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The importance of ethical decision-making in the business world has long been recognized. Recent scandals of various flavours, combined with the economic crisis, have simply served to reinforce its prominence. Corporate social responsibility and ethics in business settings have been the subjects of much discussion in the popular press, on ethics-related blogs and in academic research. The overarching themes appear to deal with the question of the degree to which business should take stakeholders other than shareholders into account, as well as an exploration of the conditions under which individuals will recognize the ethical dimensions of a decision and act on that recognition. This ongoing discussion has rightly included the role of a business school education in this process. With this context in mind, I take a brief look at how Canadian business schools accredited by the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business (AACSB) choose to deliver ethics education.

There are 62 business schools in Canada, 17 of which are AACSB accredited. I focus on these accredited programs for two reasons. First, these are among the larger programs, graduating approximately 9,000 Bachelor’s degree holders in the 2008-2009 academic year. Further, the AACSB is actively working to increase the number of accredited schools and at least several more in Canada are likely to move towards accreditation. This suggests that AACSB standards are becoming the business school norm.

Second, while ethical training is one of the core components of AACSB accreditation, the requirements leave significant discretion to each program. For example, as a general goal, the AACSB states the following:

“The general knowledge and skills goals, while not management specific, relate to knowledge and abilities that graduates will carry with them into their careers. Such learning areas as communications abilities, problem-solving abilities, ethical reasoning skills, and language abilities are the types of general knowledge and abilities that schools might define as a part of these goals.” (p. 62, “Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation”)

While no specific course requirements are made by the AACSB with respect to ethics training, further direction states that schools with integrated learning goals, including incorporation of ethical considerations into decision-making, “…may embed the measurement of accomplishment on those goals into a capstone business-strategy course” (p. 65). Section 1F or the Eligibility Procedures advises schools to adopt a Code of Conduct that provides guidance to faculty, staff and students in their decision-making. This is essentially the extent of the prescriptions put forward. The overall absence of clear direction leaves the specific approach to ethics education to be determined by each program.
There are a number of models that could be adopted, ranging from dedicated, required courses within the business school to complete outsourcing of ethics education to other areas (e.g., philosophy or religious studies) to including ethics components within existing courses. While there is variation, the ‘standard’ model that has been adopted across the 17 accredited schools appears to be incorporation of ethics into core courses, while allowing some number of electives on ethics later. For instance, the University of Alberta does not require an ethics course, but integrates ethics into a required 200-level course titled Introduction to Canadian Business. Wilfrid Laurier ensures that ethics issues are highlighted and discussed across courses in different business areas. Seven of the 17 accredited schools do require a course dealing exclusively with business ethics and/or corporate social responsibility: Brock University, HEC, Concordia, St. Mary’s University, Simon Fraser University, Queen’s University, and the University of Manitoba. At the University of Manitoba, the students choose one of several courses offered through philosophy or religious studies. At the other six universities there is a specific course required through the business school.

A number of questions are raised by the integration strategy that has been widely adopted. First, how effective is teaching business ethics as part of a core course that is on another subject? For instance, while I am teaching my introductory management accounting course, I do try to highlight ethical dimensions where I am able; however, I find that the focus is invariably on the management accounting concepts at hand and the ethics discussion is tangential. Stated another way, the ethics and CSR are not the point of the conversation, but something to consider as we cover a topic. Whether this approach serves to fully impress upon students the importance of ethics considerations is, I believe, an open question.

Second, what qualifies an individual faculty member to teach ethics? Per data collected by the Canadian Federation of Business School Deans, less than 1% of the faculty at the 41 responding schools are reported by their school as having business ethics or CSR as their area of expertise. Of the 572 full professors, just 9 are business ethics or CSR experts. At associate professor level, it is 3 of 709 and at assistant professor level it is 5 of 533. Fewer than half of these individuals are at AACSB accredited schools. While there are certainly many more faculty members who consider themselves active in business ethics or CSR thought (I include myself), this still suggests a relative dearth of individuals focused primarily on preparing business students for the ethical dilemmas that await them in the ‘real’ world. Is common sense adequate to train our students about ethics and CSR or is there value to having individuals from ethics and CSR backgrounds in the mix somehow? In my opinion, this is also an open question.

Finally, in its Eligibility Procedures and Accreditation Standards for Business Accreditation, the AACSB characterized ethical reasoning skills as “not management specific” (p. 62). There is a great deal of existing research that suggests that this is often not the case. Individuals tend to frame a business decision as something more akin to a game, where social norms such as reciprocity and honesty are deemphasized. In a sense, there are ‘business rules’ and ‘non-business rules’. If this is the case, a course on something along the lines of ‘moral philosophy’ as an ethics elective, likely taught by a philosophy professor in the philosophy area, may not carry over well to a business context. The value of this sort of coursework, at least as it relates to the behavior of the student in professional or business life, may be questionable. This in turn suggests that training in ethics should be as close to business settings as possible, with the express intent of studying ethics directly.

I close by noting that, in addition to formal coursework, students often engage in extracurricular activities related to ethics. For instance, groups of MBA students at top graduate business schools around the world are creating their own commitments to behave as ethical corporate citizens (see http://mbaoath.org/). These are part of a larger initiative to make management a ‘profession’ in the vein of physicians and lawyers. Obviously, it remains to be seen whether and how these sorts of initiatives affect practice. The speculation on this front is underway (see dueling articles by INSEAD faculty at http://knowledge.insead.edu/contents/csr-mba-oath-091125.cfm and http://knowledge.insead.edu/contents/csr-mba-hbs-oath-091125.cfm?vid=342). It will be most interesting to see whether and how these types of initiatives evolve.
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Why do Some Professors Think Business Ethics Education Isn’t Important?

BY SCOTT CARSON

Scott Carson has one of the best vantage points for observing ethics education in business schools in Canada. He is by training, an ethicist. He has been Dean at two fine business schools and is currently Director of the Queen’s MBA. He has held a number of directorships and has advised governments. He brings an invaluable perspective to this topic.

Why is ethics education not a priority in business schools like finance or marketing? I think there are three answers to this question.

**FIRST IS A LACK OF CLARITY** about what should be taught. In large part, this turns on different perspectives of the meaning of ethics education itself. Consider three concepts. ‘Normative’ ethics addresses the most basic questions of morality: How ought we to conduct ourselves from the moral point of view? For example, is it morally acceptable to bribe a foreign government official? Contrast this with a ‘descriptive’ question: Do business people as a matter of fact bribe foreign government officials? Not should they, but do they? Related to description is ‘explanation’. Why do business people bribe foreign government officials? Explanation goes beyond description to investigate the reasons why people act the way they do. A rational explanation for bribery might be that it is thought to gain competitive advantage. A psychological explanation might focus on unconscious motivations.

The question about what should be taught is largely driven by the conceptual orientation of individual business professors. The normative side of the family of concepts finds its natural home in philosophy and theology. Since the time of Socrates, the big questions of how to live a good life, and what constitutes acting morally, have been addressed by philosophers and theologians. Description and explanation usually go together, and are the purview of the social sciences – in business schools this is the usual domain of organizational behaviour scholars. The result of this discipline split is that a comprehensive and cohesive perspective on what to teach is often hard to achieve. Each discipline addresses different issues and from different conceptual perspectives. A consequence of this is that overall it detracts from the influence ethicists have with curriculum committees when business programs are revised or restructured.
THE SECOND ISSUE is about how business ethics should be taught. One school of thought is that, regardless of a professor’s conceptual orientation, teaching ethics requires a sustained investigation into the problems and underlying principles that determine how business people and corporations ought to act and why. Developing a reasonable depth of understanding requires at least a stand-alone course. The other school of thought recommends teaching ethics as a component of other business courses. For instance, in finance class some time could be devoted to ethical problems such as portfolio churning by fund managers or market manipulation by large institutional investors. The strength of this approach is that it illustrates that ethical problems are shot through all aspects of business decision making and action, not just isolated within a special set of considerations. The drawback, however, is that professors often complain that they have no academic training in addressing ethical issues and to some extent have no more authoritative knowledge than the students themselves. This professorial discomfort also can lead to relegating the ethics component to the back seat of the course. By extension, the prestige of the subject matter within the school curriculum takes a hit as well.

WHY SHOULD BUSINESS ETHICS BE TAUGHT is the third problem. “If you haven’t learned what is morally right and wrong by the time you get to business school, it’s too late!” Interestingly proponents of this view are sometimes the same people who blame business schools for instilling the culture of greed in graduates that purportedly led to the current financial crisis. But, if a business education can teach greed, why not goodness? That said, there is an important basic point to the why question. Going to university is a small part of a student’s life, and basic values are set in childhood. So ethics education, from this perspective, may not lead to very much.

What is the solution? The what problem can’t be resolved by hoping to find super-trained academics who are competent in all aspects of the disciplines and who can easily traverse the normative, descriptive and explanatory themes. Graduate programs don’t train academics that broadly. Still, even a small business school might be able to employ one of each, or draw faculty from the philosophy and psychology departments to work together on a comprehensive and coherent approach. Collaboration is the key.

My bias on the how question is that even if courses across the disciplines contain ethical themes and discussions – which I think they should – a sustained in-depth examination of problems and underlying principles requires at least a dedicated course. The across-the-curriculum approach can provide valuable context, but not careful analysis, any more than general coffee shop discussions about the financial crisis can substitute for sophisticated analyses in finance and economics classes.

Finally, why should we teach ethics? It depends upon what we set as our fundamental objectives. Transforming basically immoral or amoral students into virtuous citizens is not realistic. We can’t change a student’s basic character, so that shouldn’t be our objective. But identifying and sensitizing students to ethical issues, and teaching them how to analyse different sides of the problems on the basis of the moral principles that underlie them, are both achievable objectives and that is where we should concentrate our efforts.

The 1970s comedian Roger Dangefield frequently used the refrain “I don’t get no respect!” We don’t get respect by asking for it – it needs to be earned. Business ethics education has a great opportunity to redefine itself in a way that moves it from the margins into the mainstream of business programs. Public awareness of the importance of good ethical conduct has never been higher, so now is the time to move forward – especially with our colleagues in business schools.
Ethics Education in Canada: A Student’s Perspective

BY JODY GREWAL

Jody Grewal is a fourth year student in the School of Accounting and Finance, University of Waterloo, working towards a Masters of Accounting and the CA professional designation. She is currently working at Deloitte as part of her co-op education program.
Some of them search for an alternative course that can be taken distance-ed and that has minimal time commitment compared to the accounting ethics course. They argue that writing a research paper on an ethics topic and learning different ethical frameworks will not help them when they face real dilemmas on the job. Others scan the core-competency maps for the CA, CMA and CGA designations and determine that ethics is not explicitly examined on any of these exams, and resolve to take a more “objective” accounting course that will help them pursue their goal of passing the exam. Some even joke that the executives who contributed to the collapse of Enron were all products of Harvard Business School’s refined business ethics program.

I have friends attending business schools around Canada, some of whom have required ethics courses and some ethics electives. When I ask them about the required courses, the general consensus is that the ‘ethical dilemmas’ from the textbook are assigned, the students prepare them for discussion, and a somewhat disorganized, haphazard way of coming up with a ‘solution’ occurs during class. One of my friends mentioned that while his section argued a particular approach to handle the dilemma, another section took the complete opposite side, both of which the instructor of the course accepted! He told me that this made him feel as though the subject matter is much too subjective, and that the exam wasn’t even based on ethical dilemmas, but on the classical moral theories of utilitarianism, Kantianism, etc. It wasn’t surprising that when I asked him if he was going to take an upper-year ethics elective, he said it was unlikely.

Another friend had a different experience, recounting very engaging lectures about responsibilities that business people have to society, how various aspects of business have ethical implications, and how her instructor sought to use experiences and examples that had occurred very recently to communicate important messages to the class. As a result of her positive experience, she said “opened [her] eyes to what it means to be accountable for your work and its impact on society” she will be taking as many as two ethics course electives in her final year. Another colleague that I work with at a public accounting firm for my co-operative education, believes current business ethics course choices are not necessarily good for accounting students. He said that his university gives them the option of taking an ethics course open to all business students, or an accounting ethics course. To his dismay, many of his peers take the business ethics course, due to its relative ease and lighter time commitment as compared to the accounting ethics course. He said that after taking three years of focused accounting courses, he cannot imagine why his peers would ‘skimp’ on the ethics component of the program, which, as he said “could make the difference between keeping and losing your designation”.

I believe that the goal of accounting ethics education – or business ethics in general – is to prepare us to think systematically about the moral consequences of decisions and act in a way that is ethically or morally competent. Recent corporate collapses and accounting scandals threaten the accounting profession in its entirety, and students should understand the importance of acquiring sound ethical reflection. Regardless of whether students feel they can learn ethics on their own and that class-time is better used to teach those “objective” topics tested on the professional exams, I believe that the critical component that a student misses out on by not taking an accounting ethics course is learning the history of the accounting profession. Understanding the profession’s history helps us to understand its continuing ethical challenges as well as the collection of not only triumphs, but also massive failures to meet public expectations. I strongly believe that in order to dedicate oneself to becoming an expert in any area, so as to obtain a degree in the field of choice and become a member of the professional body, it is imperative that we understand and appreciate why this profession exists, how far it has come from its early days, the struggles and triumphs it has seen over the years, and where it is headed in the future. Without this knowledge, accounting students cannot maximise their learning and their appreciation for the subject, nor can they hope to contribute in a significant way to its development throughout their professional careers.

As an accounting student, it is interesting for me to observe the reaction of my fellow classmates when faced with the option of taking a fourth year accounting ethics course.

“RECENT CORPORATE COLLAPSES AND ACCOUNTING SCANDALS THREATEN THE ACCOUNTING PROFESSION IN ITS ENTIRETY, AND STUDENTS SHOULD UNDERSTAND THE IMPORTANCE OF ACQUIRING SOUND ETHICAL REFLECTION”
I am pleased to introduce the second of a three issue newsletter partnership between the Centre for Accounting Ethics, University of Waterloo and the EthicsCentre CA. We thought it was appropriate to honour this relationship by giving this particular issue an educational focus.

Business Schools are a key source of future managers across Canada. Most consider ethics to be an important component of their educational mandate. Indeed, the principle accreditation body for business schools internationally, the Association to Advance Collegiate Schools of Business, assumes a commitment to reflect ethical values in core curricula. We were therefore curious to find out what in fact Canadian business schools are providing in the way of ethics education. Tom Vance of the Centre for Accounting Ethics conducted a small study (with students Jody Grewal and Mary McCutcheon) and reports his findings. He also addresses the ongoing debate about how best to educate students in this regard: through dedicated courses (and if so, taught within business schools or elsewhere such as in philosophy departments) or through integration in a broad range of courses.

We thought it useful to round out this material with two contrasting but equally important perspectives: those of the student and those of a former Dean with a unique interest in ethics education. Scott Carson will be familiar to members through his Codes of Conduct in the Private Sector report that can be found on the Resources page of the EthicsCentre CA website. Scott is a former Dean of Business at St. Mary’s University and Wilfrid Laurier University and is currently director of the Queen’s MBA. Jody is a fourth year student in the School of Accounting and Finance with an interest in almost everything. She is a star student, star athlete, star volunteer and will, later this year, travel to New Zealand as one of only 12 students selected by Zonta International for the Jane M. Klausman Women in Business Scholarship. She is a young woman who can give us enormous faith that our future will be in good hands.

Our last and very valuable contribution is the Legal Column written by Ian Kyer. Many of you will know Ian as a lawyer at Fasken Martineau in Toronto with an outstanding reputation nationally and internationally in IT and e-commerce law. Ian is, however, far more than a legal practitioner alone. He is an historian, a writer and a generous contributor to a host of organizations. For present purposes, we are delighted to note that he is one of ‘our’ (University of Waterloo) own and was recently awarded the Arts Alumni Achievement Award for his contributions to his professional field and his community and public service. We are honoured to include his column in this newsletter.

I close this Editor’s piece with a personal observation. Our newsletters and columns often exude an up-beat tone. But these are tough, tough times for many. Much of this suffering can be laid at the feet of our corporate decision makers who played hard and fast with a sometimes shaky regulatory environment. We are told of recovery but in truth it is fragile at best and while markets may shift upwards, individuals in all sectors are little better and often worse than they were a year ago. And then, of course, there is the extraordinary suffering of the most marginalized in this world, who have the misfortune to live where war is waged or natural disasters strike. If ever there is a time to shake up educators and demand they equip our youth with the tools to make good decisions in their future, it is now. For the most part students are an idealistic bunch. But as educators we often fall short in what we offer them in terms of what really matters: that is, how to become the very best citizens they can be. We cannot continue to pay lip-service at most to these elements of an education.
Lessons My Professional Life has Taught Me

BY IAN KYER, FASKEN MARTINEAU

I have practiced corporate commercial law in Ontario for almost 30 years. In that time I have faced a number of ethical dilemmas. When they arose there was no drum roll, no waving of flags – no real drama of any kind, just a few seemingly innocuous remarks. Yet those remarks in the circumstances in which they arose had the potential to reshape my life.
In this article I have set out some of these challenges in a fashion that minimizes the risk of revealing who my client was but allows me to illustrate how such problems arise and to offer some practical suggestions on how to deal with the problems without sacrificing your career or your client.

In my experience most young lawyers are ethical people and cannot envisage that they would ever act in ways that are inappropriate and unethical. What they do not realize is that unethical conduct arises from countervailing considerations. Some ethical problems appear in the guise of friendship - a long time friend asks you to bend the rules just this once (“I would do the same for you”). Others arise from a business opportunity - having landed a new client with tremendous potential for future business, you are asked to show appreciation by “smoothing the way” for him or her (“I will be forever grateful”). Sometimes it is simply a matter of being very busy with things that “really matter” and concluding that in this particular case you need not comply with the rules because they are simply unnecessary complex and time consuming. In all of these circumstances doing the unethical thing is simply easier or perceived to be more appropriate. Standing up to your friend or your new client or overcoming your own desire to take what you see as the more efficient route is no easy matter. Nobody wants to be a “stickler for the rules” at the cost of a friendship or client relations. So you are motivated to act inappropriately and to put your legal career at risk. You effectively are betting your career and you may be betting your personal liberty.

So let’s look at some of the situations I have found myself in.

One task that a lawyer is often called upon to perform is notarizing a document. It is in essence an extremely simple, almost mechanical task. You are shown a document and asked to administer an oath and to witness someone signing the document indicating that he or she has sworn the content to be true. Sometimes you are asked to simply verify the completeness and accuracy of a copy that has been made of a previously prepared document. In the first case you are asserting that the person was in your presence, took the oath and signed the document. In the second you are certifying that you have carefully compared the original document and the copy and found them to be identical. While the lawyer’s role as notary public is simple it is nevertheless an important task that has developed over time to prevent fraud. Now let us suppose that a friend calls and asks if you can produce a notarial copy of a document. Of course you say yes. But the problem is that he is running around getting ready for a trip and does not have time to come to the office and show you the original, take the oath and sign it. “But that ought not to be a problem in today’s world. You can make up a copy based on the earlier draft you prepared - it has not changed,” he explains. “You can then scan a signature from another document that I have signed and electronically paste it at the end. Then attach the notarial certificate that says that I took the oath and signed the document in your presence. Please then send the document by fax or email to the following address. It has to get there by 5pm. Nobody will be the wiser.” It all seems so simple. True you are certifying that the copy you have prepared is a true copy of an original that you have not seen and you are stating that he stood before you and took the oath when he was not there and you are stating that he signed the document when he did not. But you trust your friend and you want to be helpful. Requests like this are common but I am happy to say that I have not given in. What I say to my friends who ask me to do something like this is that as much as I want to be helpful I cannot do it. My reputation and honour as a person who takes his notary public duties seriously is central to my professional standing. I must be able if and when cross-examined to say that I have never cut corners. I have always insisted on strictly following the required procedures. All of which is true. What I do not say is that I know from things that I have seen that these sort of shortcuts always come to light eventually. Perhaps your friend forgot to tell you about some change made in the document so that your copy and the original are not identical. Or perhaps he had hurt his signing hand the day before and other documents signed by him on the day in question exhibit characteristics not found in the signature you scanned. Perhaps while he is

“My reputation and honour as a person who takes his notary public duties seriously is central to my professional standing.”
away you are required to produce the signed original and all you have is the electronic version. These can and do happen and you are left to explain how and why you did what you did.

Several times in my career new clients have presented me with an ethical dilemma. In each case I was so happy that I had landed these clients who offered the prospects of lucrative work and I was anxious to keep them happy.

In one case I was acting for a small group of young entrepreneurs who were selling their company. The deal was going to bring them a very large return on their investment. The problem is that in structuring the company in its early days they had lacked good advice and had made an error that was going to cost them millions of tax dollars. When this was pointed out to them their leader said, “no problem, we can just rip up the old documents and prepare new ones. No one has yet seen these documents.” When I responded that this would constitute tax fraud, the response was that I need not participate. They would look after this. I just had to leave the room. When I said that I would not and could not do so, they threatened to take their work elsewhere. It took me some time to get them to realize that what they proposed might well end up putting them in jail. This time I did run through with them all of the ways in which their fraud might come to light. Had their auditors seen the earlier documents? What about other investors? Had they filed documents based on the earlier structure? I reminded them that Ollie North had thought that no one would detect his actions but archived emails had proved his undoing when the Contra scandal arose. They eventually saw the light. I kept them as clients and we got the deal done.

There was no such happy ending in my next example. In this case I was approached by a company in a foreign country. I had been seeking work from this country for some time and initially was thrilled with the prospect of working with this new client. They needed some documents prepared in connection with a joint venture project for which government funding was being received. They dutifully provided me with the very strict rules from the government that set out how the documents were to be prepared and delivered to the government. I noted that documents had to be accompanied by sworn statements. Clearly there was concern about fraud. I, however, was not to be involved in the administering of the oaths since that was to take place in the foreign country. I just had to prepare the documents that were being attached to the sworn statements. Unfortunately in the course of my briefing the representatives of my new client let slip that the documents that I was being asked to prepare were not actually to be acted upon. They were to be presented as accurate descriptions of the joint venture for the purposes of securing the funding but the real business deal was very different. When I said that they were asking me to participate in a fraud they assured me that they would never do that. I was just putting words on a piece of paper. I had done my duty by telling them that what they proposed was wrong. They would consider my advice and act as they saw fit. If they chose to swear falsely and submit my documents as accurate that was their business not mine. I objected in as polite a way as I could but they would not be moved. When I insisted that I could not do as they asked they expressed surprise at my lack of knowledge about how business was done in their country. They left saying that I was so naïve and would regret my decision. I never have. When I read about people who gave in to their desire to be a good friend or who looked the other way as their profitable client broke the rules, I remember how close I came to taking the easy path and following in their footsteps.

My hope is that my experiences can help others to resist these temptations. In suggesting that you learn from my experience, I am reminded of the advice given to helicopter pilots. “Learn from the mistakes of others - you may not live to learn from your own”. While my ethical challenges were not life threatening, many threatened my career and some my personal liberty.


Speakers’ Corner

DIRECTORS’ DUTIES IN THE POST-BCE ERA
October 28, 2009 Ava Yaskiel,
Partner, Ogilvy Renault LLP

Ms. Yaskiel reviewed the decision of the Supreme Court of Canada relating to the proposed privatization of BCE. Prior to the BCE decision, the prevailing view was that in the context of a change of control transaction, the board’s fiduciary duty shifts from acting in the best interests of the corporation to maximizing shareholder value. The BCE decision rejected this notion and made it clear that directors owe their fiduciary duty to the corporation in all circumstances.

Ms. Yaskiel highlighted the significance of the decision with respect to the guidance it has provided regarding (i) the duties of directors and (ii) the rights of stakeholders both generally and in the context of a change of control transaction. She suggested that the decision will have far-reaching impact on change of control transactions in Canada in ways yet to be determined. She also noted that the decision has reaffirmed the importance of process in establishing an evidentiary record supporting the reasonable exercise of directors’ business judgment.

NEW CSR LEGAL PRINCIPLES AND HOW THEY CONTRIBUTE TO SUSTAINABILITY
November 4, 2009 Professor Chip Pitts, Lecturer,
Stanford Law School (co-sponsored with the Ontario Bar Association and the Canadian Corporate Counsel Association)

Professor Pitts examined the hard and soft laws that ground CSR, suggesting that responsible corporate behaviour has become a matter of important legal concern for virtually every corporation. He compared how national laws, international treaties and voluntary initiatives differently reflect seven CSR principles he and Professor Janda of McGill University have identified through their joint research. Professor Pitts provided a number of examples of these principles and how they contribute to sustainability.

The seven principles identified and discussed were: Integrated Decision-making, Stakeholder Engagement, Transparency, Global Normative Convergence, Prudent Risk Management, Accountability and Community Investment.

BUILDING AN ETHICAL CULTURE:
A TASK FOR THE PEOPLE
December 3, 2009
Fiona Crean, Ombudsman, City of Toronto

Fiona Crean spoke to the EthicsCentre after completing her inaugural year as Toronto’s first Ombudsperson. Ms. Crean summarized the Ombudsman role as a government willing to be self scrutinized. Over the past year developing and implementing the policies and processes of her office, her theory regarding ethics in government has evolved to include the people stating “a community will not truly have ethics in governance until it has developed a culture of ethics”. She offers that building this culture is the responsibility of the people. The people are the city. The pursuit of ethical municipal government is a shared journey requiring the active participation of the people themselves in developing a culture of ethics in government. Leadership must come from the bottom and the top. She encourages us to ‘put ethics back into daily life and at the centre of public debate’.

EthicsCentre facilitates the discussion of ethical issues. We serve as a forum and catalyst for constructive discussion and debate. So it was encouraging and inspiring when Ms. Crean left us all with the message: “Wherever you go, in whatever you do – in your conversations with yourself and others, initiate and engage in the dialogue. Ask what the ethical standards are that we want to guide our lives, our economy, our governments.” Ms. Crean’s speech is posted on the Centre’s website (on the Past Events page).

Continued on page 14…
Ann-Louise Howard held our attention with her presentation about Lockheed Martin's multi-faceted ethics communication program. This engaging presentation included a demonstration of their ongoing awareness training program and a video created by a group of employees. This touching video was part of an employee contest to create an additional ethics awareness vehicle. This further demonstrated their employees' commitment to promote and most importantly embrace their corporate ethics culture. Lockheed Martin's ethics communication program includes a one-time orientation ethics compliance training program, annual awareness training, and an anonymous reporting vehicle. In addition to these basic elements there is job-specific training which is manager led to 'set the tone' and includes interactive video. Their ethics communication program uses state-of-the-art methods to communicate the company's values including:

- Awareness training (available online for public viewing)
- Ongoing “Integrity Minute” communications delivered to the employee's inbox
- Ethics Matters posters
- Intranet resident employee discussion blog including an 'Ask Us' feature
- ‘Be an ethics star’ contests
- Arts & Film Festival with the theme “Shaping our Culture”. Entries included inspirational film, poem, quilt, etc.

Ms. Howard’s interactive seminar was greatly appreciated by the EthicsCentre members present. Lockheed Martin uses creative tools to communicate their corporate values and the enthusiastic involvement by their employees is a measurement of success for this innovative program.

 Siemens is one of the largest and most diversified companies in the world of electronics and electrical engineering, operating in the industry, energy and healthcare sectors. The company has approximately 5,065 employees in Canada, working to develop and manufacture products, design and install complex systems and projects, and tailor a wide range of solutions for individual requirements. For almost 100 years in Canada, Siemens has stood for technical achievements, innovation, quality and reliability. Sales for Siemens in Canada for fiscal 2009 (ended September 30), were $2.5 billion CAD. Through its global compliance program and related initiatives, Siemens seeks to be a world leader in compliance and integrity.

Enbridge Gas Distribution has a 160-year history and is Canada’s largest natural gas distribution company. Enbridge Gas Distribution is owned by Enbridge Inc., a Canadian-based leader in energy transportation and distribution and one of the 2010 Global 100 Most Sustainable Corporations. Enbridge Gas Distribution and its affiliates distribute natural gas to about 1.9 million customers in Ontario, Quebec, New York State and New Brunswick. For more information go to www.enbridgegas.com.
Attention Graduate Students

SCHOLARSHIP AVAILABLE FROM CANADIAN CENTRE FOR ETHICS AND CORPORATE POLICY

The EthicsCentre CA is proud to announce the creation of a scholarship for Canadian graduate students working in business ethics. The new $5,000 scholarship will fund research on topics of interest to the Canadian business and professional communities.


ELIGIBILITY: Any student registered in a Masters or Doctoral Program at a Canadian post-secondary academic institution.

YEAR: September 2010 – August 2011

AMOUNT: $5,000 to be distributed in two parts: (i) $2,500 upon grant of the Award and (ii) $2,500 upon receipt of the report by the Centre.

APPLICATION DATE: Submissions must be received at:
The Canadian Centre for Ethics and Corporate Policy
One Yonge Street, Suite 1801, Toronto, ON, M5E 1W7
By June 30, 2010
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