



# THE UNIVERSAL ACCREDITATION BOARD ACCREDITATION STUDY COURSE

LAW AND ETHICS

---

*Session* **8**

## **Overview**

This session of the Accreditation Study Course is designed to give participants an overview of legal and ethical aspects of the practice of public relations.

*NOTE TO COACH:* For the first part of this session, it is appropriate to bring in a guest who teaches communications law at a local college or university, or some other similar resource. Adjust the material on legal aspects accordingly, but do not abandon the exercises. You will need some interaction with participants. Uninterrupted lecture can be very monotonous.

### ► **Reading to be assigned BEFORE this session**

- Section 3, Detailed list of Knowledge, Skills and Abilities tested, Candidate's Preparation Guide for the Examination for Accreditation in Public Relations.
- *In texts and reference resources:* First Amendment, Commercial Speech, Defamation, Libel, Slander, Privacy, Copyright, Trademark, Government Regulatory Agencies, Legal Considerations and the Internet, Political Expression, Lobbying, Foreign Agents, Freedom of Information provisions, Sunshine laws.
- Code of Ethics or Professional Standards of candidate's professional organization.

### ***Special Note for Coach***

*If you have not been coaching recently, please review these preliminary materials: For You, the Coach; The Coaching Method; Managing the Class; About House Rules. Before the day of the class, make sure you are familiar with the content in the reading which candidates should have done, and with the exercises you are going to conduct in this session. Consider any adjustments you may need to make if this is a free-standing unit, or is part of a sequence of preparation classes.*

### ► **Significance of Subject Matter**

- Ethics and Law are weighted at 15 percent of the multiple-choice Examination.

### ► **Handouts for this session**

- Ethics pocket cards
-

- ▶ **Visual Aids needed for this session**
    - Elements of Libel – Visual #20
    - Copyright – Visual #21– two pages
    - Ethics Pocket Guide– Visual #22
  - ▶ **Other materials needed for this session**
    - Projector for Visuals
    - PDF file of ethics card, if handouts are not available
  - ▶ **Exercises conducted during this session**
    - Lee Iacocca and Statue of Liberty campaign
    - Auto dealer and Thesqueakywheel.com
    - Fair use and fair comment
    - Ethics scenarios
  - ▶ **New lecture material to be delivered during this session**
    - Legal Aspects
    - Ethical Aspects
- 

## I. Agenda

*Instructions: Announce*

*2-3 minutes*

- ▶ Legal aspects (about an hour)
- ▶ Ethical aspects (about an hour)

## II. Legal Aspects

*Allow 10-15 minutes*

- ▶ First, let's reprise an exercise from the "jump-start" workshop you may have attended. If you were in such a workshop, you now get an opportunity for second thoughts, which are often useful.
  - > A moment for a generation-gap question. How many of you know something about Lee Iacocca? [Show of hands.] His career in the auto industry spanned more than 40 years. As general manager at Ford Motors, he is credited with developing the popular Mustang. As Chrysler chairman, the original mini-van. He appeared personally in widespread advertising on television and became something of a celebrity. After retiring from Chrysler in 1992, he turned to developing and marketing an electric bicycle and an electric car. For this exercise, we are back in his Chrysler days, on a spinoff from a real-life episode.

> *The scenario:*

You are the Public Relations Director for Lee Iacocca, when he was a chief executive and primary spokesman of the Chrysler Corporation. He has been appointed to lead a national fund-raising drive for restoration of the Statue of Liberty. An editorial in the *New York Times* questions his competence for this task. He is hoping mad about what he sees as unfair treatment. Lawyers (in-house) advise him to sue for libel.

**He wants your thoughts about the advisability of suing. What comments or concerns will you express to him?**

- > **Instruct the class:** Take two minutes and make a few notes, reflecting the reading you have been doing, or your own previous experience.
- > **Call for response:** What comments or concerns will you express to him?
  - Who will give me a first response?
  - How many had something similar to these?
  - Who had something different?
- > **Probe** for legal aspects— elements of libel:
  - Published?
  - Identification?
  - Defamation?
  - Damage?
  - Fault/malice/negligence?

*Visual #20: Elements of libel*

- > **Probe** for concept of “public figure”
  - Would Iacocca be considered a public figure?
  - Could the Chrysler Corporation be considered a public figure?
  - Public figures must prove malice – what is that?
- > **Recommend** review of material in “bookshelf” textbooks. Cite Chapter 9 in *Advertising and Public Relations Law*, Moore et al; Chapter 9 in *This is PR*, Newsom et al; recommend using the index in other general texts.
- > **Observe:** In practice, first you would run through the legal aspects, at least in your mind, and then you put on your hat as public relations counselor.

► Now think about this:

- > If he decides to follow the lawyers’ advice and sue, what comments do you have about the public relations aspects, and what plans do you suggest for the court of public opinion?
- > **Take responses** as usual, and critique as you think best.

- > **Observe:** Such situations are a complex challenge. Think about this enough to be sure how you might respond in a real-life episode, where your chief executive is similarly criticized and equally angry. Remember that when a chief executive is publicly criticized, the concern goes beyond personal reputation – a major worry is the effect on investors, in a public corporation, or contributors, in a nonprofit.

▶ Next, let's take a look at a more recent situation.

*Allow 15 minutes*

- > *The scenario:*

You are a sole practitioner in a Midwestern city of half a million population. Among your clients is an auto dealer who draws trade from surrounding communities. Your role is not in advertising. You work primarily on open houses for showrooms, the auto show, and a service department newsletter for new car customers, following up on scheduled maintenance. The newsletter is posted on the company's Web site. The routine reminders are distributed by e-mail.

Today your telephone rings, and it is the service manager at the dealership. For two days, the company has been receiving e-mails that a complaint about it has been posted on a Web site, and "another potential customer" has just viewed the details. There is a counter on the messages. It has gone past 100. The general manager is worried about the company's reputation being damaged. He is thinking of calling his lawyer.

The service manager wants you to find out how this is happening, and whether you think there is grounds for legal action.

You go to a search engine, search for the dealer's name, and find the Web site: [Thesqueakywheel.com](http://Thesqueakywheel.com). For \$5, a disgruntled customer can post a complaint there for one year. The site manager will help format it. Each time a browser accesses the complaint, an e-mail is automatically generated to the company named in the complaint. The counter keeps a tally on the site as well as building it into the e-mail.

On the Web site, the customer – who lives 50 miles from the dealership – is complaining that he bought a new car in June. In the fall he and his wife took it to the city for service. He says he needed a front-end alignment that the dealer missed on the new car inspection prior to delivery. He was told "they couldn't take care of us." He took the car to Sears; got the alignment; took the bill back to the dealership and was told "the conversation was over – we could sue them if we wanted to."

When you report the complainer's name to the service manager, he tells you a somewhat different story: The owner had scheduled a 3 p.m. appointment for an oil change. When the couple arrived and asked for an alignment, he told them it could not be handled during that appointment, and offered to reschedule. (The service department starts early and closes at 4:30.) He remembers – well – that the couple became angry, the man began to scream and swear, and they were asked to leave. The couple did not leave – they went into the showroom and continued to comment and make a scene.

- > **Preside over discussion:** Let's stop for a moment and review the elements of libel.
  - What do you see in this episode?

*Again, Visual #20: Elements of libel*

- Published?
  - Identification?
  - Defamation?
  - Damage?
  - Fault/malice/negligence?
- ▶ Next step: The dealer and his attorneys decide to sue the customer for damages. They charge slander and libel. Do you see grounds for slander?
- > If necessary, **probe** for differences between libel and slander.  
[Slander is oral; libel is written.]
  - > Which one is the more damaging?  
[Libel winds up in clipping files and archives and never dies; slander may evaporate.]

The case is filed in court and, of course, reported in the newspaper. When the petition was filed, the Web site counter had gone over 300. Two days after the story came out in the newspaper, the counter approached 8000. Eight days later, it was 57,000.

Presumably, that means 57,000 e-mail messages went to the dealer. The dealer's Web site invites readers to e-mail the dealership if they have questions or special requests.

- > **Ask** class: Do you see another issue in the e-mail inbox?
- > **Probe** for
  - Similarity to spamming
  - "Denial of service" – offense when communication is jammed by spam
- > **Conclude:** Don't ask me to identify this case. Your "bookshelf" textbook, *Advertising and Public Relations Law*, makes it plain that the person who passes along defamatory material is just as liable as the person who originates it. The newspaper has the privilege of reporting such matters if they go to court. I don't have that privilege. So I'm not going to tell you who and where that dealership is. This case is a good illustration of how new technology brings new issues into the field of law with which public relations practitioners should be acquainted. The *Associated Press Stylebook and Libel Manual*, also on your "bookshelf," observes that the law of libel is not static, and mentions dramatic changes and new interpretations. Legal concerns can cause money to change hands. They are an important component in the "toolbox" of accredited practitioners.

*Elapsed: 30-35 minutes*

- ▶ Now for some quick drills over a few other areas of your reading:
  - > Take two minutes and make notes on fair use and fair comment.
    - What aspects of law are we in, here?
    - Take responses as usual.
  - > If the class seems unclear about this, send them back to their texts to learn it.
  - > **Comment:** You need to have things like this firmly in mind, and you need to be sure of your source for the information. Don't neglect your studies on legal aspects.
  - > Here are a few basics about copyright which you need to know:

*Visual #21 Copyright  
Two pages in succession*

- > **You may relate:** To augment your studies on copyright, I will contribute an observation by an experienced practitioner, which you probably won't find in the texts:
  - **Question:** In "fair use" of a copyrighted document or other work, how much can you quote without infringing?
  - **Opinion:** There is no mathematical standard. Consider the intent of the law. It protects the right of the author or composer or artist to profit from his or her own work. You ought not to give away what the creator of the work expects to sell. Of course, reviews and publicity can enhance the opportunity to sell. Mathematics can help – if you are looking at a 400-page book, you probably can quote four lines. Maybe four paragraphs. Probably not four pages. If you are looking at a four-line poem, that's different. And if you expect to sell or profit from your project, the balance shifts. You may need to share. Be sure you know how to seek copyright permission.
- > **Ask:** Is anyone ready to distinguish between Freedom of Speech and Freedom of Information?
- > How about Foreign Agents Registration – which applies to public relations practitioners who acquire a client from outside the United States?
  - If the class seems unclear about this, send them back to their texts to learn it.
- > **Comment:** Repeating myself: You need to have things like this firmly in mind, and you need to be sure of your source for the information. Don't neglect your studies on legal aspects.
- > **Try this one on for size:** An elected state official appears in PSAs for television about lower speed limits saving lives, by reducing collisions and one-car accidents. They get widespread usage, as a public-interest issue. Naturally, his name appears under his image. He is a candidate for re-election in an upcoming election. An opponent goes to the television station and demands equal time. What legal aspect affects the station management's decision?

[NOTE FOR COACH: It falls under “equal time” for political candidates, which endures although the Fairness Doctrine is no longer enforced.]

- > Current considerations relating to the World Wide Web and the Internet may not appear in some of your texts. This medium changes with breath-taking speed. It will be important for you to learn how to stay up-to-date. [NOTE TO COACH: If you are offering the technology session in this series, promote it here.]
- > Here’s a glimpse from John Pavlik and David Dozier in a study, – written in 1996! – Managing the Information Superhighway.<sup>1</sup> That was once the catch-phrase for the Internet and the Web:

- The information superhighway presents profound legal issues for those seeking to effectively manage it for organizational ends. Among those challenges are legal liability for the cyberspace activities of employees, intellectual property right and copyright protection, libel, privacy, piracy and the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

As more organizations provide the technological infrastructure for their employees to access the Internet, and its features such as electronic mail, list serves, chat rooms, the World Wide Web and beyond, these organizations open themselves to possible legal liability now and down the road.

- > **Take a look** at this situation, presented as a “what-if” illustration in the Pavlik-Dozier study:
  - For example, envision a major tobacco company in which hundreds of employees have direct access to the Internet. One employee visits and downloads research at a medical research center on the addictive nature of nicotine. Subsequently, that company is sued and accused of having prior knowledge of research on the addictive nature of nicotine. The CEO denies this accusation. Lawyers for the plaintiff produce an audit of Web activity of the company employee who earlier downloaded the research.
- > A couple of important facts to carry with you: Public relations practitioners probably **would** be held accountable for material they transmit on the Internet, because they control the content. The service providers probably would not be liable, because they don’t control the content their clients transmit. This can become pretty scary in newsrooms and public relations departments. An example: Toward the end of 2002, a court in Australia said that a man there could sue Dow Jones for libel over an article published in the United States, distributed over the Internet, and thus also “published” in Australia.
- ▶ Before we leave this subject area, let me urge you to look back at the items in Section 3 of the Detailed list of Knowledge, Skills and Abilities tested, Candidate’s Preparation Guide for the Examination for Accreditation in Public Relations. Specifically, Section 3.3. It lists something over a dozen legal issues which you are expected to know, uphold, or be able to use. **This preparatory session is not a course in applicable law.** We can’t cover all of that. You can, if you will put your nose in the books or your

fingers on your computer keyboard and search the World Wide Web for current information. I recommend this to you. It is an important part of your professional qualifications – and in the APR Examination, you could be asked about any one of those issues.

*Elapsed: About 1 hour*

### III. Ethical aspects

*[Coach transmits information]*

*Allow 30 to 60 minutes, depending on discussion  
And whether you do both major scenarios*



Those of you who are PRSA members should be aware that the Public Relations Society of America adopted a new Member Code of Ethics in 2000. It approaches the subject from the standpoint of values, such as advocacy and honesty, and of provisions to be upheld, such as free flow of information, safeguarding confidences and disclosure of information.

Other organizations which are partners in the Universal Accreditation Board retain their own codes, or may be developing them. For this reason, the 2003 Examination for accreditation uses terminology such as “generally accepted” codes of ethics. The provisions in the various documents are similar. I just want you to be aware of the terminology you may encounter.

A procedure for making ethical decisions has been developed by the PRSA Board of Ethics and Professional Practice. It is produced in a wallet-sized pocket card. I think it would serve well under any of the partner organizations’ codes of ethics I have seen.

*Visual #22: Ethics Pocket Guide*

- > **Hand out** cards, if you have them, or say: I have this in a pdf file if you want to print it for yourself.
- > **Comment:** Many of us lead a sheltered life, so far as ethical conflicts are concerned. It is possible to live a long time, in some areas of practice, and never encounter a thorny ethical situation. Let me draw a parallel between this and driving a car. You may never be involved in a collision. Let us hope not. Regardless, you need to know what to do, and be well prepared on how to do it, should the occasion arise – or slam into you. Many states have questions about responsible procedures in the driver’s license examination. You very likely will encounter something about ethics in your Readiness Review and the multiple-choice Examination. You need to be prepared to talk your way through a hypothetical problem, and to identify conflicts on the computer screen.

*NOTE TO COACH:* If your chapter is offering the session on Personal Presentation, encourage your candidates to work on ethics questions as well as other subjects. If not, encourage them to take the two short scenarios you will offer, and talk them through with a colleague, a spouse, or in front of a mirror, for practice in fluency. Instruct them to have the listener ask questions, inquire how they could make an unethical situation better, or what factors might influence them to “go along” with a questionable scenario. Urge them to do each one two or three times, with different listeners, and observe how much better they become with practice. Six scenarios on ethical dilemmas are posted on the PRSA Web site: [http://www.prsa.org/\\_About/Ethics/index.asp](http://www.prsa.org/_About/Ethics/index.asp)

*Now let's run through a little practice with these concepts.*

- > Here is one scenario, adapted from a worksheet of the Boston chapter of PRSA:  
You are working for a pharmaceutical company that wants to sell more of its nondrowsy allergy drug. One of your interns offers to go into chat rooms of health Web sites that focus on the topics of allergies, and to tout the success she has had in using this drug. She does not intend to disclose the fact that she does not personally suffer from allergies, nor that she works for the company. She intends to do a content analysis on the responses for a term paper at her university.
- > **Conduct** discussion: Look at the values and provision on the pocket guide.
  - Do you see conflicts?
  - Where?
- > Here is another:  
As a sole practitioner, you are approached by a group of prominent citizens who want to advocate for the closing of a nuclear power plant. They argue that it is upwind of a major metropolis and either an accident or a terrorist attack there could result in widespread fallout and loss of human life. They want you to prepare informational materials without mentioning the fact that closing the plant could result in rolling brownouts in the metro area.
- > **Conduct discussion:** Look at the values and provision on the pocket guide.
  - Do you see conflicts?
  - Where?
- > Now here is one created by PRSA's Board of Ethics and Professional Practice:  
Assume that you are the director of public relations for Megabucks Energy Company, a Houston-based Fortune 500 oil and gas exploration and production company. Megabucks has been experiencing declining profits due to drops in oil and gas prices. Recent drilling on one of the company's properties in the Java Sea has produced promising results of a significant new oil and gas reservoir. Although geological testing is incomplete, rumors are flying in the marketplace about the potential of this new well to significantly increase Megabucks' profits. Senior management asks you to prepare a news release that responds to these rumors and downplays the significance of the find.

As part of your research, you discover internal reports that show that this new well is, indeed, a major discovery and that further testing is planned simply to determine the size of the reservoir.

► What do you do?

> **Tell the candidates:** Look at the six steps on the reverse side of the pocket card:

1. Define the specific ethical issue and/or conflict.
2. Identify internal/external factors that may influence the decision.
3. Identify key values.
4. Identify the parties who will be affected by the decision and define the public relations professional's obligation to each.
5. Select ethical principles to guide the decision making process.
6. Make a decision and justify.

> **Proceed:** Let's go through them one by one.

*NOTE FOR COACH:* Here is the discussion guide prepared by the Board of Ethics and Professional Practice, as a guide. Use the questions as you think best. One option is to read each sentence aloud, then make your own comments or provide opportunity for the class to comment. Some items, such as "key values," are simply recitation, unless you want to ask for agreement or disagreement. On item 4 you may want to ask candidates to think about other affected parties, or subgroups, appropriate if their own organization were involved.

**1. Define the specific ethical issue and/or conflict.**

- Is it ethical to disseminate deceptive information regarding the financial condition of my company on which a number of key publics may rely?

**2. Identify internal/external factors that may influence the decision.**

- What does the SEC require in such instances?
- Do federal/state laws require a particular decision?
- What do company values, policies and/or procedures require?

**3. Identify key values.**

- *Loyalty* – As a professional, my commitment to my employer comes before other obligations.
- *Advocacy* – As a responsible advocate, I must consider both my company's interests and the interests of those affected by my decision.
- *Honesty* – I am obligated to tell the truth in advancing my company's interests and in communicating with the public.
- *Independence* – I must retain my objectivity in counseling my employer on the course of action that is in the company's best interest.

**4. Identify the parties who will be affected by the decision and define the public relations professional's obligation to each.**

- Company/employer, Board of Directors, shareholders (and potential shareholders), SEC, financial analysts (community), financial media, employees, public, profession, self

**5. Select ethical principles to guide the decision making process.**

*[This step calls for a close look at your Code of Ethics or statement of Professional Standards, to discern the applicable provisions. There may be established guidelines.]*

- An illustration from the PRSA Code: "Protecting and advancing the free flow of accurate and truthful information is essential to serving the public interest and contributing to informed decision making in a democratic society." The stated intent of this provision is "to maintain the integrity of relationships with the media, government officials and the public." The Code guidelines that address this situation require that members: "preserve the integrity of the process of communication" and "be honest and accurate in all communications."

**6. Make a decision and justify.**

- The public relations professional's greatest loyalty is to his/her client/employer. The professional is obligated to provide counsel and communication support that serves the best interest of the organization. At the same time, responsible advocacy requires that the interests of those affected by the decision be considered. The fact that numerous publics might rely to their detriment on this information must be considered.

Although the potential for conflict between loyalty to employer and honesty exists, the value of independence helps resolve any conflict. Sound, objective counsel would require the public relations professional to refuse to write the release and advise the company on a more appropriate course of action that does not deceive the public or other parties. This decision would, in fact, serve the company's best interest since the release of deceptive information could contribute to declining public(s) trust in the organization, not to mention potential legal liabilities associated with SEC disclosure requirements. This decision would preserve the integrity of processes of communication and also help the company (and the public relations professional) maintain important relationships with the financial community, financial media, government officials, and others.

This decision is supported by principles of ethics, as outlined in the PRSA Member Code of Ethics, which prohibits the dissemination of deceptive, i.e., dishonest information and requires members to advance the free flow of accurate and truthful information.

- > **Raise a contrast:** Stepping aside from the Board of Ethics approach for a moment, think about what might influence you to make a different decision – one that could be considered “wrong” in the process we just worked through.
- > **Preside** over a little discussion of real-life pressures on practitioners.
- > **Resume:** Let’s try another one from the same board, and then I will ask the same question about “what if”:

A counseling firm principal tells the reporter of a local daily newspaper that a competing firm is recommending to a client – whom both firms had been courting – some underhanded tactics to gain government approval of a plan to begin a new mining operation. Specific tactics included payments to elected officials. That “tip” results in a front-page feature accusing the company of planning to “buy” mine approval by paying off local government officials.

- > **Again, tell the candidates:** Look at the six steps on the reverse side of the pocket card:
  1. Define the specific ethical issue and/or conflict.
  2. Identify internal/external factors that may influence the decision.
  3. Identify key values.
  4. Identify the parties who will be affected by the decision and define the public relations professional’s obligation to each.
  5. Select ethical principles to guide the decision making process.
  6. Make a decision and justify.

*NOTE TO COACH:* Here is the discussion guide for this one:

- 1. Define the specific ethical issue and/or conflict.**
  - Is it ethical for a disgruntled competitor to tell the media what the winning firm has proposed to prospective client to win the account?
  - Is it appropriate to share this information with a reporter?
  - Or should you report it to the proper authorities?
- 2. Identify internal/external factors that may influence the decision.**
  - Would the new mine benefit or harm the public?
  - Are the proposed tactics legal?
  - Are the proposed tactics truly part of the firm’s program?
  - Is there any reason to suspect local elected officials?
  - Does the competitor know whether the information about the proposed tactics is accurate?
  - Does the competitor know whether the company has indicated whether it will follow or reject the recommendations?
  - How did the competitor discover this information? Was it through the use of improper tactics?

**3. Identify key values.**

- *Fairness* – As ethical practitioners, we are to deal fairly with competitors.
- *Honesty* – We adhere to the highest standards of accuracy and truth.
- *Advocacy* – We serve the public interest.

**4. Identify the parties who will be affected by the decision and define the public relations professional's obligation to each.**

- Competitor and employees, elected officials, media, general public, losing firm and its employees.

**5. Select ethical principles to guide the decision making process.**

- Promoting healthy and fair **competition** among professionals. This principle seeks to promote respect and fair competition among ethical practitioners of public relations with no actions that would deliberately undermine a competitor.
- Protecting and advancing the **free flow of accurate and truthful information** is essential to serving the public interest and contributing to informed decision making in a democratic society. The intent of this provision is to maintain the integrity of relationships with the media, government officials and the public. One of the key guidelines in this regard is honesty and accuracy in all communications.

**6. Make a decision and justify.**

Ethical practitioners in this situation – assuming the information shared with the reporter is incorrect or without basis – should simply accept the prospect's decision to use another firm. Furthermore, if the information is not accurate the competitor firm faces clear legal exposure for making false accusations. However, if the ethical practitioner knew the winning firm's tactical plan included payoffs, there could be a responsibility on the individual's part to make that known to the proper authorities in the interest of the public good. The ethical obligation must be based upon legally obtained facts. If the account was won or lost simply upon the basis of plan content and personality of the presenting team – as is so often the case – the actions of the losing firm principal are wrong, probably illegal and certainly not in keeping with the code. If, however, the winning plan was based upon unethical tactics that may be implemented, the losing firm is ethically obliged to make that known in the interest of the public good – but only to the proper authorities and not necessarily a media reporter.

- > Again, on the other hand, what might influence you to make a different decision – one that could be considered “wrong” in the process we just worked through.
- > Preside over a little discussion of real-life pressures on practitioners.

#### IV. Summing up

- ▶ **Comment:** Studying what you need to know about law and ethics may feel more like “slogging.” Keep telling yourself that you need to know these things. They may be a first-aid kit or a survival suit. In our field of activity, you never know what will come up. Knowledge of how to deal with unexpected events is a key to self-assurance. A working knowledge of law and ethics is among the attributes that senior practitioners declared essential for professional public relations. When you have this under your belt, you have made a long stride toward accreditation and a more significant life in our profession.

#### References

- 1 *Managing the Information Superhighway: A Report on the Issues Facing Communication Professionals.* A study funded by a grant from The Institute for Public Relations Research and Education. [www.instituteforpr.com](http://www.instituteforpr.com)

### Session 8 Links

#### Handouts

Ethics pocket cards

No link; order from PRSA

#### Visual Aids

#20 Elements of Libel

[http://www.prsa.org/\\_Advance/apr/coachpdf/coachVis20.pdf](http://www.prsa.org/_Advance/apr/coachpdf/coachVis20.pdf)

#21 Copyright – two pages

[http://www.prsa.org/\\_Advance/apr/coachpdf/coachVis21.pdf](http://www.prsa.org/_Advance/apr/coachpdf/coachVis21.pdf)

#22 Ethics Pocket Guide

[http://www.prsa.org/\\_Advance/apr/coachpdf/coachVis22.pdf](http://www.prsa.org/_Advance/apr/coachpdf/coachVis22.pdf)

#### Other materials needed for session 8

PDF file of ethics card,  
if handouts are not available







