

2026-2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



Technology & Computer Science Case Competition challenges members to analyze a real-world case involving multiple areas of technology and computer science. Members present their findings and solutions to a panel of judges, demonstrating knowledge in areas such as cybersecurity, IT support, information management, networking, programming, website design, and system integration.

Event Overview

Division	Collegiate
Event Type	Team of 1, 2, 3, or 4 members
Event Category	Case Competition
Event Elements	Presentation with a Topic

Event Information:

National Leadership Conference:

Timing Structure:

- **Equipment Set-Up:** 3 minutes
 - No interaction allowed with judges during this time.
- **Presentation:** 10 minutes
 - A one-minute warning will be provided
- **Question & Answer (Q&A):** 5 minutes

Important: Time allocations are exclusive. The presentation must begin immediately after the 3-minute set-up time concludes. Time may not be shifted between segments. Competitors will not interact with judges during the set-up period.

Important Notes:

- **Internet Access:** Provided
 - Please be aware that internet access at conference venues may be unreliable. Always prepare a backup plan in case the connection is lost or does not work with your device.
- **Event Schedule Notes:**
 - Some events may begin before the Opening Session.
 - All schedules are posted in local time for the NLC host city.
 - Schedule changes are not permitted.

State Leadership Conference:

This event will not be offered at the State Leadership Conference. Any event not offered at SLC will be considered an “open event,” and members will be allowed to register to compete at the National Leadership Conference on a first come, first served basis, using the Colorado FBLA NLC Intent Form. Check the SLC Call to Conference for more information.

*** Event specifics are continued below. Review the document in its entirety.

2026-2027 Technology & Computer Science Case Competition

The case competition and rating sheet can be found starting on page 5. **The business entity should not be contacted for additional information.** This case competition for educational purposes only, offering a real-world scenario to help FBLA Collegiate members develop critical skills. This year’s case competition was created in partnership with [CaseBasix](#).



Classrooms to Corporate boardrooms: [CaseBasix](#) fast-tracks student potential into real-world success.

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition - Page 1 of 9 – Updated August 2026

© 2026 National Future Business Leaders of America, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form without prior written permission.

2026–2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



National Leadership Conference

Required Competition Items

Items Competitor Must Provide	Items FBLA Provides
• Technology and presentation items • Photo identification • Conference-provided nametag • Attire that meets the FBLA Dress Code	• Table • Internet Access

Eligibility Requirements

To participate in FBLA competitive events at the National Leadership Conference (NLC), the following criteria must be met:

- **Membership Deadline:** FBLA national membership dues must be paid to the specific division by 11:59 p.m. Eastern Time on March 1 of the current school year.
- **Conference Registration:** Members must be officially registered for the NLC and must pay the national conference registration fee to participate.
- **Official Hotel Requirement:** To be eligible to compete, competitors must stay within the official FBLA housing block.
- **State Entry Limits:** Each state may submit up to four entries per event.
- **Event Participation Limits:** Each member may participate in:
 - Two individual or team events, and
 - One chapter event (e.g., *Community Service Project* or *State of Chapter Presentation*).
- **Competitor Responsibility:** Only registered competitors are permitted to plan, research, prepare, and set up their presentations. Advisers and others may not assist.
- **Participation Requirement:** To be eligible for an award, each competitor must complete all components of the event at the National Leadership Conference.
- **Identification at Check-in:** Competitors must present valid photo identification (physical or digital) that matches the name on their conference name badge. Acceptable forms include a driver's license, passport, state-issued ID, or school ID.
- **Late Arrivals:** Competitors will be allowed to compete until such time that the results are finalized, or participation would impact the fairness and integrity of the event, as determined by Competitive Events staff. If judges have left the competitive event area, it is no longer possible to compete. Five penalty points will be assessed for late arrivals in any competitive event.

Event Administration

This event consists of two phases: a preliminary presentation and a final presentation.

Presentation Details

Venue & Format

- Presentations occur in-person at the National Leadership Conference (NLC).
- Competitors/teams are randomly assigned to presentation sections.
- Presentations will take place in a large, open area with a designated space of approximately 10' x 10', which includes a table and chairs for the judges.
- The preliminary round is closed to conference attendees and audience.

2026–2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



Technology Guidelines

- **Internet Access:** Provided (*Please be aware that internet access at conference venues may be unreliable. Always prepare a backup plan in case the connection is lost or does not work with your device.*)
- Presentations must be delivered using one or two personal devices (laptop, tablet, mobile phone, or monitor approximately laptop-sized).
- If using two devices, one must face the judges and the other must face the presenters.
- Projectors and projector screens are not permitted, and competitors may not bring their own.
- Wireless slide advancers (e.g., presentation clickers or mice) are allowed.
- External speakers are not allowed; audio must come directly from the presenting device(s).
- Electricity will not be available.

Non-Technology Items

- Visual aids, samples, notes, and other physical materials related to the project may be used.
- Items may be placed on the provided table or on the judges table, if space allows.
- No items may be left with the judges following the presentation.

Restricted Items

- Animals, except for authorized service animals.
- Food, which may be used for display only and may not be consumed by judges.
- Links and QR codes, which may be shown but may not be scanned or clicked by judges at any time.

Research

- Information must be supported by credible, well-documented sources.
- Any use of copyrighted material, images, logos, or trademarks must be properly documented.

Team Expectations

- In team presentations, all members must actively participate in the delivery of the presentation.

Advancement to Finals

- The top-scoring competitors or teams from each preliminary section will advance to the final round in equal numbers.
- The number of competitors or teams advancing to the final round depends on the number of preliminary sections:
 - 2 sections: Top 6 from each section advance
 - 3 sections: Top 4 from each section advance
 - 4 sections: Top 3 from each section advance
 - 5 sections: Top 3 from each section advance
 - More than 5 sections: Top 2 from each section advance

Scoring

- Preliminary round scores are used to determine which competitors or teams advance to the final round from each section.
- Final round scores determine the final rankings and top award winners.
- Judges are responsible for breaking all ties in both preliminary and final rounds.
- All judging decisions are final. Results announced at the National Leadership Conference are considered official and will not be changed after the conclusion of the National Leadership Conference.

2026–2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



Penalty Points

- Competitors may be disqualified if they violate the Code of Conduct or the Honor Code.
- Five points are deducted if competitors do not follow the Dress Code or are late to their assigned presentation time.

Recognition

- A maximum of 10 entries (individuals or teams) may be recognized per event.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)

- FBLA complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) by providing reasonable accommodations for competitors. Accommodation requests must be submitted through the conference registration system by the official registration deadline. All requests will be reviewed, and additional documentation may be required to determine eligibility and appropriate support.

Recording of Presentations

- Unauthorized audio or video recording is strictly prohibited in all competitive events.
- FBLA reserves the right to record presentations for educational, training, or archival purposes. Competitors should be aware that their presentations may be recorded by FBLA-authorized personnel.

Important FBLA Documents

- Competitors should be familiar with the [Competitive Events Operations Manual](#), [Honor Code](#), [Code of Conduct](#), and [Dress Code](#).

2026-2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



2026-2027 Technology & Computer Science Case Competition

This case is for educational purposes only, offering a real-world scenario to help FBLA Collegiate members develop critical reasoning and casing skills. These skills can be applied to careers like software engineering, technology consulting, and AI governance and risk, etc.

*The case needs to be solved with independent research using publicly available information and your own business acumen skills. **The business entity should not be contacted for additional information.***

Overview and Background Information

Client: JPMorgan Chase & Co.

Project: Scaling a Responsible AI Coding Assistant Across the Engineering Workforce

JPMorgan Chase & Co., headquartered in New York City, is the largest bank in the United States and one of the largest financial institutions in the world, with roughly \$4 trillion in assets and operations spanning consumer and community banking, commercial and investment banking, and asset and wealth management. Its roots trace back to 1799, and the modern firm was formed by the 2000 merger of J.P. Morgan & Co. and Chase Manhattan. Today, under CEO Jamie Dimon, it serves millions of consumers and small businesses alongside many of the world's most prominent corporations, governments, and institutional clients across more than 100 markets worldwide.

The firm organizes its work around a few core business areas:

- **Consumer & Community Banking** - everyday banking, lending, card, and payments services for millions of households and small businesses.
- **Commercial & Investment Bank** - investment banking, markets, securities services, wholesale payments, and commercial banking for corporations, institutions, and governments.
- **Asset & Wealth Management** - investment management and wealth-planning solutions for individuals and institutions.
- **Corporate** - treasury, technology, risk, and firmwide functions that support and control the businesses.

Behind the brand sits one of the largest technology organizations in the private sector. JPMorgan spends on the order of \$18 billion a year on technology and employs roughly 55,000 technologists, including more than 40,000 software engineers who build and maintain the trading, payments, risk, and customer-facing systems the firm runs on—infrastructure that moves trillions of dollars around the world every day. Software is not a back-office function here; it is the operating core of the bank, which makes both the quality and the security of that code business-critical.

Artificial intelligence is now a central pillar of that investment. JPMorgan reports more than 450 AI use cases in production and operates a proprietary, model-agnostic platform called LLM Suite that is used daily by more than 200,000 employees, along with an AI coding assistant deployed to its engineering teams that leadership credits with 10 to 20% productivity gains. The firm has ranked first among global banks on the Evident AI Index for four consecutive years. Crucially, this work is governed: a firmwide Model Risk Governance function and an Explainable AI Center of Excellence treat responsible, human-supervised AI as a requirement rather than an option, consistent with the model-risk expectations that regulators place on large banks.

2026–2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



As a systemically important, heavily regulated institution, JPMorgan cannot adopt AI the way a startup might. Every significant use of a model must be explainable, validated, and subject to human oversight, and any tool that touches production code must meet strict standards for security, reliability, and fairness. This study focuses on how AI-assisted programming can responsibly support JPMorgan's engineering workforce—accelerating how engineers write, debug, test, document, and learn—while preserving the human judgment and accountability that the firm's regulators and customers depend on. The primary users of your proposed solution are JPMorgan's software engineers and engineering leads, with important stakeholders in its AI governance, model-risk, and cybersecurity functions.

Your Task

You have been engaged by JPMorgan Chase & Co. as technology consultants supporting its engineering and AI governance teams. Artificial intelligence is rapidly changing how software is written, tested, documented, and maintained, and JPMorgan is already operating at scale: its in-house LLM Suite reaches more than 200,000 employees, an AI coding assistant has been rolled out to tens of thousands of engineers, and leadership reports 10 to 20% productivity gains. The opportunity is real, but so are the stakes.

JPMorgan does not have an AI-adoption problem; it has a responsible-scaling problem. In a heavily regulated bank whose code moves trillions of dollars, AI-assisted programming raises the stakes on hallucinated or insecure code, embedded bias, and over-reliance on automation.

Leadership has asked your team to design a conceptual AI assistant or AI-supported programming workflow that helps engineers write, debug, test, document, or learn something new, while demonstrating transparent reasoning, guarding against bias and misuse, and keeping qualified humans accountable for every significant decision. The guiding principle is that AI must augment human judgment, not replace it, and every design choice should reflect JPMorgan's identity as a security-first, heavily regulated institution.

Before you begin, take time to understand the sector you will be working in. [Click here to explore what the banking industry entails](#) and to build the context you will need to create a credible, responsible-AI recommendation.

Ultimately, your goal is to propose a responsible, AI-assisted programming solution that strengthens JPMorgan's ability to innovate while preserving the security, transparency, and human accountability that a systemically important bank requires.

Additional Note: Your solution should draw on JPMorgan's publicly available information, including its LLM Suite platform, AI coding assistant rollout, Model Risk Governance and Explainable AI functions, and reported scale, and should reflect the firm's identity as a security-first, heavily regulated institution. The AI assistant does not need to be fully functional, but it must clearly demonstrate AI decision-making, ethical considerations, and usability.

Deliverables

Your final presentation should include:

- **AI-in-Programming Research & Literacy Assessment:**

2026–2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



- Research the current state of AI in programming and software development, including common applications of AI-assisted coding tools and their known limitations and risks, such as bias, hallucinated output, security flaws, and misuse.
 - Assess the evolving role of human oversight in AI-supported workflows and the AI-literacy skills engineers need to use these tools responsibly and effectively.
 - Connect these practices to JPMorgan's context as a regulated bank, drawing on credible, well-documented sources.
- **Responsible-AI Best Practices Survey:**
 - Survey best practices, case studies, or market research from other banks and technology organizations on the ethical design and deployment of AI systems used in programming.
 - Evaluate approaches such as user-centered and bias-aware design, human-in-the-loop decision-making, transparency in AI reasoning, and strategies for validating and verifying AI output.
 - Where possible, draw on expert-informed resources to ground your understanding of real-world expectations, challenges, and ethical considerations.
- **Conceptual AI Assistant or Workflow Design:**
 - Identify a clear problem, task, or learning challenge a JPMorgan engineer faces that could be supported by an AI assistant, then design a conceptual assistant or workflow that helps the user solve it, make a decision, or learn something new.
 - The design must include clear instructions for user input; the rules, logic, or reasoning used to determine outputs, including decision or selection pathways; and at least one explicit explanation of how AI is being used.
 - The tool does not need to be fully functional, but it must clearly demonstrate AI decision-making, ethical considerations, and usability.
- **Safeguards, Human Oversight & Measurement of Success:**
 - Specify safeguards that prevent bias, harm, or misuse, and a concrete plan for human-in-the-loop oversight and error checking suited to a regulated, security-first bank.
 - Define the KPIs JPMorgan should track, for example, engineer productivity, code quality and defect rates, security and compliance incidents, and AI-suggestion acceptance and override rates, and explain how leadership would use them to know the solution is working and where to refine it.

Recommended Resources

Support your findings with credible, well-documented sources. The following resources offer useful background on JPMorgan's technology and AI posture and on responsible-AI governance in regulated industries:

- **JPMorgan Chase Artificial Intelligence Research:**
<https://www.jpmorganchase.com/about/technology/research/ai>
- **JPMorgan Chase Technology:** <https://www.jpmorganchase.com/about/technology>
- **JPMorgan Chase Preparing the Workforce for the Future of AI:**
<https://www.jpmorganchase.com/newsroom/stories/how-jpmc-is-preparing-workforce-for-ai>
- **NIST AI Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0):** <https://www.nist.gov/itl/ai-risk-management-framework>
- **Federal Reserve & OCC SR 11-7: Supervisory Guidance on Model Risk Management:**
<https://www.federalreserve.gov/supervisionreg/srletters/sr1107.htm>

2026–2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



2026- 2027 Technology & Computer Science Case Competition Presentation Rating Sheet

Expectation Item	Not Demonstrated	Below Expectations	Meets Expectations	Exceeds Expectations	Points Earned
Content					
Understanding of the Case & Responsible AI Challenge	Does not demonstrate understanding of the challenge.	Shows limited understanding of AI risks or JPMorgan’s needs.	Clearly explains the responsible-scaling challenge and business context.	Demonstrates strong insight into AI opportunity, risk, regulation, security, and human accountability.	
	0 points	1-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	
AI-in-Programming Research & Literacy	No meaningful research presented.	Research is limited, unclear, or weakly connected to the case.	Explains current AI programming uses, benefits, limitations, risks, and human oversight..	Provides strong, well-supported research clearly connected to JPMorgan’s regulated environment.	
	0 points	1-7 points	8-13 points	14-15 points	
Responsible-AI Best Practices	No meaningful best practices identified.	Identifies limited or weakly supported practices.	Evaluates relevant practices for transparency, bias mitigation, validation, and human oversight.	Applies a strong range of researched best practices thoughtfully to JPMorgan’s needs.	
	0 points	1-7 points	8-13 points	14-15 points	
Conceptual AI Assistant or Workflow Design	No relevant AI solution presented.	Solution is incomplete, unclear, or weakly aligned to user needs.	Presents a clear, usable solution with defined inputs, logic, outputs, and AI use..	Presents an innovative, user-centered solution with clear reasoning, strong usability, and responsible AI integration.	
	0 points	1-9 points	10-17 points	18-20 points	
Safeguards, Human Oversight & Measurement of Success	No meaningful safeguards, oversight, or success measures.	Safeguards or metrics are limited or unclear.	Provides appropriate safeguards, human oversight, error checking, and KPIs.	Integrates strong safeguards and meaningful KPIs that support continuous monitoring and improvement.	
	0 points	1-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	
Presentation Delivery					
Statements are well organized and clearly stated	Competitor(s) did not appear prepared	Competitor(s) seemed prepared, but flow was not logical	Presentation flowed in logical sequence	Presentation flowed in a logical sequence; statements were well organized	
	0 points	1-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	
Exhibits self-assurance, poised body language, and strong vocal delivery that enhances overall presentation	Competitor(s) did not demonstrate self-confidence	Competitor(s) demonstrated self-confidence and poise	Competitor(s) demonstrated self-confidence, poise, and good voice projection	Competitor(s) demonstrated self-confidence, poise, good eye contact, voice projection, and delivery	
	0 points	1-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	
Demonstrates the ability to effectively answer questions	Does not respond to questions or responses are completely off-topic.	Provides incomplete or unclear answers that show limited understanding.	Responds accurately and clearly to most questions, showing adequate understanding.	Responds confidently with clear, accurate, and thoughtful answers that enhance the overall presentation.	

2026-2027 Competitive Events Guidelines

Technology & Computer Science Case Competition



	0 points	1-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points	
Presentation Protocols					
Adherence to Competitive Events Guidelines	Competitor(s) Did Not Follow Guidelines	Execution Aligned with Guidelines: ✓ Used only allowable technology devices (sizing specs followed; maximum of two, with only one facing judges at a time) ✓ Presentation aligned with the assigned topic ✓ Maintained professional boundaries during set-up time (no interaction with judges) ✓ Did not leave materials behind after the presentation ✓ Links or QR codes were displayed appropriately (not clicked or scanned by judges) ✓ Audio was presented without external speakers - Avoided use of food or live animals			
	0 points	1- 10 points			
Staff Only: Penalty Points (5 points for dress code penalty and/or 5 points for late arrival penalty)					
Presentation Total (110 points)					
Name(s):					
School:					
Judge Signature:					Date:
Comments:					