LGST 100-301
Ethics and Social Responsibility

Course Overview
This course is a multi-disciplinary, interactive study of business ethics and the social responsibility of business. Ethics is not meant to be a stand-alone topic, but should be integrated into all aspects of business. The course will relate to issues in organizational behavior and management, strategy, marketing, and international business.

The course is designed to inform and stimulate your thinking on ethical issues and professional challenges encountered in business. The material covered is intended to help prepare you to recognize and manage ethical issues as these arise, and to help you formulate your own standards of integrity and professionalism.

Objective
Overall course objectives are:

- To increase awareness of the ethical dimension of business conduct;
- To contribute insight into your leadership and professional responsibilities in your future careers;
- To develop analytical skills for identifying and resolving ethical issues in business; and
- To practice decision-making about ethical issues.

During the beginning of the semester we will concentrate on understanding your own values and purpose and will address issues faced by individuals in organizations. Next, we will examine corporate responsibility issues that confront the leadership of organizations. Finally, we will focus on issues of international business ethics.

We will use readings, cases, videos, guest speakers, and debates to examine real issues confronting managers of organizations, and to practice analyzing and solving the issues.

Grading Policy
Grading will be at my discretion and in accordance with Wharton policies. With the exception of clerical/coding errors, no change of grades will be issued after final grade sheets are delivered to the University Registrar. No individual extensions are given for class assignments—the only extensions granted will be those given to the entire class. Late assignments will have five points deducted per day past the due date.
Grading

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assignment</th>
<th>Weighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class Participation</td>
<td>(20%) Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Investing Slide Deck</td>
<td>(15%) Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debate</td>
<td>(25%) Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam</td>
<td>(25%) Individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Reference Memorandum</td>
<td>(15%) Individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details for completion of these assignments appear in the Course Assignments section of this syllabus.

Course Materials

The course pack will be available from Reprographics and study.net (s). There will be a separate charge for printing via Reprographics. Other materials, including journal and newspaper articles, will be available on Canvas or Penn Library Course Review (PLCR). In some instances, a link to the article will be provided. To access Canvas go to SPIKE or https://wharton.instructure.com/login

Classroom Etiquette

You are expected to treat your classmates and their opinions with courtesy. You are expected to arrive for class on time. Cell phones and computers should be turned off. No typing or texting is permitted during class time. For my reasoning about this “no electronics” policy, consult https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/students-are-better-off-without-a-laptop-in-the-classroom/

Meals

You are invited and encouraged to sign up on Canvas for student-faculty meals sponsored by the Wharton Meals Program. The meals are entirely voluntary, and there is no charge to students. Lunches will take place at Pod.

Office Hours

Should you have any questions or concerns about the class, please do not hesitate to see me or Yvette or Alberto. You should consider coming to office hours to address any concern you may have about the course, even if you would simply like to discuss the material further. No appointment is needed to meet during my office hours (MW 4:30-5:30) and you should feel free to drop by. If you are not able to meet during office hours, please email me or Yvette or Alberto to arrange an alternative meeting time.

Reading List and Calendar

Readings are open to modification in order to accommodate the interests and flow of the class. “s” = material available through Study.net. “PLCR” = material available through Penn Course Library Reserves, accessible on Canvas. All other materials are available through Canvas or handed out during class.
### Detailed Schedule – LGST 100

#### A. INTRODUCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August 30</td>
<td>1. Introduction to the Course</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### B. INDIVIDUAL VALUES AND PURPOSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 4</td>
<td>No Class – Labor Day!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 6</td>
<td>2. Personal and Professional Purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Christensen, <em>How Will You Measure Your Life?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Smith, <em>Why I am Leaving Goldman Sachs</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>Needs and Values Program</em> (complete this exercise before class as a first step to knowing your values)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 11</td>
<td>3. Introduction to Ethical Reasoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Badaracco, <em>Personal Values and Professional Responsibilities</em> (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 13</td>
<td>4. Social Investing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Bouri, <em>Three Big Takeaways from the Latest Impact Investing Data</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Podcast: &quot;Why Impact Investing Needs to Go Mainstream&quot; with transcript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <a href="http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/impact-investing-going-mainstream/">http://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/impact-investing-going-mainstream/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>** You are only responsible for reading the Executive Summary pp.12-16 **</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### C. INDIVIDUAL VALUES AND WORKPLACE ETHICS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September 18</td>
<td>5. Individual Values in the Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- <em>A Note on Five Traditional Theories of Moral Reasoning</em> (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Case: <em>Conflict on a Trading Floor</em> (s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September 20</td>
<td>6. Individual Values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cohen, <em>Owner of a Credit Card Processor is Setting a New Minimum Wage: $70,000 a Year</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday September 25</td>
<td>7. Ethics in Negotiations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday September 27</td>
<td>8. Decision Making About Ethical Issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday October 2</td>
<td>9. Ethical Issues in the Workplace: Fairness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday October 4</td>
<td>10 Dissent and Whistleblowing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>11. Ethical Issues in a Diverse Workplace</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 9</td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sandberg: <em>Why We Have Too Few Women Leaders</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><a href="http://www.ted.com/talks/sheryl_sandberg_why_we_have_too_few_women_leaders.html">http://www.ted.com/talks/sheryl_sandberg_why_we_have_too_few_women_leaders.html</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• McGregor and Schulte, <em>Women still hold only 19 percent of U.S. board seats</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Slaughter, <em>Unfinished Business</em>, 2015, Chapter 4, “Competition and Care”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td><strong>12. Debate: Google was right to fire James Damore.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 11</td>
<td>Optional (under <strong>Debate Articles</strong> Folder in Canvas):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conger, <em>Here’s the Full 10-Page Anti-Diversity Screed Circulating Internally at Google</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Quora, <em>Was Google Right to Fire James Damore?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Damore, <em>Why I was fired by Google</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>13. Students present social investing assignment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td><strong>14. Debate: Autonomous vehicles serve the best interests of society.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>Optional (under <strong>Debate Articles</strong> Folder in Canvas):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Auto Insurance Center, <em>Top 20 Pros and Cons Associated with Self-Driving Cars</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday</td>
<td><strong>15. Ethical Issues in a Diverse Workplace/ Microaggressions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 23</td>
<td>Assignment:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Case: <em>It Wasn’t About Race or Was It?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday</td>
<td><strong>16. Debate: Universities are right to rescind admission based on a student’s social media.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td>Optional (found under <strong>Debate Articles</strong> Folder in Canvas):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Ali, <em>Harvard Revokes Admission of Several Students for Posting ‘Offensive’ Memes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Line, <em>Harvard’s decision to rescind admissions over social media violates free speech, professor says</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Topic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday October 30</td>
<td>17. Does Business Have a Social Responsibility?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Friedman, <em>The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Freeman, <em>Stakeholder Theory</em> on <a href="http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bIRuALcvPe8">http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bIRuALcvPe8</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday November 1</td>
<td>18. Debate: Corporations are right to make decisions based on their religious views.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Optional (found under Debate Articles Folder in Canvas):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Porterfield, <em>Why Corporations Have Religious Freedom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Michaelson, <em>Why Corporations Don’t Deserve Religious Freedom</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday November 6</td>
<td>19. Duty to Rescue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dunfee, <em>Do Firms with Unique Competencies for Rescuing Victims of Human Catastrophes Have Special Obligations?</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Case: <em>Merck &amp; Co. (s)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday November 8</td>
<td>20. Bribery and Corruption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Assignment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Fadiman, <em>A Traveler’s Guide to Gifts and Bribes</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Nichols, <em>Business Case for Complying with Bribery Laws</em> (selections TBA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Case: <em>Khan on Bribery</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday November 13</td>
<td>21. Guest Speaker: Sebastian Escarrer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday November 15</td>
<td>22. Guest Speaker: Pierre Ferrari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>REVIEW SESSION 6:00 – 7:00 pm Room F95 J MHH</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday November 20</td>
<td>23. In class exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday November 22</td>
<td>No Class - Happy Thanksgiving!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday November 27</td>
<td>24. Guest Speaker: Pierre Gentin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday November 29</td>
<td>25. Guest Speaker: Bonnie Jonas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday December 4</td>
<td>26. Social Entrepreneurship Panel ** Future Reference Memo due on Canvas by midnight **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wednesday December 6</td>
<td>27. Guest Speaker: Nien-hê Hsieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monday December 11</td>
<td>28. Wrap-up</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Course Assignments

Class Participation (20%)

The course is intended to allow you to develop the analytic skills and substantive framework to address challenges as they arise in business. Many of these challenges will involve justifying your position to those who disagree with you. To this end, the course emphasizes articulating reasoned arguments. Participation is expected and required in this class. Although good participation involves good listening, listening alone does not constitute satisfactory participation. Both quality and quantity are taken into account. Participation involves making valuable contributions to class discussions through thoughtful comments or questions. Consider participation an evaluation of how much you contribute to moving class discussions forward.

Attendance will be taken on a regular basis. Class participation contributes to your grade, and you cannot participate if you are not present. A seating chart will be created in class and students will be expected to sit in the same seats for the rest of the term. If you are late or miss class, it is “your” responsibility to find out what you missed.

Please see or email me right away if you have any concerns with being able to attend every class session. I expect you to treat class like showing up to an important job. The only absences that are excused are those for medical reasons and family emergencies. Classes missed for other reasons, including job interviews, are not excused.

This class is a joint effort, and your active participation and engagement are essential. There are further ways to participate, in addition to speaking in class:

- Everyone is expected to contribute to the Discussion Board on the Canvas site. The Discussion Board is a supplement to class participation, not a replacement. The Discussion Board can be used to continue our class discussions, to raise business ethics issues of interest, and to post articles related to the class.
- You are also encouraged to participate by coming to office hours to discuss the material.

Social Investing Assignment (15%) Due

For this assignment you are to prepare a slide deck of no more than 9 slides (including Title slide, Appendix slide and References slide) uploaded to Canvas by midnight Wednesday Oct. 4.

The assignment asks you to take on the role of creator and portfolio manager for a new socially responsible fund. You must first decide the values your fund stands for and the investment criteria that will define your selection process. We will provide examples to help you formulate the values by which your fund will operate. Once you decide on your values and your fund description, you will need to find two investments in firms that fit your criteria. Through your research, your slide deck will demonstrate how these two firms align with your fund’s values.

Your initial investment in the fund is a hypothetical $10 million. Based on the stock price of the two firms you will allocate the $10 million. For example if the stock of Firm A is trading at $10 a share and the stock of firm B is trading at $50 a share, you may choose to buy 500,000 shares of Firm A and 100,000 shares of Firm B. However, you do not have to split your investment equally across the two firms if you feel that one firm better meets your investment values criteria.

Include in your deck an Appendix slide that lists the stock price of each of your investments with the date of that price, as well as the number of shares of each stock you will purchase, and the total. Also, include a slide listing your references.

You will be graded on your formulation of a coherent set of values and investment criteria for your investment decisions. You should include how those values reflect your own personal values. You will also be graded on the strength of your research about your two chosen firms and the alignment of those firms with your investment values.
Examination (25%)

This in-class closed-book examination will include short-answer questions (two to three sentence answers), short essay, multiple choice and true/false questions. The purpose of the examination is to test your comprehension of the major concepts introduced in the readings and classes.

Group Debates (25%)

Teams will have the responsibility for developing and advocating a position supporting or opposing a debate proposition. A list of team members is due in class on Wednesday, September 27th. Debate topics will be assigned to teams via a lottery process in class that day.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Debate: Google was right to fire James Damore.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Debate: Autonomous vehicles serve the best interests of society.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Debate: Universities are right to rescind admission based on a student's social media.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October 25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Debate: Corporations are right to make decisions based on their religious views.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>November 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each team has the following specific responsibilities:

- To prepare a Power Point presentation of the arguments supporting your team's position. A hard copy is due the day of the debate. An electronic copy of the Power Points containing your opening statement must be posted to Canvas no later than 24 hours prior to the start of the class in which the debate takes place.
- To present in class a constructive argument of the team’s proposition and a rebuttal of the opposing team’s position, and manage questions from the opposing team and classmates.
- To present your side of the debate in an uncompromising manner, in other words, you must maintain your stance without conceding points to your opposition.
The debate format follows:

(Caution: This debate format has been invented by the instructor and is not intended to bear any resemblance to standard debates that you may have experienced in the past.)

- Pro Team Opening Statement: 8 minutes
- Con Team Opening Statement: 8 minutes
- Pause for Team Members to Confer: 2 minutes
- Pro Team Rebuttal: 4 minutes
- Con Team Rebuttal: 4 minutes
- Pause for Team Members to Confer: 2 minutes
- Pro Team Closing Statement: 2 minutes
- Con Team Closing Statement: 2 minutes
- Con Team Asks Question of Pro Team: 1 minute
- Pause for Team Members to Confer: 1 minute
- Pro Team Answers Con Team’s Question: 2 minutes
- Pro Team Asks Question of Con Team: 1 minute
- Pause for Team Members to Confer: 1 minute
- Con Team Answers Pro Team’s Question: 2 minutes
- Pro and Con Teams Field Questions from Class: 10 minutes

The presentation in class will be assessed based on your ability to construct and present a compelling argument supporting your position and to rebut and answer questions about opposing points of view. In your debate you should present your position clearly, coherently, and in an engaging way to your audience of classmates. Your classmates will have an opportunity to “judge” the debate and will have input into the grading of the debate.

The following criteria will be used to grade the debates:

- A clear set of arguments tied to course materials: 55 points
- Research that provides strong evidence to support your arguments: 25 points
- Clear, persuasive, and engaging presentation: 20 points

Future Reference Memo (15%) Due

To protect against the risk of memory loss, you are to write yourself a survival memo (no more than 1,250 words) uploaded to Canvas by midnight December 4th. Your memo will communicate the most helpful lessons, models and concepts you’ve learned about ethics in business for your personal reference. You will be graded based on the seriousness of your engagement with the course materials, as well as the reflection and insight you demonstrate.
Optional Podcasts

For those of you who are interested in learning more about the theories of ethics, as well as gender bias, I recommend podcasts from two sources: *Philosophy: The Classics Podcast* and *Philosophy Bites*, as well as *freakonomics* podcasts. Some possibilities are listed below.

**Consequentialism:**

John Stewart Mill - Utilitarianism (Philosophy: The Classics Podcast) - 13 min

**Contemporary Commentator from Leading Living Philosophers:**

1) Brad Hooker on Consequentialism (Philosophy Bites Podcast) - 13 min
2) Philip Pettit on Consequentialism (Philosophy Bites Podcast) - 20 min
3) Roger Crisp on Utilitarianism (Philosophy Bites Podcast) - 13 min

**Deontology:**

Kant - Groundwork of Metaphysics of Morals (Philosophy: The Classics Podcast) - 14 min

**Virtue:**

Aristotle - Nichomachean Ethics (Philosophy: The Classics Podcast) - 24 min

**Contemporary Commentator from Leading Living Philosophers:**

1) Roger Crisp on Virtue - (Philosophy Bites Podcast) - 14 min
2) Terence Irwin on Aristotle's Ethics (Philosophy Bites Podcast) - 17 min

**Gender Biases and Gaps:**

Biographical Sketches

DR. DIANA C. ROBERTSON

Diana C. Robertson is the James T. Riady Professor of Legal Studies and Business Ethics, The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania. Diana previously served on the faculties of London Business School and Goizueta Business School, Emory University, as well as taking a recent sabbatical at The London School of Economics. She holds an undergraduate degree from Northwestern University and an M.A. and Ph.D. in sociology from UCLA. Diana’s research centers on business ethics and corporate social responsibility. At present she is conducting research using neuroimaging technology to identify neural activations in the brain associated with moral reasoning.

Diana received the Albert E. Levy Scientific Research Award at Emory University in 2007 and was a finalist for the Journal of Marketing 2007 Harold H. Maynard Award. Diana has also been the recipient of awards for both undergraduate and MBA teaching at Wharton and Emory University. Diana’s work has been published in academic journals including Business Ethics Quarterly, Human Relations, Journal of Business Ethics, Journal of International Business Studies, Journal of Marketing, Journal of Marketing Research Management Science, Neuropsychologia, Neuroimage, Organization Science, PLOS One, and Sloan Management Review. She is the co-editor of a forthcoming book from Cambridge University Press, Thinking about Bribery: Neuroscience, Moral Cognition, and Psychology of Bribery.

Diana has been a member of the Global Advisory Council of the World Economic Forum on the Role of Business and of the Values Council. At the University of Pennsylvania, Diana has served as Chair of the University’s Social Responsibility Advisory Committee and is a member of the Penn Forum for Women Faculty. Diana is the doctoral coordinator in the Department of Legal Studies and Business Ethics.

YVETTE SOKEI, L’18

Yvette is originally from Nigeria. She is in her second-year at Penn Law and is an Associate Editor for the East Asian Law Review Journal. This past summer, she was a summer associate at Wiley Rein in Washington DC. Yvette holds a BBA from George Washington University in Finance and International Business. While in college, she also studied abroad for a semester in Hong Kong. Before law school, she worked at the U.S. General Services Administration in DC for two years.

ALBERTO GOMEZ, L’20

Alberto is originally from Venezuela and majored in Finance at the University of Florida. Post-graduation, Alberto participated in Teach For America here in Philadelphia and subsequently served as the Director of Operations for his placement school. Alberto is in his second year at Penn Law, and he interned for the Office of the General Counsel of Pennsylvania this past summer.
About the Guest Speakers

SEBASTIAN ESCARRER  sebastianescarrer@melia.com

Sebastián Escarrer is Chairman of Wharton Executive EMEA Board, Vice chairman of the Spanish Executive Committee of the International Chamber of Commerce - ICC as well as member of the Worldwide “Executive Board”, Vice chairman of Excultur - the Spanish travel industry lobbying group, Vice chairman of the Tourism Board of the Spanish Confederation of Employers' Organizations (CEOE), Chairman for the Progress in Management Association in the Balearic Islands and Vice chairman for the Mediterranean Region. At the same time, Mr. Escarrer is a member of the Executive Committee of the World Travel and Tourism Council (WTTC), board member at PICTET Advisory Board of the Premium Brands Funds and member of the Advisory Board of Caixabank in the Balearic Islands.

After graduating from ICADE, Mr. Escarrer held several positions in multinational companies such as Coca-Cola, First Boston, IBM, Hyatt and the Mac Gemini. In 1993 he obtained an MBA from The Wharton School of Business with three majors. In 1993 he joined Grupo Sol, now Meliá Hotels International as CEO and as Vice chairman for 19 years.

Mr. Escarrer’s achievements and reputation have earned him several awards in the travel and finance industries, including his selection in 1997 as one of the 100 leading businessmen for the 21st Century by the World Economic Forum. The same year US magazine “Travel Agent” chose him as their “Personality of the Year in Latin America” and one year later as “Personality of the Year in Europe”. In 2002, he was nominated “Best Entrepreneur in the Balearic Islands” by the magazine “Actualidad Económica”. In 2009 Escarrer was named the Spanish business leader that generates the greatest confidence by the Barometer of Corporate Confidence Survey and in 2011 the Spanish Institution Forum for the excellence management recognized him with the Golden Master for his professional career.

PIERRE FERRARI  Pierre.Ferrari@heifer.org

As president and CEO of Heifer International, Pierre Ferrari joined in 2010 with more than 40 years of business experience. Ferrari has a keen interest in sustainable and ethical development and the methods needed to get there. He is a marketer and entrepreneur and more recently, a social venture developer. He worked for years with Coca-Cola USA, before deciding in 1995 to focus his energies and business acumen on social issues and to use his skills and aptitude to help, invest in and partner with people living in material poverty to help them achieve self-sufficiency, independence and health, goals that directly align with Heifer’s empowerment-oriented mission.

Ferrari is a current board member of the Small Enterprise Assistance Fund, which provides equity financing to small and medium enterprises in developing countries and emerging markets; InterAction, an alliance organization of 180 NGOs united by a commitment to work with the world’s poor and vulnerable, serving as a convener and thought leader to make the world a more peaceful, just and prosperous place; Global Impact, an organization that raises resources and partnerships that help the world’s most vulnerable people by providing integrated, partner-specific advisory services; and Fair Trade USA, an organization using a market-based approach to empower family farmers and workers around the world to get a fair price for their harvest.

Ferrari is also a former chair and current Board member of Ben & Jerry’s Homemade Ice Cream, which seeks to meet human needs and eliminate injustices, focusing on children and families, the environment and sustainable agriculture on family farms. As part of his service with Ben & Jerry’s, Ferrari led the board to firm up its global commitment to fair trade by 2013 with its vanilla, cocoa and coffee farmers, a course that matches with Heifer’s work with smallholder farmers. Ferrari holds a master’s degree in Economics from The University of Cambridge and an MBA from Harvard Business School.
PIERRE GENTIN   pgentin@gmail.com

Prior to joining Cahill in October 2015, Mr. Gentin served for seventeen years in senior legal and risk positions at Credit Suisse AG. As Managing Director and Global Head of Litigation and Regulatory Investigations, Mr. Gentin advised the bank’s board of directors, executive management team, and senior business personnel on legal and regulatory exposures. He represented Credit Suisse before government officials and regulators worldwide and he negotiated directly the resolution of the bank’s material civil disputes. In 2014, LawDragon named him one of the 500 Leading Lawyers in America for his “masterful job managing Credit Suisse’s civil disputes, investigations and enforcement actions around the world” and in 2015 The Legal 500 named him In-House Litigation “Individual of the Year” for the United States. At Credit Suisse, he served on the General Counsel Division’s global management committee which ran the 1700-person legal and compliance division. As the highest ranking litigation and enforcement lawyer at the bank, he was a member of the Global Leadership Council comprising the senior leadership group at Credit Suisse.

Mr. Gentin also held a senior risk role as Credit Suisse’s Head of Reputational Risk for the Americas. He chaired the Americas Reputational Risk Council. Earlier in his career at Credit Suisse, Mr. Gentin was General Counsel for the Global Research Division. He was responsible for Credit Suisse’s implementation of the 2003 “research settlement” among Wall Street firms and U.S. federal and state securities regulators and he co-chaired the Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association’s Global Fixed Income Research Task Force. Before joining Credit Suisse, Mr. Gentin served as an Assistant United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York. He represented the United States government in civil cases before the U.S. federal trial courts and he argued numerous appeals before the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

Mr. Gentin also devotes time to civic and professional commitments. He has been an Adjunct Professor of Law at Fordham University Law School and served on the Fordham Corporate Law Center’s board of advisors. At Fordham, Mr. Gentin created and taught a seminar called “In-House Lawyering on Wall Street.” He lectures frequently on legal and business topics at universities including Harvard, Princeton, Columbia, Cornell and Penn. He serves on the executive committee and board of trustees of the Practising Law Institute and is co-editor of the forthcoming PLI Answer Book entitled “The Mediation of Financial Services Disputes.” Mr. Gentin is a member of the World Economic Forum’s Global Agenda Council and an alumnus of the Forum’s Young Global Leader program. He serves as Chair of the Board of Directors of the Princeton Center for Jewish Life and is a Chair for the Bronx Region of the Princeton Alumni Schools Committee. He has served on the executive board of the Anti-Defamation League’s Lawyers’ Division and in 2014 he was honored with the ADL’s Human Relations Award.

BONNIE JONAS    bjonas@pallasglobal.com

Bonnie Jonas served for 18 years as an Assistant United States Attorney in the U.S. Attorney’s Office for the Southern District of New York (the “SDNY”). Ms. Jonas’s most recent position with the SDNY was as Deputy Chief of the Criminal Division, from 2013 to 2016. She also served as the SDNY’s Financial Fraud Coordinator for President Obama’s Financial Fraud Enforcement Task Force and as Co-Chief of the General Crimes Unit.

During her tenure in the SDNY, Ms. Jonas investigated and prosecuted many of the Department of Justice’s most historic and complex matters. Ms. Jonas investigated and prosecuted individuals at WorldCom, Royal Ahold, Aurora Foods, and Commerzbank and prosecuted and oversaw reforms through corporate monitorships of Deutsche Bank, Toyota, and General Motors.

Ms. Jonas was an attorney with the law firm Paul, Weiss, Rifkind, Wharton & Garrison and a law clerk for the Honorable Reena Raggi of the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of New York. Ms. Jonas is a graduate of the Wharton School and Columbia Law School. Ms. Jonas currently serves on the Board of Advisors of the Program on Corporate Compliance and Enforcement at NYU School of Law.

She has been recognized with prestigious national awards, including the Director’s Award for Superior Performance by a Litigative Team for the WorldCom case; Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency, Gaston L. Gianni, J.r. Better Government Award for the Toyota Prosecution; 2014 Recipient of The National Association of Former United States Attorneys’ Exceptional Service Award; 2015 Recipient of New York County Lawyers’ Association Award for Outstanding Public Service.
Nien-hê Hsieh is an associate professor of business administration in the General Management Unit at Harvard Business School. His research concerns ethical issues in business and the responsibilities of global business leaders. Professor Hsieh teaches Leadership and Corporate Accountability to first year MBA students and to Executive Education participants in the Program for Leadership Development. He joined the faculty from The Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania, where he was an associate professor of legal studies and business ethics and served as codirector of the Wharton Ethics Program.

Professor Hsieh’s research centers on the question of whether and how managers ought to be guided not only by considerations of economic efficiency, but also by values such as freedom and fairness and respect for basic rights. He has pursued this question in a variety of contexts, including the employment relationship and the operation of multinational enterprises in developing economies. Professor Hsieh also studies foundational aspects of this question, examining principles for rational decision making when choices involve multiple values that appear incomparable. In his current work, he focuses on institutional dimensions of this question. In this research, he investigates standards managers should follow even if not required by legal and public institutions, and how managers should respond when existing institutions make it difficult to meet these standards.

Professor Hsieh’s work has been published in Business Ethics Quarterly, Economics and Philosophy, The Journal of Political Philosophy, Philosophy and Public Affairs, Social Theory and Practice, Utilitas, and various other journals. He serves on the editorial board of Business Ethics Quarterly and the executive board of the Society for Business Ethics.

Professor Hsieh holds a B.A. in Economics from Swarthmore College, an M.Phil. in Politics from Oxford University, and a Ph.D. in Economics from Harvard University. Before joining the faculty at Wharton in 2001, he was a Postdoctoral Fellow at Harvard Business School, and he has held visiting fellowships at Harvard University, Oxford University, and the Research School for Social Sciences at the Australian National University.