INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS ETHICS CASE COMPETITION

JUDGE'S FORM

Judge
(If you have a business card with you, please leave it with the überjudge.)

Name:
Company:
Telephone:
Email:
How many years have you judged (including this year):
Session:
Date:
Topic:
Time of session:

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

The team's job is 1) to describe a problem that a company or industry is facing and 2) to propose a solution to that problem. As appropriate to their case, the team should describe the legal, business/financial and ethical dimensions of the problem. In the same vein, their solution should be legal, make sense financially and be ethically sound. The team should inform you of your "business identity" and their "business identity."

I. LEGAL DIMENSION

In evaluating how well the team covered the legal aspects of the case, please base your score on how well they answered the following questions:

Is the problem brought about by any laws or regulations having been broken?
Do any laws or regulations determine or limit what the company/industry may or may not do in trying to resolve this problem?
Do any major court cases determine or limit what the company/industry may or may not do in trying to resolve this problem?
Is there any likelihood of law suits?
Is the solution legal?
If no laws or cases apply, did the team make this clear?

SCORING. Overall, how well did the team explain the legal dimensions of the problem and their solution?

1. OUTSTANDING
Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.

2. GOOD
Everything one could reasonably expect.

3. ACCEPTABLE
Most of what one could reasonably expect.

Unsatisfactory performance

4. MARGINAL
Much of what should be there, but not enough.

5. WEAK
Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.

6. POOR
Very weak.

II. FINANCIAL/BUSINESS DIMENSION

In evaluating how well the team covered the business/financial aspects of the case, please base your score on the following:

Did any business/financial factors contribute to the problem?
Are the business/financial implications of any legal issues pointed out?
Are the business/financial implications of any ethical issues pointed out?
What are the business/financial implications of the solution?
Does the solution make sense from a business/financial perspective?
Is the solution affordable?

SCORING. Overall, how well did the team explain the business/financial dimensions of the problem and their solution?

Satisfactory performance

1. OUTSTANDING
Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.

2. GOOD
Everything one could reasonably expect.

3. ACCEPTABLE
Most of what one could reasonably expect.

<u>Unsatisfactory performance</u>

4. MARGINAL
Much of what should be there, but not enough.

5. WEAK
Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.

6. POOR
Very weak.

III. ETHICAL DIMENSION (This section is worth double.)

In evaluating how well the team covered the ethical aspects of the case, please
base your score on the following:

From the standpoint of a secular, philosophical perspective, precisely why is the problem an
ethical issue?
What is the amount and type of tangible good and harminvolved in the problem and
solution?
Are the actions themselves in this case (in the problem and solution) ethically defensible?
Is there a conflict of rights? Is this resolved?
Is the solution ethically acceptable?
(Please keep in mind that teams have been encouraged to handle the ethical issues in
simple, commonsense language. That is, they should translate any technical, ethical issues
into everyday language.)

SCORING.
A. Overall, how well did the team explain the ethical dimensions of the problem and their
    solution?

<u>Satisfactory performance</u>

1. OUTSTANDING
Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.

2. GOOD
Everything one could reasonably expect.

3. ACCEPTABLE
Most of what one could reasonably expect.

<u>Unsatisfactory performance</u>

4. MARGINAL
Much of what should be there, but not enough.

5. WEAK
Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.

6. POOR
Very weak.

B. Teams were instructed to discuss the ethical issues in a simple and
straightforward way and to relate them clearly to the central issues associated
with running a business? (That is, the discussion of the ethical issues should have
helped "sell" the team's solution to you as a business person.)

How well did the team do this?

<u>Satisfactory performance</u>

1. OUTSTANDING
Complicated ethical issues were made remarkably easy to understand.
Relevance to business concerns were crystal clear and insightful.

2. GOOD
No problem. Ethical issues were explained simply. Connection to business
concerns was clear.

3. ACCEPTABLE
The explanation wasn't everything it should be, but you got the general
idea of the ethical issues and their connection to business concerns.

<u>Unsatisfactory performance</u>

4. MARGINAL
You only partially understood either the ethical issues (explanation wasn't
clear enough or it was too technical) and/or their connection to business concerns.

5. WEAK
The explanation was seriously lacking. You just barely understood the ethical
issues (explanation wasn't clear enough or it was too technical) and/or their connection to
business concerns.

6. POOR
Ethical issues and/or their connection to business concerns not at all
understandable.

Did the team's discussion of the ethical issues use technical philosophical
language, cite philosophers as authorities or appeal to any religious tradition? (We don't think
this would be appropriate in typical business settings.)
Yes
No

IV. OVERALL PERSUASIVENESS (This section is worth double.)

In evaluating how persuasive the team was, please base your score on the
following:

Were the problem and the solution clearly explained?
Were the analyses thorough and well-informed?
Is the solution realistic and practical?
Is the solution legal, financially responsible and ethical?

Scoring: On the basis of what you've just heard, how convinced were you by the team's overall analysis of the problem and suggestion for a solution?

Convinced

1. ABSOLUTELY AND TOTALLY CONVINCED
You have no reservations whatsoever.

2. CONVINCED
You have reservations, but nothing major.

3. MORE OR LESS CONVINCED
You have reservations (maybe one large one, or a series of small ones), but the presentation left you more convinced than unconvinced. (Ambivalence that ends up on just this side of the fence.)

Unconvinced

4. ALMOST CONVINCED
You have major reservations that leave you more unconvinced
than convinced, but you found parts of the presentation convincing. (Ambivalence that ends up on just the other side of the fence.)

5. UNCONVINCED
The presentation may have had some good points, but clearly not enough to convince you.

6. COMPLETELY UNCONVINCED
Not a prayer.

V. PRESENTATION SKILLS

In evaluating the team's presentation skills, please base your score on the following:

Were speakers comfortable enough with the material that they did not read from a text?
Could all of the speakers be heard?
Were the graphics program, visual aids and/or handouts used effectively?
Did the team manage their time well?
Did they handle the question and answer session effectively?

We're trying to discourage two bad habits that students have fallen into over the last few years: reading from a text and being so enamored with graphics that the speaker simply fades into the role of a narrator. Please consider these serious errors if the team you're

judging does either of these.
Scoring.
How polished and professional was the presentation?

<u>Satisfactory performance</u>

1. OUTSTANDING
Everything one could reasonably expect, plus more.

2. GOOD
Everything one could reasonably expect.

3. ACCEPTABLE
Most of what one could reasonably expect.

<u>Unsatisfactory performance</u>

4. MARGINAL
Much of what should be there, but not enough.

5. WEAK
Some of what should be there, but seriously incomplete.

6. POOR
Very weak.

Did any member of the team simply read from a prepared script?
Yes
No

VI. COMMENTS

Is there anything else about the group's performance (good or bad) that you'd like to note?