying questions (“Can you explain...?”) - such questions are nonetheless welcome!
 - ✓ **but answering such questions will be rewarded with points**
 - no points are awarded for rhetorical questions that have been covered already (“Isn’t it, Business Ethics can be seen as a contradiction in terms”) or
 - contributions that are lacking depth.

- Only very regular participating students who contribute during ICP AND TCP Q&As in a significant way, quantitatively, but especially qualitatively will receive 1, 2, or 3 of the 22 total participation points.

VIII. Guidelines for Individual Concept Presentations (ICP): 27% of the total course grade

1. Each student chooses one of the topics (assignment is on a first-come-first-serve basis); each topic can only be assigned once per section.

- All topics are of similar difficulty and belong to one of three different overarching topic categories (see the additional explanations in the excel file with the topic list).
- Three presentations will be held in each two hours session (see the exact schedule in the Excel file in the ICP folder).
- Read the following notes carefully before you start working on your presentation. The total score of 27 points is divided into four categories (see A to D below):

A) Presentation (5 min.; two criteria with 3 points each = 6 points)

- In the short presentation, the selected topic should first be explained in general terms and considered in terms of its topicality/actuality in order to give the audience a basic understanding of the most important facts/aspects related to this topic (3 points). The presenter decides which aspects she/he considers most important in relation to the topic at hand.
- The next step is to explain to what extent the selected topic is of **ethical relevance for the business-related context** (another 3 points).
- Due to the very limited time, in both aspects you have to limit yourself to what you consider to be the most important information, which in turn has to be integrated into the presentation as concisely, clearly and efficiently as possible.
- The presentation itself should be practiced extensively beforehand in order to keep to the allotted time (5 min.) and to be able to deliver a fluent, persuasive and professional presentation.
- For most topics basic information on both aspects can be found in the course book (sometimes on several pages; it is therefore essential to read the book carefully).
- However, in addition, a fundamental online literature research is required to deepen the theoretical information content of the presentation (scientific literature should be used primarily). You can start your online research with <https://scholar.google.com/>
- When working on the second aspect (on the ethical relevance in the business context), your personal ideas and considerations as well as concrete self-selected examples from corporate practice can also be included in the presentation in addition to the theoretical explanations.
- Full points can only be given if the argumentation is clear, coherent, consistent, concise, conclusive, and grammatically flawless (this also applies to the Executive Summary, see D) below).

B) Slides (5 slides per aspect = 10 slides; two criteria with 3 points each = 6 points)

- To be uploaded according to google classroom announcement (at least 48 hours before the presentation; late submission will result in point deduction). When submitting in email (bablu.kum@mahidol.edu), please rename the slides as follows:
topic_sec_student number:
Example: World Happiness_Sec3_7654321

- The presentation should consist of 10 slides, 5 on each of the two aspects mentioned above (see A)) - one slide more or less is OK.
- The most essential information should be presented on the slides in a clear, visually appealing, concise and error-free manner. Each slide should therefore be carefully proofread to avoid mistakes (grammatical and linguistic errors and the like lead to the deduction of points).
- Slide content should always be created with the limited time frame in mind.

C) Q&A with course participants (10 min; two criteria with 3 points each = 6 points)

- In the Q&A part, the **audience** has the opportunity and responsibility to ask the presenting student questions about the topic (and collect participation points if the questions are thematically appropriate and content-related).
- Points for **presenters** are awarded based on two aspects: On the one hand, on the background knowledge of the respective topic, which is revealed by the answers (3 points), on the other hand, on the sovereignty, clarity, consistency and conciseness of the answers (another 3 points). Consequently, no points are credited for very superficial and short (yes-/ no-) answers.
- It is obvious that an in-depth examination of the chosen topic is an important prerequisite for being able to answer the audience's questions in a well-founded and confident manner.

D) Executive Summary (consisting of two parts corresponding with the presentation; 800 words; three criteria with 3 points each = 9 points)

- To be uploaded according to google classroom announcements. Please check the deadlines in the syllabus. When submitting in email (bablu.kum@mahidol.edu), please rename the slides as follows: topic_sec_student number:
Example: World Happiness_Sec3_7654321
- The Executive Summary summarizes the main findings of the presentation and should consist of 800 words (EXCLUDING: references, your name, your student number, section number).
- Ideally, it should be written in such a way that an external person who has not listened to the presentation is still able to understand the content presented.
- In general, the Executive Summary is based on your presentation (see A). However, the focus of the executive summary lies **not** on the explanation of the concept itself but in pointing out a) its **topicality** (why is this concept, issue topic, **relevant today** – criterion 7); b) its ethical relevance for the **business context** (criterion 8 – about 400 words); and its relevance regarding **sustainability** (criterion 9 – about 400 words). The three criteria are explained below in more detail:
 - Criterion 7 (**topicality**): In addition to the formal correctness of the summary, it is also evaluated whether it is made clear that the analyzed topic is not only interesting, but also **up to date, i.e. of high current relevance**.
 - Criterion 8 (**business relevance**): The general **business relevance and business-ethical relevance** of the topic must be clarified (also with the help of practical and application-oriented examples and the inclusion of the ethical theories/dimensions discussed up to that point).
 - Criterion 9 (**sustainability**): Here it should be made clear what your topic has to do with **sustainability**. Your summary will implicitly reflect to what extent you have a

basic understanding of what sustainability means and why sustainability - **in relation to your covered concept** - is **relevant to different stakeholders?**

- Every solid argument, subject relevant technical terminology, utilization of ethical concepts etc. will score a point or partial points.
- **(in-text citation and references are must in APA referencing style)**
- Formal deficiencies (e.g. grammatical and linguistic errors, see criterion 7) in the Executive Summary also lead to points being deducted. Consequently, accurate proofreading is essential.

2. When evaluating your presentations, it will be considered that students who present one of the topics in the first sessions (at the beginning of the trimester) had less preparation time. Students presenting one of the later topics should meaningfully consider content discussed in earlier sessions (such as ethical terminologies, ethical theories, etc.) in their presentations.

3. Cheating students will be penalized according to MUIC's examination policy. Plagiarized content will result in 0 points for the executive summaries

As plagiarism in this context counts if you...:

- submit someone else's work as your own; this includes "ghostwriting".
- re-write someone else's work without indicating sources in the list of references.
- use quotations, but not indicating the source in the list of references (you should limit quotations to an absolute minimum or better avoid them altogether, if possible)
- mention some, but not all, sources that must be indicated in the list of references.
- indicate the source in the list of references, but fail to change the structure and wording when using original text ("quoting"). You should limit quotations to an absolute minimum or better avoid them altogether, if possible.
- indicate sources incompletely or inaccurately in the list of references.
(cf. <http://go.turnitin.com/paper/plagiarism-spectrum>)

Be aware that today's AI supported apps and programs (e.g. turnitin) easily detect plagiarism with search algorithms that detect "matches" from everywhere in the internet including sites secured by paywalls.

- If you employ a ghostwriter be aware that the ghost may hunt and haunt you later ...∞
- Cases of plagiarism or ghost writing will lead to a disqualification. Evidenced cases will be reported to the college and may lead to disenrollment of a student.
- The college policy has no mercy for people whose keyboard main function area looks like... (Image plagiarized from: 99colleges.com/plagiarism-in-b-school-applications)



IX. Guidelines for Final Business Ethics Team Case Presentation (TCP): 51% of the total course grade

1. The **topic shall be decided upon by students themselves**, with each case being presented by 1 student or 2 students in a team (depending on class size); team-membership shall be freely arranged amongst students themselves.

- The team case presentations take place during the normal class time during the last three and a half weeks of the course. Usually three presentations will be held in each two hours session (see the exact schedule in the Excel file in the TCP folder).
- The rubric for the team case presentation's evaluation can be found on the last pages of this appendix. Please note: Teamwork depends on the coordinated interaction of the two team members, therefore both team members will earn the same grade (exceptions are made if there are significant differences in effort or achievement between the two team members; in this case, the students will be informed about the different points awarded immediately after the presentation).
- The duration of the presentation itself is 15 minutes, followed by a 15 minutes Q&A session. Each case presentation is allocated a maximum of 30 minutes in total (including Q&A). For students in the audience participation points can be earned during Q&A (details on this below).
- Read the following notes carefully before you start working on your presentation. Analogously to the ICP, the total score of 51 points is divided into four categories (see A to D below):

A) Presentation (15 min.; eleven criteria with 3 points each = 33 points)

- The presentation should be supported by visual aids such as power point, and maybe - if suitable - by very brief, well-selected video footage (make sure the video quality is sufficient).
- Clarify beforehand who in your team is responsible for which aspects / parts of your team's presentation and take these responsibilities into account when practicing the presentation.
- The speaking time of both team members should be about the same, so that a fair evaluation is possible.
- As with the ICP, you should keep in mind: **“Proper practice prevents poor performance...”**. Do not simply read the content off the slides, but practice your presentation beforehand so that you get some routine (a common mistake is when presentations have not been practiced).
- Define and clarify technical terms and abbreviations you use.
- During the process of your preparation you should take possible questions by participants into consideration.
- The presentation (and therefore the slides) should have the following structure and include the following components:
 - *Introduction (incl. **ethical Strengths and Weaknesses in the Ethical SWOT Analysis**):* Presentation of a real company / corporate case / ethically negative, positive or exemplary case / generic case -> facts, what happened and what are the ethical problems / issues / implications in this business context? And: What were the consequences? The introduction also includes a brief contextualization and benchmarking¹ of the case

¹ - **Contextualization:** In order to take a closer look at the case and to be able to analyze it appropriately, we must first take a closer look at the underlying context. Contextualization therefore means that the case is fundamentally “situated” and “embedded” in a certain context (for example, considering economic, political, social, technological or other influencing factors - depending on which dimensions and factors are relevant for the case under consideration). For example, if company X dismisses a large number of employees, then we have to embed this measure in a more general context in order to be able to assess it ethically: How is the company

(alternative: presentation of a business ethical theory / concept or a startup concerned with sustainability)

The first part of the **ethical SWOT** analysis, the presentation of the **ethical strengths (S) and weaknesses (W)** of the company/ case under consideration, is also covered in the introduction of the presentation. A first slide could be prepared for contextualization and benchmarking, and a second slide should focus on **ethical strengths and weaknesses**. The opportunities (O) and threats (T) are analyzed and evaluated later in separate categories (see criteria 8 and 9 in the evaluation form and rubric).

Analysis:

- **Ethical** stakeholder analysis (see criteria 2, 4, 5, 6): The actual stakeholder analysis consists of four separate criteria:
- After identifying **the relevant and potential stakeholders** (criterion 2),
- criterion 4 focuses on the **stakeholder relationships** and thus the question regarding how the stakeholders could **collaborate (work together or against each other and even against the company)**.
- In this context you also need to evaluate and point out how the company in your case considers the **diversity and differences of its stakeholders** (regardless of age, class, gender, personal traits, background, and culture) (criterion 3).
- The next step is to examine the **ethically relevant impact of the company's actions on the relevant stakeholders** (criterion 5) and
- vice versa (potential) **impacts of stakeholders on the company** (criterion 6).
- **Ethical SWOT** analysis part 2 and part 3: (criterion 8): In these parts you need to
- point out the (potential) **future ethical threats (T) from ignoring sustainability dimensions**; and
- **future ethical opportunities (O)** resulting from considering **sustainable practices** seriously (criterion 9)
- somewhere within the entire analysis (where depends entirely on your focus, and on your topic and on your personal style) you need to demonstrate that you can apply relevant appropriate **normative ethics theories** to validate your arguments (argue **why something is ethical or unethical**) (see criterion 7)
- **Key Takeaways and transferability:** What do we need to remember about this case? What could other companies learn from this case?

B) Slides (max 20 slides; one criterium with max 3 points)

doing financially, is it making big profits or losses? Did the layoffs come during a general economic crisis or a pandemic? Are the layoffs the result of wrong management decisions (such as fraud) or the consequence of an environmental disaster (such as floods, fire or the like)? Is there a technological innovation that will replace many jobs? What was done (taking into account the company's financial situation) to support the laid-offs? -> We have to know this context to some extent in order to be able to ethically analyze the downsizing measures in company X; or in other words, we need to "contextualize" the problem / case.

- **Benchmarking:** In particular, benchmarking means that a comparison is made with the business practices of the main competitors. Are there the same problems there (such as child labor, environmental pollution, etc.) or have effective internal company structures been implemented in order to avoid such problems? (and not just on paper, but in real figures?) Or do the main competitors have exactly the same problems, i.e. behave just as unethically as the company under consideration? What is going better there and what is possibly even worse (in relation to the case under consideration)? On this basis, the company you are looking at should be briefly compared and classified.

- Each team has to upload one copy of their visual presentation slides no later than 48 hours before the presentation (late submission will result in point deduction). When submitting in email (bablu.kum@mahidol.edu), please rename the slides as follows: topic_sec_ student numbers of both students:
Example: VolkswagenDieselgate_Sec3_7654321_7654322
- Neither put too much or too little information on a single slide, but try to compress the most important information in keywords, schemas, or diagrams.
- As with the slides on the ICP, careful proofreading is required (so the information above applies equivalently)

C) Q&A with course participants (15 min. including 5 min. audience involvement; three criteria with 3 points each = 9 points)

- The 15 min Q&A session should include maximum 5 minutes in which the team involves the audience in their case study, such as through several suitable audience questions (see criterion 12: Pay attention to the appropriateness of the questions asked!), a kahoot quiz, or similar educational tools. In the remaining 10 minutes it is the audience's turn to ask the presenters questions.
- You may want to clarify who is responsible for which questions during the Q&A session.
- The explanation of the general criteria for awarding participation points in the Q&A session can be found in the explanations above.

D) Executive Summary (consisting of two parts corresponding with the presentation; 800 words; two criteria with 3 points each = 6 points)

- Each team has to upload **one** (1) copy of a compressed executive summary of the team's case project in a Google classroom folder as a word document or PDF file (See the comments on plagiarism above). Please check the deadlines in the syllabus. When submitting in email (bablu.kum@mahidol.edu), please rename the slides as follows: topic_sec_ student numbers of both students:
Example: VolkswagenDieselgate_Sec3_7654321_7654322
- The executive summary can follow a similar structure as the slides, should be as close to 800 words as possible, and must be comprised of following components:
 - 0) Topic, Student ID, Full Name, mahidol email address, section number
 - 1) *Intro* (200 words): Introduction, **contextualization, and benchmarking** of case and ethical issues; first part of the **ethical SWOT Analysis** focusing on **Strengths and Weaknesses**
 - 2) *E-SHA* (200 words): **Ethical Stakeholder Analysis** according to criteria 2, 4, 5, 6 (can include ethical theory support)
 - 3) Second part of the **ethical SWOT** (200 words): Analysis **focusing on Opportunities and Threats** (can include ethical theory support)
 - 4) *Suggestions for improvement/ what can other businesses learn from this case* (200 words): How can the company improve from an ethical perspective? How should the responsible persons have acted? What would you do, if you were responsible? What should be done to prevent such cases from happening again in the future?
 - 5) References (no word limit) (**in-text citation and references are must in APA referencing style**)

X. Evaluation Form and Rubric: Individual Concept Presentation

	9 criteria x 3 points	Below Expectations	Good	Excellent
	max. 27 points	0-1	2	3
1	Presentation Explanation and current relevance of concept	Several shortcomings in regard to content, clarity and didactic value, not up-to-date	Succinct and clear, elucidating, didactically valuable and up-to-date	Succinct and very clear, highly elucidating, high didactic value, topical, up-to-date
2	Presentation Business Ethical relevance	Business Ethical relevance of the concept insufficiently well explained, not up-to-date	Business Ethical relevance, topicality, actuality of the concept well explained	Business Ethical relevance, topicality, actuality of the concept very clear, succinctly and concisely explained
3	Q&A Background knowledge revealed through answers	Most answers given are sufficient to address the questions asked, but with a number of shortcomings	Answers reveal solid background knowledge	Comprehensive answers are given that reveal extensive and deep up-to-date background knowledge beyond the slides
4	Q&A form, clarity, comprehensibility, sovereignty	Answered, with major shortcomings in regard to coherence, consistency, conciseness and clarity	Clear, coherent, concise, answered	Very clear, and highly elucidating, coherent, consistent, concise, very sovereignly answered
5	Slides: Form & Topicality Source of information, design, (formal) accuracy, topicality, actuality	Slides are OK, but with several shortcomings, current relevance not (sufficiently) made clear	Neat, well designed, didactically useful, topical, up-to-date and informative slides	Very neat, well designed, highly didactic, informative, highly topical and up-to-date slides, without any flaws
6	Slides: Business Ethical application relevance	General business-related implications/ application value/ applicability of the topic and the business-ethical relevance are not (clearly) highlighted on the slides	General business-related implications/ application value/ applicability of the topic and the business-ethical relevance are made clear on the slides	General business-related implications/ application value/ applicability of the topic and the business-ethical application reference are made very clear (also with the help of suitable ethical theories)
7	Executive Summary: Form & Topicality clarity, consistency, conciseness, topicality and up-to-date dimensions of the concept	Summary is insufficient to understand the concept's business ethical relevance without listening to the presentation; and/ or: several formal flaws; current relevance not (sufficiently) made clear	Well structured, clear, topical, up-to-date summary, that explains the concept's business ethical relevance well; no (significant) formal flaws	Very well structured, clear, consistent, concise, topical, up-to-date summary, comprehensively but succinctly explains and elucidates the concept's business ethical relevance; excellent formal design
8	Executive Summary: Business Ethical Relevance	Business (-ethical) relevance of topic is not (sufficiently) made clear in the summary	Business (-ethical) relevance of topic is adequately addressed in the summary	Business (-ethical) relevance of topic is discussed comprehensively but succinctly in the summary (also by using current examples and including suitable ethical theories)
9	Executive Summary: Overall understanding of the concepts' relevance regarding sustainability for businesses and its stakeholders [LO 4.2(1)]	No (clear) understanding regarding the importance of sustainability for stakeholders - no (sufficient) reference to the sustainability context	Sufficient understanding regarding the importance of sustainability for stakeholders - - The concept is brought in sufficient relation to the sustainability context	Clear and comprehensive understanding regarding the importance of sustainability for stakeholders - - meaningful and in-depth references to the sustainability context

XI. Evaluation Form and Rubric: Team Case Presentation

	17 criteria x 3 points: max. 51 points	0 – 1 major issues - Below expectations	2 Meets expectations/minor issues	3 Exceeds expectations/no issues
1.	Introduction, contextualization, benchmarking of case and ethical issues (1 slide) Ethical SWOT Analysis Part 1: current ethical Strengths and Weaknesses (1 slide)	Introduction and contextualization of case and ethical issues have major shortcomings Not precise or insufficient analysis of ethical strengths and weaknesses to understand the case and its ethical implications	Sufficient introduction and contextualization of case and ethical issues but with minor shortcomings. Sufficient analysis of ethical strengths and weaknesses to understand the case and its ethical implications	Very clear, comprehensive & succinct introduction and contextualization of case and ethical issues. Very detailed, well structured, and clearly presented ethical strengths and weaknesses with strong focus on ethical issues
2.	Stakeholder Identification: identify ethically relevant (1 slide) and potential (1 slide) stakeholders [LO 4.1(1)]	Identification of few ethically relevant stakeholders no identification of potentially disruptive and supportive stakeholders	Sufficient identification of ethically relevant stakeholders	Clear and comprehensive identification of current, ethically relevant stakeholders as well as potentially disruptive and supportive stakeholders
3.	The diversity and differences of stakeholders (regardless of age, class, gender, personal traits, background, and culture) [LO 1.2]	Failure to recognize the importance of diversity.	Ability to recognize the concepts and the importance of diversity.	Ability to recognize the importance of diversity, and integrate them into business analyses and solutions.
4.	Ethical Stakeholders' Analysis: analyze stakeholder relationships (min 1 slide) [LO 4.1(2)]	Limited or insufficient capacity to analyze how relevant stakeholders collaborate	Sufficient analysis on how relevant stakeholders (may) collaborate	Clear and in-depth analysis of how important current stakeholders actually do (or potential stakeholders may) collaborate
5.	Organizations' Impact: analyze organizations' ethically relevant impacts on stakeholders (min 1 slide) [LO 4.1(3)]	Insufficient or no analysis on how organizations ethically impact on stakeholders	Sufficient analysis on organizations' ethical impacts on stakeholders	Clear and in-depth analysis of organizations' ethical impacts on stakeholders
6.	Stakeholders' Impact: analyze stakeholders' impacts on the business (min 1 slide) [LO 4.1(1)]	Clear and in-depth analysis of stakeholders' impacts on organizations	Sufficient analysis on stakeholders' impacts on organizations	Clear and in-depth analysis of stakeholders' impacts on organizations
7.	Normative ethical theories support: explains why something is considered (un)ethical (min 1 slide)	Ethical theories are insufficiently aligned with the case so it is not clear how the theories relate to the case	Ethical theories are sufficiently aligned with the case to understand its ethical issues	Very appropriate and meaningful application of ethical theories elucidate the case's ethical implications
8.	Ethical SWOT Part 2: future ethical Threats & Adverse Effects of Ignoring Sustainability: analyze how the neglect of sustainability approaches may be detrimental to the business (min 1 slide) [LO 4.2(2)]	Insufficient or no analysis how the neglect of sustainability approaches may be detrimental to the business/ Not precise or insufficient analysis of ethical/sustainability threats/risks to understand future ethical implications	Sufficient ability to analyze how the neglect of sustainability approaches may be detrimental to the business/ Sufficient analysis of ethical/sustainability threats/risks to understand future ethical implications	Clear and in-depth analysis how the neglect of sustainability approaches may be detrimental to the business/ Very detailed, well structured, and clearly presented ethical/sustainability threats/risks with strong focus on future ethical issues

9.	Ethical SWOT Part 3: future ethical Opportunities & Opportunities of Sustainable Practices: explain how sustainability approaches can create value for stakeholders (min 1 slide) [LO 4.2(3)]	Insufficient or no analysis how the neglect of sustainability approaches could adversely affect stakeholders Not precise or insufficient analysis of ethical/ sustainability opportunities to understand future ethical implications	Sufficient ability to explain how sustainability approaches can create value for stakeholders Sufficient analysis of ethical/ sustainability opportunities to understand future ethical implications	Clear and in-depth analysis how sustainability approaches can create value for stakeholders Very detailed, well structured, and clearly presented ethical/ sustainability opportunities with strong focus on future ethical issues
10.	Key takeaways and creativity regarding suggestions for transferability into other business contexts, industries etc. (min 2 slides)	No or not very useful suggestions regarding transferability to other business contexts	Some useful suggestions regarding transferability to other business contexts	Very creative and highly thoughtful suggestions regarding transferability to other business contexts
11.	Presentation style : clarity, consistency, coherence, eloquence	Unclear, inconsistent, incoherent, or interruptedly presented	Clear, consistent, coherent, eloquently presented case, with a few shortcomings	Very clear, consistent, coherent, eloquently presented case
12.	Appropriateness of questions asked (min 1 slide) audience involvement	Not very relevant questions asked or audience was not that much involved	Relevant questions asked and many members of the audience well involved	Very relevant and didactically valuable questions & highly effective method to involve majority of audience
13.	Background knowledge revealed through answers	Questions remain unanswered or most answers given are insufficient since they do not address the questions asked	Most answers given are sufficient to address the questions asked, but with few minor shortcomings	Very clear and comprehensive answers given that reveal extensive and deep background knowledge beyond the slides
14.	Response to questions (form, clarity, consistency, conciseness)			
15.	Quality of slides	Sloppy or sketchy slides (consisting primarily of images); and/ or: significant formal flaws	Neat and informative slides, but with a few shortcomings	Very neat, well designed, highly didactic and informative slides, possibly with up-to-date statistical figures
16.	Executive Summary : Overall Impression, Form, clarity, consistency, conciseness: accurateness, topicality (up-to date), comprehensiveness, creativity of information	Summary is insufficient so that it is not possible to understand the ethical issues of the case without listening to the presentation, not up-to-date; and/ or: significant formal flaws	Summary is up-to-date sufficient to understand the ethical issues of the case without listening to the presentation	Very well structured, clear, consistent, concise, up-to-date summary which comprehensively but succinctly explains and elucidates the case; no formal flaws
17.	Executive Summary : Business Ethical and Sustainability dimensions	Business (-ethical) relevance of topic is not (sufficiently) made clear in the summary; and/or: no (sufficient) reference to sustainability dimensions	Business (-ethical) relevance of topic is just as adequately addressed in the summary as references to sustainability dimensions	Business (-ethical) relevance of topic is discussed comprehensively in the summary (also by using current examples and including suitable ethical theories); meaningful and in-depth references to sustainability dimensions