

FACC 100 Introduction to the Engineering Profession Fall 2017

ASSIGNMENT 2 – RESOLVING AN ETHICAL DILEMMA IN ENGINEERING VERSION 1.0

TASK FLOW FOR PEER REVIEW ASSIGNMENT

The table below describes the different tasks and their submission deadlines. The deadlines for submitting your paper are **firm**; there is a 1 day grace period (with a late penalty) for completing your reviews. **Please note the deadlines carefully.**

Task	Role		Submission Deadline
	Author	Reviewer	
Phase 1 – in class			
1*	Write the first draft of your paper and bring 2 printed copies to class.		Fri, Oct 13 (in-class)
2*		Evaluate one or two drafts and provide feedback to the authors.	Fri, Oct 13 (in-class)
Phase 2 – Peerceptiv (online)			
3	Revise your paper according to the feedback and comments received from the in class peer review exercise. Submit the 'final' version of your paper.		Fri, Oct 27 (midnight)
4		Evaluate the papers that have been assigned to you for review using the scoring dimensions described below. Provide comments and justification for the scores that you give.	Fri, Nov 10 (midnight)
6	Respond to and rate the reviews given to your paper (back evaluation).		Fri, Nov 17 (midnight)

*Phase 1 (Tasks 1 and 2) forms part of an in-class activity. Instructions on the peer review process will be given in class. Please bring 2 printed copies of your draft to class to participate in the activity. If you do not have a draft ready for class, you will not benefit from the peer review process and from the feedback/comments (which you can use to revise your paper prior to 'formal' submission).

FACC 100 Introduction to the Engineering Profession Fall 2017

CLASS 6 – IN-CLASS ACTIVITY PEER REVIEW CALIBRATION

13/23 Oct 2017

EXERCISE

Read the paper on the back side and provide an evaluation according to the rubrics given below.

Summary of paper (provide a 1 sentence summary of the paper):

Criterion	Scoring Rubric	Score	Comments (1 or 2 bullet points)
The paper describes clearly the actions that will be taken in view of the situation	<i>Fully satisfied: 3</i> <i>Mostly satisfied: 2</i> <i>Partially satisfied: 1</i> <i>Not satisfied: 0</i>	2	The decision is described clearly; I would perhaps have communicated this explicitly at the beginning rather than the end (the decision is referred to in passing in the last sentence of the opening paragraph)
The actions taken are justified with reference to appropriate ethical theories, the 6-step process to dealing with ethical issues, and/or the 3-tests for an ethical decision	<i>Fully satisfied: 5</i> <i>Mostly satisfied: 4</i> <i>Partially satisfied: 2</i> <i>Not satisfied: 0</i>	5	Not all ethical theories are referred to (but this is not expected); while the analysis may be open for debate, the decision taken by the author is properly justified within the context of select ethical theories and the 3 tests for an ethical decision
The overall presentation is professional (free of spelling mistakes, high quality of writing, etc.)	<i>Fully satisfied: 2</i> <i>Mostly satisfied: 1.5</i> <i>Partially satisfied: 1</i> <i>Not satisfied: 0</i>	2	The paper is well written and the ideas flow logically.
	Total Score	9	

Additional comments:

It was very useful to highlight the 'assumptions' that were made in the introduction. While I may not agree with all the analysis, I can appreciate clearly why the author chose his or her action.

The complex ethical issue chosen to be address is Situation 2: how to behave when presented with the opportunity to visit your dream city, all expenses paid, to interview for an internship, despite having already signed and accepted a position with a different company. From this problem statement, it is assumed that both internships are of equal merit, and thus the main incentive for pursuing this interview is a complimentary vacation. Two theories, the 3 tests, and the 6-step process for ethical decisions are examined to make the justified decision that taking the interview would be unethical.

The first ethical theory examined is Kant's Formalism, which states that it is an individual's duty to behave in an ethical manner, putting intent above results (Chen, 2013). Taking an interview based on the attractive perk of free travel is a selfish intention. While potentially leading to positive outcomes, such as networking, interview practice, and personal enjoyment, this decision violates Kant's theory that good intent outweighs results. The second theory is Aristotle's Virtue of Ethics, where emphasis is placed on being a virtuous person, which leads to making morally good decisions (Chen, 2013). Virtuous character, despite its complex and slightly ambiguous meaning, is built upon good habits. While the repercussions of this choice are not particular detrimental, it does not display virtuous habit, and therefore is not a good decision under this theory.

The 3 tests for an ethical decision include Transparency, Reciprocity, and Exemplary (Chen, 2013). Under transparency, it is much easier to act immorally if guaranteed a secret. It would, however, be uncomfortable and difficult to justify this decision if either or both companies found out, making it unethical. Under reciprocity, a free trip would not be worth having the companies find out, or in an extreme case, having the current contract revoked. Finally, while not detrimental, it is not exemplary behaviour and could lead to justifying future, worse unethical actions.

The 6-step process involves examining the problem, effects, alternatives, and action plan to address an ethical situation. By this process, the problem lies with taking an interview at a company's expense, when knowingly legally committed to another, for personal travel benefit. On the downside, this decision would cost company time and money, and could take the position away from a serious applicant. On the upside, it would gain personal travel, networking, and interview experience. Alternatively, there can be time and opportunity for future travel, future positions with this company could be considered, and there are countless other methods and services for networking and interview practice. Through consideration, the optimal solution would be to politely decline the interview and pursue other opportunities for career practice and travel. It would be necessary to act quickly, so as to not waste company time and interest, and further to limit the moral stress induced by making this decision.

To conclude, as justified by Kant and Aristotle's ethical theories, the 6-step process, and the three tests, taking the interview would constitute an unethical action. Only if the contract was verbal as opposed to legal AND the assumption stated was replaced with the primary incentive being career betterment with a superior internship, may it be considered ethical. With only the former, however, the same justifications apply.

FACC 100 Introduction to the Engineering Profession
Fall 2017

IN-CLASS PEER REVIEW

13 Oct 2017

Author's Name: _____ Your Name: _____

Instructions to author: When the peer review begins, take notes. These notes are for your own benefit when revising. Listen to your peer and *avoid getting defensive or apologetic*.

Instructions to peer reviewer : Read this peer review form first, and then read your peer's paper. You can make annotations on the paper and/or this form. The paper's author will keep this form and the annotated paper. You will also have the chance to present your comments, clarify your points, and make suggestions during conversation with your peer.

A. Score the paper according to the following dimensions and rubrics:

Dimension and rubrics	Score
<p>Presentation The overall presentation is professional and 'publication-ready', i.e., it is free of spelling mistakes; the document is well-formatted, e.g., in its use of paragraphs or subsections; the quality of writing is high; and the 1 page limit is respected. 7 – Strongly agree 5 – Agree (the paper generally satisfies the above presentation criteria; however, there are a few minor issues) 3 – Disagree (some of the presentation criteria are satisfied; however, there are major issues) 1 – Strongly disagree (the paper is completely unprofessional in its presentation)</p>	
<p>Content: action The paper describes in detail different solutions/actions that can be taken in view of the situation and recommends one clear plan of action. 7 – Strongly agree 5 – Agree (possible solutions/actions and a plan of action have been identified, but they can be articulated more clearly) 3 – Disagree (possible solutions/actions have been identified but are not described in detail; a clear plan of action is absent) 1 – Strongly disagree (no solutions/actions nor a plan of action have been identified)</p>	
<p>Content: justification The actions taken are justified with reference to appropriate ethical theories and/or the 3 tests for an ethical decision. The 6-step process is applied. The justification is easy to follow and is presented in a logical manner. 7 – Strongly agree 5 – Agree (the actions are justified but lack in detail or are sometimes hard to follow) 3 – Disagree (the actions are justified weakly with limited reference to ethical theories and/or the 3-tests; the justification is generally difficult to follow). 1 – Strongly disagree (the actions are not justified and there is no flow to the justification)</p>	

B. Identify the paragraph or section of the paper that you think is the **most effective**, and **draw a box around it**. For this section of the paper, please answer the following questions:

1. What makes this section the most effective? **Be specific in your answer.**

2. What is the role of this section in helping you understand the main point that the author is making?

C. Identify the paragraph or section of the paper that you think is the **least effective**, and **draw a box around it**. For this section of the paper, please answer the following questions:

	Yes	Somewhat	No
Does this section advance the point the author is trying to make?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the content of the section problematic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the organization of the section problematic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the writing in this section problematic?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

D. If the paper includes error in any of the following, circle it here and on the paper draft. Try to include helpful comments about the errors.

- | | | | |
|---------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|
| paragrahh structure | punctuation | capitals | abbreviation/acronyms |
| spelling | plurals | grammar | |