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Opus College of Business Center for Ethics in Practice Celebrates a New Name

The Center for Ethics in Practice is the new name for the former Center for Ethical Business Cultures. The Center’s continued work is in support and development of principled leaders and ethical business cultures throughout the Twin Cities marketplace and greater Minnesota remains our focus.

The mission for the Center for Ethics in Practice is to cultivate partnerships between the professional and academic communities around mutual learning and meaningful innovation, in service of ethical leadership, organizational success, and the common good. The Center accomplishes this mission through dialogues, programs, and events to facilitate practical learning and actionable scholarly research about professional responsibility and ethics.

We look forward to an exciting and eventful 2018-2019!
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History of the Center

The Center for Ethics in Practice originated 40 years ago as the Minnesota Center for Corporate Responsibility (MCCR). Initially established in the minds of a small group of chief executives, it expanded exponentially reaching tens of thousands of individuals in more than 300 companies. Outlined in 1978, the Center’s original purpose was to encourage and assist Minnesota business leaders in obtaining a clearer vision of business’s role in the larger society.

Beginning with a “Pilot Program” in November 1977, conceived in part, by Thomas Wyman, then of the Green Giant Company, Wyman stated a need “to discuss specific ways in which this kind of conference can be amplified and repeated to involve a broader group of companies and more people in our own management groups.”

Addressing the opening session of the Pilot Program, Judson Bemis, then chief executive of the Bemis Company of Minneapolis, defined the challenge: “The major problems of society cannot be solved without the direct participation and resources of business initiated and sponsored by active personal involvement of the chief executive officer. Our businesses must change and...CEOs must change them.”

The chief executive officers who met in those early discussions Bemis, Wyman, Kenneth and Bruce Dayton of the Dayton Hudson Corporation, C. Angus Wurtele of Valspar Corporation, Edson Spencer of Honeywell, John S. Pillsbury of Northwestern National Life, and others did not begin with answers or even with agreement on the questions. The common ground was a social vision. Their understanding of the relationship between society and business conceded a priority to society that business leaders all too often seem to reject. As Mr. Bemis put it, there is a “franchise that society grants to business.” Or, in the words of Kenneth Dayton, "...the only reason for the existence of the free enterprise system is to serve society."

The Pilot Program ended with a determination to achieve the “amplification” and “repetition” Mr. Wyman had proposed at the beginning. Out of that determination emerged the MCCR. It’s members were corporations. Dues varied with size, and size varied from small accounting firms to the multibillion dollar likes of Pillsbury, 3M, Dayton Hudson, and Honeywell. Through its seminars, research, and the continual networking of its staff and directors, the Center has helped to create and maintain in Minnesota a clear perception of good corporate citizenship. MCCR kept alive the concept of corporate stake-holders during a decade when the idea was eclipsed by preoccupation with competitiveness, takeovers, and dealmaking.

In 1988, MCCR became affiliated with the University of St. Thomas. This symbiotic relationship was built on a foundation of shared vision of ethics-based business practices and developing principled leaders, who think globally, act ethically and create enduring value for society.

In 1992, MCCR in conjunction with a group of business leaders developed The Minnesota Principles to foster fairness and integrity of business relationships in the emerging global marketplace. In language and form, The Minnesota Principles provided the substantial basis for the Caux Round Table Principles for Business, now available in 12 languages. The Caux Round Table (CRT) is a group of senior business leaders from Europe, Japan and North America committed to the promotion of principled business leadership.

MCCR was renamed the Center for Ethical Business Cultures (CEBC) in 1998. CEBC’s mission was to assist leaders in creating ethical and profitable business cultures at the enterprise, community and global levels.

CEBC achieved its mission in multiple forms. First, through its services to business (Fee-for-service leadership development training and consulting with executives and boards of directors plus public speaking). Examples of organizations that benefitted from CEBC training and/or lectures included: Best Buy, BCBS, Eide Bailly, General Mills, Medtronic, MTS, St. Jude, US Bank, United Health Group, 3M, Health Partners, Allina, ...Over 6900 leaders have been touched.

Second, CEBC built awareness through public and invitational programs focused on the ethical dimensions of prominent issues facing business. A few programming examples included the Minnesota Business Ethics Awards (annually for 19 years; Winning with Integrity: Sports, Ethics and Leadership (2016-2018); Twin Cities Risk and Values Summit (2016); Restoring Trust in Financial Services (2015); Building Ethical Business Cultures in Emerging Markets: Risks and Opportunities (2015).
Third, CEBC sought to educate the Next Generation by working with students to enhance their education experiences. The CEBC Ethics Case Competition; OCB Ethics Lab for MBA students; facilitating corporate site visits/discussions; and, guest lecturing in graduate courses are a few of the many educational outreach opportunities offered.

Finally, conducting and facilitating research on ethical leadership and culture was the third leg to fulfill the CEBC mission. Examples of CEBC research publication include: Ethics in Emerging Markets (pending publication by Cambridge press); Wiley Encyclopedia of Management: Business Ethics Volume, 3rd edition (facilitated editing with OCB faculty); Corporate Responsibility: The American Experience (2012); Modeling Ethical Business Culture (2012); Characteristics of ethical business cultures (2009); Culture of Corporate Citizenship: Minnesota’s Legacy for the Global Future (2000); among others.

In 2016, Ron James, CEBC President, retired. Since 2016, the Center has been working to fulfill the CEBC mission in the Twin Cities marketplace. However, the business landscape - in Minnesota and beyond - has evolved. Incredible technological advances, an ever-increasing global workforce, heightened consumer demand for socially responsible companies, and uber-organizational competitiveness has driven business into a volatile, uncertain, and ambiguous environment.

Just as the business marketplace has evolved, so has the Center. In September 2018, we rebranded ourselves as the Center for Ethics in Practice. For the future, our focus will be on maintaining our foundational programming, education and research while succinctly developing innovative ethics education and networking opportunities in the Twin Cities.

As mounting competitive pressures continue forced changes in corporate giving priorities and structures, the Center aims to continually revise and adapt our programs to new issues and new levels of management.

We hope you will continue your partnership with the Center as we continue to serve the Twin Cities community by building ethical business cultures, ethical business practices, and principled leaders. The future demands ethical businesses. The present demands we work to provide it.

*Historical information thanks to Dr. Ken Goodpaster.
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Auditing Culture

By: Dawn Kimmich, Assistant General Counsel, Delta Airlines and Colleen Dorsey, Director Organizational Ethics & Compliance, University of St. Thomas School of Law

Audit and Compliance and Ethics professionals share a highly symbiotic relationship. Audit is (or should be) the right hand to Compliance and Ethics’s left hand. Compliance and Ethics professionals are the face of the Code of Conduct, the portal for complaints, the business advisors. Audit professionals are the masters of process, with visibility and comfort with the organizational systems. Audit knows where and how to hunt. Compliance and Ethics often has the questions. When Audit and Compliance and Ethics partner, the team proves powerful.

As a practical reality, most organizations have more auditors than Compliance and Ethics team members. Auditors are on the road, visiting business units all over the world. Compliance and Ethics professionals usually have thinner teams, often travelling, but mostly minding the programmatic, training, investigative and advisory side of the house. Organizations which aim to embed a compliance and culture dialogue into the daily business diet, and read ethical culture, can leverage the strengths and roles of both Audit and Compliance and Ethics to this end. Culture is the new sermon in the minds of

Compliance and Ethics professionals. A partnership with Audit, masters of process, may not seem so obvious at the outset. However, Audit can leverage the core audit role, and practice, to play a very important role in measuring culture. While culture might ostensibly seem immeasurable, an organization can perform a cultural temperature reading, once it settles on a few objective indicators.

Audit and Compliance and Ethics can take two key steps to measuring culture, and arguably, leadership. They can start and lead the conversation at the enterprise level, and have the conversation at the audited business unit level.

First, Audit and Compliance and Ethics can partner to establish a communication forum which gathers leaders from various departments to share knowledge. Generally, the bigger the organization, the less collaboration across different divisions. No one has the time to worry about the others’ responsibility. The group can have leaders from Audit, Compliance and Ethics, Legal, Labor Relations, Human Resources, Health & Safety, Operations, and Security. The group composition would vary by organization. In a regular cadence of meetings, each group would bring a visual of their problem areas, by business unit or geography.

When leaders from such departments cross silos, gather in a room, and cooperate to observe patterns, the results are potentially very revealing. Compliance and Ethics will have heat spots of substantiated hot line calls. Audit knows which business units have the worst, and repeated findings. Labor Relations knows where most of the grievances start. Human Resources knows which locations have the most discrimination and harassment complaints. Health and Safety can point to where they see the most injuries. Operations knows where its failures lie. Legal knows what drives the worst litigation. Security knows which locations have the most instances of employee theft. Separately, the injuries, audit findings, litigation, complaints, HelpLine reports, and operational incidents are all symptoms of a larger problem.

Instead of keeping this information in
the collective view can be powerfully informative. The enterprise view likely highlights a cultural erosion. Very likely, the root cause of the problem will not be operational, but instead will be a leadership problem. It most likely underscores ineffective or even corrosive leadership. At the core, culture is leadership. The leaders might not be solely responsible for building the culture, but they can single-handedly erode it.

Second, Audit, with the support from Compliance and Ethics, can have conversations at the audited business unit level as well. Auditors have a unique opportunity, as they travel around the globe, to lead a conversation and get answers. Auditing culture would not be a standalone audit. The “cultural” questions aiming to identify symptoms of a culture erosion would integrate into every type of audit (financial, operational, IT or other). Which questions would the auditor ask, to get a glimpse into culture of the business unit in front of them?

The questions would aim to understand the mindset of those particular employees and leaders. The questions would range broadly across various objective and subjective factors. What is your business plan? Are you on plan? If not, how is that affecting employees? Are the employees getting bonuses? Raises? Are they paid at, above or below market rates? Do they get inflationary increases, or are they paid less now than 3 years ago? Is the business experiencing any unexpected market shifts? Is the industry battling any major disruptors? Are costs up and budgets down? Is revenue up? How is the economy in that country or area? Are there external geopolitical dynamics affecting morale (Nationalism?) Does the business unit have the latest technology and infrastructure, or are they making do with 20 year old equipment, and outdated applications? What do the employee surveys show? What are the employee relations like? Any union activity? How high is attrition? Does the leadership team have diversity of perspective? Are leaders new in their roles? Have they been there for a decade, thereby limiting opportunities for those managers next in line? Have the leaders been promoted past their competencies? Are employees comfortable around their leaders?

None of these questions, individually, define culture. But the collective set of answers may provide color on employee mindset. The questions do require the auditor to break out of the traditional practice of sitting in a conference room, while asking for and reviewing documents.

Auditors need to put down their pens, close their laptops, accept a cup of local tea, be social, and drive a conversation which aims to meet out these answers. And, they need to take good notes. The answers may enable the Compliance and Ethics function, and leadership, to better understand if these employees have a mindset to make good discretionary decisions? How likely are they to adhere to policy and process, or to report concerns? More critical to an Anti-Bribery program, for example, how likely are employees to resist local pressures or practices to cut corners for the sake of self-preservation, or operational or revenue targets?

By starting a cross-divisional conversation about hot spots at headquarters, and by leading conversations on audits with local employees and leaders about business pinch points, Audit and Compliance and Ethics can lead the unchartered path towards identifying cultural erosion. The Compliance and Ethics and Audit professionals benefit from a development as well. Compliance and Ethics can evolve from talking (or worse, preaching) about culture. Instead, they can further integrate with business partners, and address threats to culture. Meanwhile, Auditors can escape the audit conference room, develop relationships with business partners, and pack even more value and return into their increasingly tight audit plans.

Colleen Dorsey, JD, Director of Organizational Compliance & Ethics at the University of St. Thomas School of Law

Dawn Kimmisch, JD, Assistant General Counsel, Director Compliance & Privacy at Delta Air Lines
Compliance & Ethics: Better Together

By: Jon Ackman, Vice President, Director of Ethics at US Bancorp

Compliance and ethics. Compliance and ethics? Compliance AND ethics! Those three words are said very differently depending on who you work for and what topic you’re discussing.

In the financial services industry, the focus has been on Compliance with a capital “C.” In the 10 years since the financial crisis, regulators have enacted sweeping changes to promote financial stability. This not only affected how financial institutions are regulated, it also changed how they approach compliance and ethics. The most successful programs strike a balance to help employees consider rules and values to make the right choices.

**Intent and impact**

As risk and compliance functions have grown to ensure compliance with new regulation, policies, standards, guidelines and employee training have proliferated. But we can’t lose sight of the intent of the rules.

Consider an analogy from the primary and secondary education field, which also has strong governing oversight and relies heavily on standardized testing. An unintended consequence can be “teaching to the test,” with lessons and curricula focused on test preparation. While this may help improve scores, it can leave students without functional understanding of concepts or processes.

In our organizations, are we empowering employees to use common sense to execute our policies? Recent headlines about corporate misdeeds indicate that some companies aren’t. More policies aren’t always the best answer. We also have to consider human nature, and that’s where ethics comes in.

**Rules vs. values**

As compliance and ethics professionals, we’re beginning to recognize the importance of both rules and values in the design and function of programs. In the financial services industry, behavior risk and conduct risk are starting to show up in conversations with regulators. For example, the Financial Conduct Authority has published a number of white papers and essays about how to transform culture using behavioral science. Paying attention to human nature and behavioral norms is becoming essential to the care and feeding of our compliance and ethics programs.

To understand the relationship between rules and values, picture a glass jar full of rocks. The rocks represent rules. Whenever we create a new policy, we put another rock in the jar. We keep adding rocks to the jar until the jar looks full. If we create enough rules, we may believe we’ve anticipated every situation. The unintended consequence, however, is that people begin gravitating toward the small spaces between the rocks. They say, “I’ve read all the rules, and they don’t say I can’t [insert poor behavior here], so I guess it’s all right.” It’s human nature.

**Doing the right thing**

Our global ethics team works with our compliance team and partners with our human resources, employee relations and fraud investigations teams to address the spaces between the rocks. Visualize our jar of rocks filled with water. The water is the values that fills the voids between the rocks (rules). Our goal is to empower employees to turn to their personal values and our company values when they’re not sure what to do. We want them to ask, “Is this the right thing to do for our customers? For the company?” If they’re unsure, we want them to speak up.

Don’t underestimate the power of strong partnerships between the compliance and ethics functions, even if they sit in the same group. That collaboration can help create and foster a do-the-right-thing culture that not only helps your organization comply with laws and regulations but also protects and enhances your reputation.
Evolving your program

I am a precious snowflake (unique, just like you), and my program is unique (just like yours). Once you strip out the pride of title, company or industry, I bet the similarities between our collective programs will outweigh the differences. Financial services, healthcare and many utilities are heavily regulated. While the regulators that govern each group are different, they’re all trying to make sure companies have programs in place to—as Roy Snell of the Society of Corporate Compliance and Ethics puts it—prevent, find and fix regulatory and ethical issues.

Is your industry ready for increased regulatory oversight? Do you rely on a rules-based program? Are you struggling to fill in the space between the rocks? To be successful, compliance and ethics functions need to work together. Having one without the other isn’t an option. How do you get started?

• Google is your friend - There are thousands of resources available. Scholars, practitioners and professional organizations provide thought leadership on almost every conceivable topic.
• Transparency - Connecting the dots and creating trust with your employees, customers, shareholders and other stakeholders is paramount.
• Collaboration - It’s not a matter of “if,” but “when,” your company will have an ethics or compliance problem that’s visible to external stakeholders. Make sure you have strong partnerships in place before something happens. How you respond may matter more than the original offense.
• Don’t re-invent the wheel - If a model or process works, even if it’s unconventional in your industry, try it.

For example, we’re adopting an awareness model that’s often applied to public health issues. If you view ethical awareness model that’s often applied to public health issues. If you view ethical conduct as part of a larger ecosystem, and define an ethical lapse as an “illness of behavior” that has many moving parts, then you have a path for gaining insight into your program. What models or examples have you seen that might work for your organization?

• Empathy - Remember your front-line employees. The effectiveness of your compliance and ethics program rests on their ability to navigate both the rocks and the water.

SIDEBAR:
Rules, values and trust

As ethics professionals, we want employees to speak up when they have questions or concerns. But speaking up is hard. It may be one of the hardest decisions an employee faces in their career.

This brings us to trust. Employees won’t speak up if they don’t have faith in their organization’s ethics and compliance program, the humans behind the program or their own management. Having a mechanism to receive allegations, and having resources dedicated investigating allegations, analyzing trends and reporting outcomes, is only the start. You also have to study the behaviors that don’t show up on the quarterly allegations report. For example, if 90% of ethics reports are made anonymously, you may have a trust problem.

Asking people to speak up can’t be a one-and-done exercise. Rather, it should be the beginning of a long and ongoing conversation. Belief that no action will be taken and fear of retaliation are the primary reasons why employees don’t speak up. Open-door programs can create transparency and build trust between employees and managers. Training can help managers be present in tough conversations and actively support employees who raise concerns. These efforts can help create active feedback loops, giving transparency to compliance and ethics processes. This, in turn, can build employee trust in compliance and ethics programs.

Giving time and attention to “speak up,” “listen up” and “follow up” helps them confidently navigate an organization’s rules and the values. Ultimately, this leads to a more effective compliance and ethics program that has better flexibility to adapt to situations as they arise.

Jon Ackman, CCEP, Vice President, Director Global Ethics Office
The Cultural Sweetspot: Where Ethics Meets Compliance

By: Tobi Tanzer, Vice President, Integrity and Compliance and Chief Compliance and Privacy Officer at HealthPartners

“Should we follow the rules, or should we do the right thing?” It’s a question that’s familiar to most compliance professionals. So often organizations find themselves caught between what regulations say they should do and what their organizational values would have them do. But just as tricky is when there really isn’t a set of rules – or even a set of values – to give us a road map for navigating tough situations. What then?

At HealthPartners, a Minnesota-based integrated health care delivery and financing organization, we recently encountered an emerging issue that is a good example of this kind of dilemma: what do we do when neither the law nor our values give us a clear path for addressing a critical problem?

In the fall of 2016, HealthPartners launched a series of conversations about race as part of a twice-yearly activity we call Team Talks. Team Talks give colleagues at over 250 locations across the organization a chance to talk with senior leaders about topics that matter most to them, and to our patients, members and community. We began the fall 2016 Team Talks by acknowledging that race can be difficult to talk about for some people, especially in a work setting, while it is more comfortable for others. “Wherever you are,” we said, “we hope everyone can contribute something today. None of us are experts, but we all have our own experiences. So let’s create a space today where we can all learn from different perspectives and experiences.” As a leader-facilitator of several of these conversations, I was privileged to hear colleagues – many of whom I have worked with for over two decades – tell personal stories that gave me a new appreciation for who they are. It was an invaluable and humbling experience.

One surprising – and uncomfortable – issue that frequently came up during those Team Talks was that employees in a variety of roles and locations reported interacting with patients and members who had refused care or service from them, apparently in response to the employee’s race, language, ethnicity, LGBTQ status, gender, country of origin or religion. Other colleagues reported different forms of bias from patients and members, such as harshly questioning the credentials of a caregiver who appeared to be foreign born or interrogating a lab technician who was wearing a head scarf about her views on terrorism. And these expressions of patient and member bias were happening with increasing frequency.

This was concerning and presented a complex and difficult dilemma. Every patient and member carries their own personal experiences, and there may, in some cases, be understandable reasons why a person is not comfortable with a particular caregiver. Moreover, people are not always at their best when they are in extreme pain, are experiencing a health crisis or feel frightened in an unfamiliar environment. At the same time, as our Diversity and Inclusion philosophy states, we want to create an environment where every person – every patient, member, family member and colleague – feels welcomed, valued and included. Our colleagues wanted to know: should we accommodate patient and member requests – in some cases, demands – to work only with employees whose outward appearances, accents and faiths aligned with their own? Or should we refuse such demands, instead telling the people we are here to serve that . . . well, we would not be serving them? What was the right thing to do?

We knew we had to address this issue. Not only did these requests and behaviors undermine our values and efforts to be inclusive, they were also hurtful to our skilled and caring colleagues. We
knew, too, that if not handled appropriately, these interactions could create legal risk for the organization and ultimately undermine the quality and safety of care and service we strive to give to our patients and members. But there are few laws that address patient and member demands and behavior of this nature – and merely complying with those laws would do little to mitigate our risk. Turning to our organizational values of Excellence, Partnership, Compassion and Integrity was not immediately helpful, either. Depending on whom you asked, those values could either lead us to accommodating all patient demands and behaviors, no matter how outrageous or hurtful, or to protecting the dignity and diversity of our workforce, no matter what the patient or member was asking for. There would be no easy answers to this issue, but for the sake of our colleagues – and our patients and members – we did need some answers.

We began to look for those answers by doing what we do quite well at HealthPartners: We talked. We convened a team of leaders from Diversity & Inclusion, Patient Care, Member Experience, Integrity & Compliance, Human Resources, Bioethics, and Communications. Amid much impassioned conversation, the group quickly agreed that, while we needed standards for how to address patient and member bias, no single policy could address the myriad manifestations of this issue.

So we did another thing we tend to do a lot at HealthPartners: We wrote. We started by articulating several rights, responsibilities and values, that come into play – and sometimes come into conflict – when we are faced with instances of patient and member bias, including: our organizational Vision (“Health as it could be, affordability as it must be, through relationships built on trust”); patient autonomy; professionals’ obligations to do no harm to the people we serve; colleagues’ right to work in a safe, harassment-free environment; and a variety of legal obligations. From there, we drafted a series of Principles that we hoped would help guide colleagues through these situations.

And then: We listened. We took the draft Principles to a number of stakeholder groups; most significantly, we met with a number of colleagues who had directly experienced patient or member bias in some form. We heard incredible stories of empathy, grace and even humor in the face of some very difficult situations. These conversations made it clear that people needed clearer decision paths, more concrete steps to follow, and more specific, appropriate language to use. They needed to know whether they would be supported by their employer, their leaders, and their coworkers. And they needed to know how to make difficult care and service choices in the moment.

In other words, in addition to affirming our diverse and inclusive culture, we needed to be more specific about our standards and to build competency. (See Fig. A.) So we wrote some more. This time, we brought the Principles into the real world (see Fig. B), and created a toolkit for employees, based in large part on the conversations we had with so many of our compassionate, wise colleagues. The toolkit includes a step-by-step guide to help colleagues plan and practice for these situations, to help de-escalate, communicate and support each other during difficult interactions, and to facilitate reporting, follow-up and team culture after the situation has been addressed. It also includes scripting for all colleagues – from the person who is the direct target of patient or member bias, to the person who receives a complaint about another colleague, to the leader who is called upon to facilitate a resolution. The toolkit also features a video of colleagues describing their experiences, an e-learning module, and template communications.

This spring, to launch the toolkit – to affirm our culture, communicate our standards and build colleagues’ competency – we went back to where we started eighteen months ago: with Team Talks. Our Spring 2018 Team Talks were designed around about patient and member bias: how it shows up; what we, through our own biases, assume (rightly and wrongly) about it; the importance of supporting colleagues; and how to address it in a way that both honors our organizational values and complies with the law. Yes, we’re back to that: when neither organizational values nor the law gives us clear answers, or a clear path to answers, what do we do?

In an organization with a culture of compliance and ethics, we did this: We engaged with stakeholders and heard things that surprised us and sometimes made us uncomfortable. We brought multiple perspectives to the conversation and humbly acknowledged that what we had to offer wasn’t enough. We then talked more with stakeholders and learned even more from them. We affirmed our culture, established standards, and built competency, so that every colleague touched by this difficult issue felt the decisions they made were aligned with our values and our responsibilities. That’s our sweet spot.
Figure A. Finding the Organization’s Cultural Sweet Spot

Figure B

HealthPartners Principles for Addressing Patient and Member Bias

1. **Clinical Stability of the Patient Is Primary**
   This should always be the primary and foremost factor in decision-making; all of the remaining principles should be considered once the individual is clinically stable.

2. **Communication Is Critical**
   Stresses the importance of communicating openly with a patient or member to understand and respond to their concerns, express support for and confidence in the skills of our colleagues and keep the focus on patient care and member service, with leader intervention as needed.

3. **Capacity of the Patient or Member Must Be Evaluated**
   Recognizes that in some situations, patients and members may not be responsible for their behavior, due, for example, to mental illnesses or conditions and impaired judgment; our ability to respond to individual requests or tolerate certain behaviors will increase as needed to provide safe care for people who have less capacity to control or understand their behavior.

4. **Cultural and Personal Context Are Relevant**
   Reflects the fact that some requests to change caregivers may be due to an individual’s cultural background or personal history, as opposed to bias, disrespect or blatant discrimination; at the same time, cultural/personal context is never justification for disrespectful or abusive behavior toward a colleague, which will not be tolerated; in all interactions, we strive to lead with cultural humility, avoiding assumptions and seeking to understand patient and member needs.

5. **Caregivers and Other Colleagues Must Be Supported**
   Empowers colleagues and encourages them to report inappropriate words and behaviors when observed, even if not directed at them personally; the burden of recognizing and responding to intolerance and discrimination should not be borne solely by the person being targeted; when possible, caregivers and other colleagues should be consulted before any decisions are made regarding a change request; colleagues may choose to continue caring for the individual if they believe they can do so safely, objectively and professionally.

6. **Personal Safety Is Important**
   Stresses that some situations are so sensitive that, if we insist a person is cared for or served by a particular colleague, the patient, member, or colleague, might suffer physical or psychological harm.

7. **Legal Requirements Must Be Followed**
   Recognizes the importance of being aware of and complying with applicable laws and professional standards.

© HealthPartners, Inc. 2017
Upcoming Events

Ethics Edge Roundtable Breakfast Series
Join Opus College of Business Ethics Faculty as well as Twin Cities business leaders for breakfast and a discussion about Hypertransparency: Employer & Employee Rights, Responsibilities, & Ethical Considerations.

Thursday, December 6th, 2018 from 7:30 - 9:00 a.m. at the St. Thomas Minneapolis Campus. Breakfast will be served.
Members and former members: FREE. Non-members: $25.00.
Please RSVP to Teresa Sweeney @ tsweeney@stthomas.edu

Conversation RE: Commitment Event
Please join us for an exciting networking event at the Minneapolis Club featuring keynote speaker, Timothy A. Welsh, also known as Tim, has been Vice Chairman of Consumer Banking and Sales & Support at U.S. Bancorp since July 17, 2017. Mr. Welsh served as a Senior Partner at McKinsey & Company from July 2006 to June 2017 where he specialized in financial services and the consumer experience. Previously, Mr. Welsh served as a Partner at McKinsey from 1999 to 2006. He serves as Chairman Greater Twin Cities United Way.

Thursday, January 31st, 2019 from 4:30 - 7:00 p.m. Cocktails & heavy hors d’ oeuvres will be served. Please RSVP to Teresa Sweeney @ tsweeney@stthomas.edu

2019 Stakeholder Dialogue
"Save the Date" for a the annual Stakeholder Dialogue on May 2, 2019 featuring keynote speaker, Farhad Manjoo. Mr. Manjoo is the “State of the Art” columnist for Business Day, a position he assumed in February 2014. Before joining The Times, Mr. Manjoo was a technology columnist at The Wall Street Journal. Previously, he was a technology columnist at Slate magazine from 2008 to 2013. He was also a contributing writer at Fast Company from 2009 to 2013. Mr. Manjoo is the author of “True Enough: Learning to Live in a Post-Fact Society,” which was published by Wiley in 2008. He is working on a book about Apple, Amazon, Facebook and Google’s efforts to rule the business world. Sponsored by the Koch Distinguished Professors, Center for Ethics in Practice, & the Veritas Institute

Thursday, May 2nd, 2019 from 4:30 - 7:15 p.m. at the St. Thomas Minneapolis Campus.

Many MORE educational and networking opportunities to come...
Recent Writings

Dr. Jamal Al-Khatib, Professor of Marketing & director of the Small Business Institute.  
*Business Culture’s Influence on Managers’ Ethical Ideologies and Judgment: An Eight-Country Study*

As international business grows, focus on ethical business practices intensifies and insight into manager’s attitudes towards unethical negotiating practices is essential. Using a sample of 1314 managers from eight countries, we find evidence that a country’s business culture affects the distribution of managers’ ethical orientations/positions. Similar distributions are found among countries with similar business cultures versus national cultures (e.g., we find Japanese managers similar to US managers and differing from Chinese managers). We then find ethical orientations and ethical positions driving managers’ perceptions of the appropriateness of using various unethical negotiating tactics—important insights for managers preparing for cross-country negotiations. Conditionally accepted by *The Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice.*

Dr. Christopher Michaelson, Professor, Ethics & Business Law and the David A. and Barbara Koch Distinguished Professor of Business Ethics and Social Responsibility.

Forthcoming. *Do we have to do meaningful work?* In Ruth Yeoman, Katie Bailey, Adrian Madden, & Marc Thomps (Eds.), Oxford Handbook of Meaningful Work. Oxford University Press.


Dr. Katherina Pattit, Associate Professor, Ethics & Business Law.


Dr. Stacey Supina, Adjunct Faculty, Ethics & Business Law.


Dr. Nicole Zweig Daly, JD, Director, Center for Ethics In Practice.