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Business School Materials for Season Three

Ethical decision-making is a critical skill in the modern workplace, but one that can be difficult to understand, complex to navigate, and full of murky areas and dilemmas for people looking to do the right thing. *Playing By the Rules: Ethics at Work* is a public media series exploring real cases of fraud, whistleblowing, and corporate scandal.

This suite of resources is intended for use in undergraduate and graduate business school classrooms to support the study of the second season of the series. Each episode can be used to initiate in-class discussion, debate, and written assignments. These real-life stories provoke the question, “What would you do?” and subsequently provide the basis for rich student reflection and discussion.

**Included in the materials for each episode:**

**Instructor Materials:** Suggested class outline to help guide the instructor in structuring a class around discussion and debate. Students should watch each full 30-minute episode of *Playing By the Rules* prior to class in order to participate in the reflections, in-class discussion, and writing assignments.

**Extension Activities:** The instructor materials include suggested activities, assignments, and supplemental readings for students.

Because the three episodes primarily revolve around ethical decision-making, these materials can be applied to a variety of undergraduate and graduate level business school classes, including but not limited to: Management, Leadership, Professional Responsibility, Business Ethics, Corporate Social Responsibility, Business Communications, and Philosophy.
About the Series

*Playing By the Rules: Ethics at Work* looks at how ethics play a major role in contemporary business practices, and it challenges viewers to think about what they would do in similar situations.

From debating whether or not to act on a piece of insider information, choosing between the well-being of employees or an obligation to shareholders, or disclosing information about products with potentially harmful effects to consumers—understanding ethical decision-making is a critical skill in the modern workplace. Good people usually do the right thing. But as social psychology experiments have shown, even the most moral character can be influenced under certain circumstances. In every business ethics case, there are “gray areas” where decision-making can be challenging and complex.

In season three, *Playing by the Rules: Ethics at Work* looks at two stories making headlines:

### Season 3, Episode 1: “Driven”

Under its original CEO and co-founder Travis Kalanick, Uber epitomized the Silicon Valley business philosophy of “move fast and break things.” In a mere seven years, driven to win at all costs, Uber grew into a company worth more than $75 billion. While much of that growth was the result of having developed a new and popular service, it was also a result of having pushed ethical and legal boundaries. With consumers and investors increasingly sensitive as to how companies make their money, Uber has become a case study about the impact of reputational damage, and how non-traditional business risks like a negative public image can affect a company.

### Season 3, Episode 2: “Pay to Play”

Explore a scandal that exposed an underground market for the nation’s most talented teen basketball players with colleges competing to recruit them using secret payoffs. Prosecutors allege that some of these payoffs were bankrolled by Adidas, one of the world’s biggest sneaker companies, through a program known to some inside the company as “Black Ops.” Playing by the Rules visits the University of Louisville, whose basketball program and former coach Rick Pitino were at the center of the storm. The film poses ethical questions about leadership and oversight.
Season 3, Episode 3: “Lessons Learned”
Over three seasons, Playing by the Rules has reported on corporate controversies including the emissions fraud committed by Volkswagen, the Wells Fargo banking scandal and the “ninja mortgage” scandal exposed by a whistleblower at CitiMortgage. Each company failed at business ethics. Professor Katherine Phillips, director of the Bernstein Center for Leadership and Ethics at Columbia Business School, explains what these situations had in common and the lessons learned.
This section contains an excerpt from a Brown University article covering the three key ethical frameworks. This article and the three frameworks can be used as the basis for examining all cases presented in the three episodes.

An ethical framework can be useful when analyzing cases, as a guide for exploring various ways to approach a problem. The three frameworks presented here — ethical, duty, and virtue — are commonly used in decision-making or critical analysis.

Here are some sample questions to reflect on when considering these frameworks:

- Which of the three frameworks most align with your style of decision-making?
- Think back to an ethical dilemma you encountered in school or in your professional career. How would you apply each of the three frameworks to the problem you faced?

The following section is excerpted from “A Framework for Making Ethical Decisions” (Brown University, 2013):

Making good ethical decisions requires a trained sensitivity to ethical issues and a practiced method for exploring the ethical aspects of a decision and weighing the considerations that should impact our choice of a course of action. Having a method for ethical decision making is essential. When practiced regularly, the method becomes so familiar that we work through it automatically without consulting the specific steps. This is one reason why we can sometimes say that we have a “moral intuition” about a certain situation, even when we have not consciously thought through the issue. We are practiced at making ethical judgments, just as we can be practiced at playing the piano, and can sit and play well “without thinking.” Nevertheless, it is not always advisable to follow our immediate intuitions, especially in particularly complicated or unfamiliar situations. Here our method for ethical decision making should enable us to recognize these new and unfamiliar situations and to act accordingly.

Three Frameworks
Based upon the three-part division of traditional normative ethical theories discussed above, it makes sense to suggest three broad frameworks to guide ethical decision making: The Consequentialist Framework; The Duty Framework; and the Virtue Framework.

While each of the three frameworks is useful for making ethical decisions, none is perfect—otherwise the perfect theory would have driven the other imperfect theories from the field long ago. Knowing the advantages and disadvantages of the frameworks will be helpful in deciding which is most useful in approaching the particular situation with which we are presented.
1. The Consequentialist Framework

In the Consequentialist framework, we focus on the future effects of the possible courses of action, considering the people who will be directly or indirectly affected. We ask about what outcomes are desirable in a given situation, and consider ethical conduct to be whatever will achieve the best consequences. The person using the Consequences framework desires to produce the most good.

Among the advantages of this ethical framework is that focusing on the results of an action is a pragmatic approach. It helps in situations involving many people, some of whom may benefit from the action, while others may not. On the other hand, it is not always possible to predict the consequences of an action, so some actions that are expected to produce good consequences might actually end up harming people. Additionally, people sometimes react negatively to the use of compromise which is an inherent part of this approach, and they recoil from the implication that the end justifies the means. It also does not include a pronouncement that certain things are always wrong, as even the most heinous actions may result in a good outcome for some people, and this framework allows for these actions to then be ethical.

2. The Duty Framework

In the Duty framework, we focus on the duties and obligations that we have in a given situation, and consider what ethical obligations we have and what things we should never do. Ethical conduct is defined by doing one’s duties and doing the right thing, and the goal is performing the correct action.

This framework has the advantage of creating a system of rules that has consistent expectations of all people; if an action is ethically correct or a duty is required, it would apply to every person in a given situation. This even-handedness encourages treating everyone with equal dignity and respect.

This framework also focuses on following moral rules or duty regardless of outcome, so it allows for the possibility that one might have acted ethically, even if there is a bad result. Therefore, this framework works best in situations where there is a sense of obligation or in those in which we need to consider why duty or obligation mandates or forbids certain courses of action.

However, this framework also has its limitations. First, it can appear cold and impersonal, in that it might require actions which are known to produce harms, even though they are strictly in keeping with a particular moral rule. It also does not provide a way to determine which duty we should follow if we are presented with a situation in which two or more duties conflict. It can also be rigid in applying the notion of duty to everyone regardless of personal situation.
3. The Virtue Framework
In the Virtue framework, we try to identify the character traits (either positive or negative) that might motivate us in a given situation. We are concerned with what kind of person we should be and what our actions indicate about our character. We define ethical behavior as whatever a virtuous person would do in the situation, and we seek to develop similar virtues.

Obviously, this framework is useful in situations that ask what sort of person one should be. As a way of making sense of the world, it allows for a wide range of behaviors to be called ethical, as there might be many different types of good character and many paths to developing it. Consequently, it takes into account all parts of human experience and their role in ethical deliberation, as it believes that all of one’s experiences, emotions, and thoughts can influence the development of one’s character.

Although this framework takes into account a variety of human experience, it also makes it more difficult to resolve disputes, as there can often be more disagreement about virtuous traits than ethical actions. Also, because the framework looks at character, it is not particularly good at helping someone to decide what actions to take in a given situation or determine the rules that would guide one’s actions. Also, because it emphasizes the importance of role models and education to ethical behavior, it can sometimes merely reinforce current cultural norms as the standard of ethical behavior.

Putting the Frameworks Together
By framing the situation or choice you are facing in one of the ways presented above, specific features will be brought into focus more clearly. However, it should be noted that each framework has its limits: by focusing our attention on one set of features, other important features may be obscured. Hence it is important to be familiar with all three frameworks and to understand how they relate to each other—where they may overlap, and where they may differ.
The chart below is designed to highlight the main contrasts between the three frameworks:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Consequentialist</th>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>Virtue</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deliberative Process</strong></td>
<td>What kind of outcomes should I produce (or try to produce)?</td>
<td>What are my obligations in this situation, and what are the things I should never do?</td>
<td>What kind of person should I be (or try to be), and what will my actions show about my character?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Focus</strong></td>
<td>Directs attention to the future effects of an action, for all people who will be directly or indirectly affected by the action.</td>
<td>Directs attention to the duties that exist prior to the situation and determines obligations.</td>
<td>Attempts to discern character traits (virtues and vices) that are, or could be, motivating the people involved in the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition of Ethical Conduct</strong></td>
<td>Ethical conduct is the action that will achieve the best consequences.</td>
<td>Ethical conduct involves always doing the right thing: never failing to do one's duty.</td>
<td>Ethical conduct is whatever a fully virtuous person would do in the circumstances.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivation</strong></td>
<td>Aim is to produce the most good.</td>
<td>Aim is to perform the right action.</td>
<td>Aim is to develop one's character.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Because the answers to the three main types of ethical questions asked by each framework are not mutually exclusive, each framework can be used to make at least some progress in answering the questions posed by the other two. In many situations, all three frameworks will result in the same—or at least very similar—conclusions about what you should do, although they will typically give different reasons for reaching those conclusions.

However, because they focus on different ethical features, the conclusions reached through one framework will occasionally differ from the conclusions reached through one (or both) of the others.

The previous section is excerpted from “A Framework for Making Ethical Decisions” (Brown University, 2013)
Case Overview

They’ve become the Ten Commandments of Silicon Valley – a set of popular motivational slogans like “Move Fast & Break Things,” “Change or Die,” and the ubiquitous one-word exhortation “Disrupt!”

Perhaps no company embodied those values more than Uber. In a mere seven years, Uber went from a local San Francisco ride-hailing service to a multi-national corporation, operating in more than 70 countries. By 2017, it was valued at nearly $75 billion, more than General Motors.

Clearly, much of that growth was the result of having developed a new and immensely popular product. In part, it was also a result of having pushed ethical and legal boundaries. Under the leadership of its former chief executive Travis Kalanick, Uber was accused of stealing technology, manipulating its business partners, and illegally operating in cities across America. Driven to win at whatever cost, Kalanick referred to his way of doing business as “burning the village.” More than once, that risk-taking put Uber in jeopardy, antagonizing tech giants like Apple and Google as well as government regulators.

As one well known tech investor put it, “Travis’s biggest strength is he will run through a wall to accomplish his goals. Travis’s biggest weakness is that he will run through a wall to accomplish his goals.” Under Kalanick, Uber didn’t just develop a bad reputation with the outside world. Inside the company, an “Animal House” atmosphere prevailed in which sexual harassment and gender discrimination were commonplace.

In the summer of 2017, amid growing concerns about his leadership and with Uber hoping to become a public company, Kalanick was forced out by the board of directors. A new CEO, Dara Khosrowshahi, has been charged with repairing Uber’s image.

With consumers and investors increasingly sensitive to how companies make their money, Uber presents a case study in non-traditional business risks, like a company’s public image and the impact of reputational damage. As similar controversies unfold over the business practices of tech giants like Facebook and Google, does that mean the Silicon Valley era of “moving fast and breaking things” may be coming to an end?

Focusing on the importance of ethical business practices and experienced leadership, Playing by the Rules: Ethics at Work tells the story of Uber’s ascent, the controversies which followed, and the efforts of current management to instill a new company culture.
Media Utilization Tips
Ideally, instructors will assign the full episode (27 minutes) to students to watch in advance of the class, so that they may fully participate in the in-class discussion.

Link to view:

Key Moments: Instructors may choose to highlight key moments within the episode when key players were faced with a critical decision for students to pause and reflect on the episode. Below are the timestamps of three key decision-making moments:

4:45 – Explain Uber’s early legal misstep with the city of San Francisco.
10:05 – What was Greyball? Why did regulators consider it illegal?
18:53 – What were some of the recommendations given to Uber to address internal issues? Do you agree with these?

Reflection Questions: Instructors may also choose to provide students with reflection questions as they watch the episode. Examples of reflection questions include:

- Describe the parties involved and their interests.
- Describe the corporate culture at Uber.
- How did Travis Kalanick’s personality and actions influence the corporate culture at Uber?
- What did Kalanick stand to gain or lose if he had changed his behavior?
- Describe key moments when Kalanick or Uber’s shareholders could have made different choices with different outcomes for the company.

Key Takeaways
Here are some of the key themes in this episode:

- As observed in previous seasons of Playing by the Rules, corporate culture has an impact on a corporation’s bottom line. As investors become more and more interested in how a company makes its money, professional missteps and a toxic culture can have negative effects on the bottom line.
- What happens when leaders cannot or will not accept accountability for their behavior? The sheer volume of scandals Uber faced in one year alone offered its CEO countless opportunities to change his behavior on his own; however, the board was ultimately forced to remove Kalanick.
Supplemental Case Readings
The following articles provide additional information about the Uber case. Instructors may use this as background reading to prepare to lead the class. Additionally, instructors may choose to assign one or more of the articles as supplemental reading.

- **Uber's scandals, blunders and PR disasters: the full list**
  (The Guardian, June 27, 2017)

- **Uber Founder Travis Kalanick Resigns as C.E.O.**

- **Reflecting On One Very, Very Strange Year At Uber**
  (Susan Fowler, personal blog, February 19, 2017)
Below is a suggested structure for class discussion and activities based on this episode. This structure assumes the instructor has assigned students to watch the episode prior to class.

Class Outline:

I. Overview (10 minutes)
- Outline the case and key issues at play.

II. Discussion (30 minutes)
- Open up the floor for class discussion.
- Discussion questions:
  - Describe the parties involved and their interests.
  - Describe the corporate culture at Uber.
  - How did Travis Kalanick’s personality and actions influence the corporate culture at Uber?
  - What did Kalanick stand to gain or lose if he had changed his behavior?
  - Describe moments when Kalanick or Uber’s shareholders could have made different choices with different outcomes for the company.
- Suggested themes to highlight:
  - How a toxic corporate culture can affect a company’s bottom line.
  - Kalanick and/or Uber’s investors could have shifted the outcome if they had made different decisions at key turning points. The removal of Kalanick could be seen as a move in the right direction.

III. Activity: Debate (50 minutes)
- Open up the floor for class discussion.

IV. Conclude (15 minutes)
Season 3, Episode 1: Driven
Extension Activities

I. Case Summary
Assignment: Prior to class, assign students to write a three-sentence summary of the case presented in the episode. The summary should include an overview of the key issue presented in the case, along with the case outcome.

II. In-Class Debate
The “bad behavior” of founders and CEOs often trickles down, seeping into a company’s corporate culture and, in some cases, negatively impacts the company’s bottom line. In the case of American Apparel, the company’s notorious “bad boy” founder, Dov Charney, behaved similarly to Travis Kalanick.

Dov Charney and American Apparel: Dov Charney was the founder and CEO of American Apparel, notorious for his “bad boy” behavior and accusations of sexual harassment spanning years. After shares in the company plummeted, the American Apparel board suspended and eventually fired him for his behavior.

1. Split the class into three groups: two groups will argue for and against American Apparel, and the third group will serve as judges. The instructor should print and distribute the applicable article to each group. The judges should read both articles.

   • **Pro:** American Apparel’s board acted appropriately in ousting Dov Charney.
     American Apparel Ousts Its Founder, Dov Charney, Over Nude Photos

   • **Con:** Dov Charney should not have been fired over sexual harassment claims.
     Dov Charney Was Fired for Losing Money, Not Sexual Harassment
     (Slate, June 27, 2014)

2. Distribute the applicable reading assignment to each group and give students time to read independently and discuss as a group (20 minutes). During this time, the judges should read both articles and discuss the key issues at play.

3. Each group should clearly articulate their stance and make an argument as to why they are correct (5 minutes per group).

4. After each group states their case, the judges should pose questions to each group (5 minutes per group).

5. Judges will then leave the room and deliberate, and return with a final verdict and explanation of their reasoning (10 minutes).
III. Editorial

**Assignment:** Write a 250-word editorial either siding with or critiquing the actions of Kalanick and Uber’s leadership, including their decision-making during the scandal.

Note: Instructors may choose to ask students to use the included ethical frameworks included in the full *Playing by the Rules* classroom materials or other frameworks appropriate to their class in their analysis.

**Key considerations:**

- Explain what you would have done if you were on the board of directors of Uber. Would you have kept Kalanick as CEO, or voted to remove him?
- Describe the factors contributing to your decision.
- How would you weigh the consequences of your decision?
- What impact would your decision have on key stakeholders (Uber shareholders, employees, research teams, the public, consumers)?
- What possible outcomes do you foresee?
- Describe one or two ethical frameworks you would use to weigh your decision.

**Alternate Assignment:** Write a 250-word editorial describing a similar ethical dilemma you have personally witnessed or experienced. Please do not reveal details about identities, company, etc. Apply the frameworks discussed in class and the major trade-offs faced by the main decision maker in the dilemma.

IV. Optional Assignment: Opposing Side

**Assignment:** Write a 250-word response to your own editorial, taking the opposing side. If you argued in favor of firing Kalanick, discuss what considerations the board might consider if they decided to keep him in his position. If you argued in favor of keeping Kalanick, discuss what issues or liabilities might arise as a result of that decision.

**Key Considerations:**

- Examine the arguments you made, and take the opposing viewpoint.
- How might the situation’s outcome change with this new decision?
- What impact would your decision have on key stakeholders (shareholders, employees, research teams, the public, consumers)?
- Examine the ethical frameworks you used to make your original decision and consider how they apply now.
V. Related Readings

Instructors may choose to assign additional readings for context on the key issues of this episode, either in advance of class or post-class:

- **The Six Characteristics of Toxic Leadership**
  (Leadership Forces, January 12, 2016).

- **Coping In A Toxic Work Environment**
  (Forbes, June 17, 2013).
Case Overview

In June of 2017, high school basketball star Brian Bowen II announced his intent to enroll in the University of Louisville. Basketball fans and the sports media alike never saw it coming.

Bowen was, in the vernacular of college athletics, a “five-star” recruit. Considered one of the best high school players in the nation, he would be named a McDonald’s All-American, an honor previously bestowed on some who would go on to become basketball legends like Michael Jordan and Magic Johnson.

In the spring of 2017, Bowen had been heavily recruited by several high-profile college basketball programs, including Arizona, Michigan State, and Oregon. That fall, it was expected that he would be playing for one of those teams. Instead, in early June of 2017, sports fans opened their browsers to headlines like, “Out of Nowhere, Louisville Lands Brian Bowen.”

While Bowen’s announcement was a surprise to most, to a small handful of the aspiring agents, would-be financial advisors, and amateur sports league officials who work in the shadows of youth athletics, it was not. How Bowen ended up at Louisville – and what happened to him once he got there – would result in one of the biggest scandals to hit college basketball in decades.

The scandal exposed an underground market for the services of Bowen and other talented players like him, featuring a cast of bagmen and secret payoffs. And it’s alleged those payoffs were bankrolled by Adidas, one of the world’s biggest sports apparel companies, running an illegal program known inside the company as “Black Ops.”

An FBI investigation eventually exposed the “Black Ops” program, revealing that employees at Adidas were determined to gain a competitive advantage in the $60 billion a year North American sports equipment market, even if that meant breaking the law. The plan? Steer talented players to universities which were sponsored by Adidas, resulting in increased exposure for its products.

The Adidas executive at the center of the controversy, along with several associates, was convicted in the scheme, while the names of several well-known universities – the University of Louisville, the University of Kansas, and North Carolina State among them – would be sullied. This episode of Playing by the Rules raises important questions of leadership and oversight. What did senior executives at Adidas know about the illicit program and when did they know it? Why didn’t those universities keep a closer eye on their sports programs? And what reforms are necessary to make sure it doesn’t happen again?
Media Utilization Tips

Ideally, instructors will assign the full episode (27 minutes) to students to watch in advance of the class, so that they may fully participate in the in-class discussion.


Key Moments: Instructors may choose to highlight key moments within the episode for students to pause and reflect on the episode. Below are the timestamps of three key decision-making moments:

- **4:20** – What is “grassroots” basketball? What do its organizers stand to gain from relationships with sneaker companies?
- **10:50** – Who are “the middlemen?” What did they stand to gain from relationships with Adidas?
- **17:25** – How did Adidas disguise its payments to families and players?
- **20:05** – What steps did the University of Louisville take to “clean house?”

Reflection Questions: Instructors may also choose to provide students with reflection questions as they watch the episode. Examples of reflection questions include:

- Describe the parties involved and their interests. What do companies like Adidas stand to gain from college recruiting?
- Describe the system of grassroots basketball and how it feeds into the college basketball system.
- What factors contribute to the corruption in college basketball recruiting?
- How might a star player navigate the waters of recruiting given this corruption? What are their interests? What do players and their families stand to gain?

Key Takeaways

Here are some of the key themes in this episode:

- Despite NCAA rules regarding amateurism, major athletics companies like Adidas find ways to skirt regulations and entice players and their families to attend their affiliate colleges through financial incentives, merchandise, and more.
- This behavior and activity fuels a competitive and corrupt environment in college sports, where companies “win” when they skirt the rules. Although college sports are classified as amateur sports, major sponsorships and financial incentives create situations in which star players and their families must participate in ethically questionable decision-making in high-stakes situations in order to set players on a path for professional success as adults.
Supplemental Case Readings

The following articles provide additional information about the Adidas and Bowen scandal. Instructors may use this as background reading to prepare to lead the class. Additionally, instructors may choose to assign one or more of the articles as supplemental reading.

- **Three sentenced in Adidas recruiting scandal**
  (ESPN, March 5, 2019)
- **Father of ex-Louisville recruit Brian Bowen says former assistant Kenny Johnson gave him cash**
  (USA Today, October 9, 2018)
- **Former Louisville recruit Brian Bowen sues Adidas**
  (CBS Sports, November 19, 2018)

Addendum

In October 2019, NCAA Board of Governors voted unanimously to allow student athletes to be paid for the use of their name, image, and likeness. The ruling will go into effect once its three divisions decide on rules for such opportunities, and these decisions will happen between now and January 2021.

Discussion/Contemplation Questions:

- How might this initiative change the landscape for student athletes and their families?
- What factors should the NCAA divisions consider when setting these rules?
- What impact, both positive and negative, could it have on student athletes?
- What impact, both positive and negative, could it have on universities or other stakeholders?
- If this ruling had been in place in the past, how might it have changed the outcome of the Adidas and Bowen scandal?

Related Readings:

- **NCAA says athletes may profit from name, image and likeness**
  (CNN, October 29, 2019).
- **The NCAA Had to Cut Athletes a Better Deal**
  (The Atlantic, October 30, 2019).
Class Outline:

I. Overview (10 minutes)
   - Outline the case and key issues at play.

II. Discussion (30 minutes)
   - Open up the floor for class discussion.
   - Discussion questions:
     - Describe the parties involved and their interests. What do companies like Adidas stand to gain from college recruiting?
     - Describe the system of grassroots basketball and how it feeds into the college basketball system.
     - What factors contribute to the corruption in college sports recruiting?
     - How might a star player navigate the waters of recruiting given this corruption? What are their interests? What do players and their families stand to gain?
   - Suggested themes to highlight:
     - Major athletics corporations are involved in what is intended to be amateur sports. Financial outcomes create corrupt environments for universities and star players.
     - Players and their families must navigate a corrupt environment, challenging their values and moral reasoning.

III. Activity: Debate (50 minutes)
   - See “Extension Activities” on the following page for an activity outline.

IV. Conclude (15 minutes)
I. Case Summary

Assignment: Prior to class, assign students to write a three-sentence summary of the case presented in the episode. The summary should include an overview of the key issue presented in the case, along with the case outcome.

II. In-Class Debate

In college sports, despite regulations, financial stakes are high. Beginning at a young age, high school sports players are scouted and recruited by major universities, resulting in questionable practices including incentives, bribes and more.

The Fab Five: The 1990s University of Michigan basketball scandal involving Ed Martin and the “Fab Five” was one of the biggest scandals in college sports history. An investigation by parties including the FBI and Department of Justice found Martin, a financial booster of Michigan’s basketball program, guilty of illegal activity including bribes, money laundering, and gambling. The players were also fined and eventually suspended from their amateur careers.

1. Split the class into three groups: two groups will argue for and against TD Bank, and the third group will serve as judges. The instructor should print and distribute the applicable article to each group. The judges should read both articles.

   • Pro: The players knew what they were doing and should not have accepted money from Martin. Michigan Forfeits Victories from Five Seasons (Associated Press, November 11, 2001)

   • Con: College athletics are set up to benefit all but the players involved. They should not have been punished. The Impact Of Michigan's 'Fab 5' On The Social Milieu Of College Sports (NPR, September 12, 2016)

2. Distribute the applicable reading assignment to each group and give students time to read independently and discuss as a group (20 minutes). During this time, the judges should read both articles and discuss the key issues at play.

3. Each group should clearly articulate their stance and make an argument as to why they are correct (5 minutes per group).

4. After each group states their case, the judges should pose questions to each group (5 minutes per group).

5. Judges will then leave the room and deliberate, and return with a final verdict and explanation of their reasoning (10 minutes).
III. Editorial

Assignment: Write a 250-word editorial either siding with or arguing against the decision making of Brian Bowen and his family.

Note: Instructors may choose to ask students to use the included ethical frameworks included in the full Playing by the Rules classroom materials or other frameworks appropriate to their class in their analysis.

Key Considerations:

- Explain what you would have done if you were in the player’s position. Would you have accepted financial incentives?
- How would you weigh the consequences of your decision?
- What impact would your decision have on key stakeholders (athletic companies, colleges, recruiters, the public, your family)?
- Describe one or two ethical frameworks you would use to weigh your decision.

Alternate Assignment: Write a 250-word editorial describing a similar ethical dilemma you have personally witnessed or experienced. Please do not reveal details about identities, company, etc. Apply the frameworks discussed in class and the major trade-offs faced by the main decision maker in the dilemma.

IV. Optional Assignment: Opposing Side

Assignment: Write a 250-word response to your own editorial, taking the opposing side. If you argued in favor of taking a bribe or incentive, discuss the negative ramifications of having done so. If you argued in favor of not taking a bribe, examine how this decision would affect your future career.

Key Considerations:

- Examine the arguments you made, and take the opposing viewpoint.
- How might the situation’s outcome change with this new decision?
- What impact would your decision have on key stakeholders (athletic companies, colleges, recruiters, the public, your family)?
- Examine the ethical frameworks you used to make your original decision and consider how they apply now.
V. Related Readings

Instructors may choose to assign additional readings for context on the key issues of this episode, either in advance of class or post-class:

- **Corruption, Scandal And The Multi-Billion Dollar Business Of College Basketball**  
  (NPR, October 25, 2018).

- **The Shame of College Sports**  
  (The Atlantic, October 2011 issue).
Season 3, Episode 3: Lessons Learned
Extension Activities

Link to View:

Season 3, Episode 3 features a recap of the entire Playing By The Rules series. It highlights all of the case studies featured in Seasons 1-3 of the program.

Teachers may opt to select this single episode as an overview/introduction to ethical decision making instead of utilizing the course material for all three seasons.

If you choose to use only this episode instead of the full suite of materials, Assignment 1 offers a general writing prompt that can also be used as the basis for in-class discussion and dialogue.

If you are utilizing this episode as the culmination of the entire suite of resources, you may opt to use Assignment 2 to conclude.

Assignment 1: Case Reflections
Summarize each of the eight cases featured in “Lessons Learned.” Highlight the key issue or dilemma in each case, and identify the key stakeholders.

Reflections to consider:
- Who are the stakeholders? What do they stand to gain or lose?
- What was the key issue of each case?
- What was the outcome?
- How could the outcome have been different?

Option: Use the chart on the following page to fill in an overview of each case.

Assignment 2: Essay
Select one of the eight cases featured in “Lessons Learned” that you found particularly interesting or complex. You may also opt to choose a case in which a decision may not have been clear, or the situation more nuanced. Reflect on the case and how you might have acted if you were involved.

Reflections to consider:
- Who are the stakeholders? What do they stand to gain or lose?
- What was the key issue of each case?
- What was the outcome?
- How could the outcome have been different?
- What about this case did you find particularly interesting, or complex?
- How would you have reacted if you had been involved? What ethical frameworks would have helped guide your decision-making process?
| Season 1, Episode 1  | The Whistleblower |  |  |  |
| Season 1, Episode 2  | Ask Why |  |  |  |
| Season 1, Episode 3  | The Run Coal Memos |  |  |  |
| Season 2, Episode 1  | Engine Troubles |  |  |  |
| Season 2, Episode 2  | The Bank Job |  |  |  |
| Season 2, Episode 3  | Taking Advantage |  |  |  |
| Season 3, Episode 1  | Driven |  |  |  |
| Season 3, Episode 2  | Pay to Play |  |  |  |