**Meeting Minutes**

**Pod x Case Study Discussion**

**COMP 4620: Professional Practice in Computer Science**

**March 5, 2024, at 2:30 PM**

**E2-330 EITC**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Present** | **Regrets** (Absent) |
| **Group 10:** | Cedric Berard, Landon, Nicolas, Victor |  |
| **Group 11:** | Group members |  |
| **Group 12:** | Group members |  |

**Call to Order** (presentation started at): 2:34 PM

1. **Presentation**

Group 11 gave a video presentation about the case study: acm code of ethics

1. **Debate**

**G10 is affirmative – acm code of ethics does extensively cover issues regarding**

**G12 is opposing – does not**

**G11 split up to help these two groups**

**Opposed- Missing stance on AI, last update 2018 -> react slowly**

**Missing intellectual property, respecting others work**

**Some parts not working as intended specifically section 4**

**Section 1.4 broad doesn't say why.**

**Affirm- 1.2 avoid harm -> applies to many things**

**broadness is good to cover everything**

**Both sides discussed together**

**Very good debating happened**

1. **Discussion**

**The presenting group asked us to discuss if the acm code of ethics can fix existing issues?**

**Groups discussed should cs be regulated professions?**

**Groups discussed what they would add or remove from the acm code of ethics.**

**Groups discussed if all acm ieee ...should come together to make a more universal code of ethics**

**Groups went into more detail and went through section 1.2 of the acm code of ethics**

**roups went into more detail and went through section 1.3 of the acm code of ethics**

**roups went into more detail and went through section 1.2 of the acm code of ethics**

1. **Adjournment**

The discussion concluded at 3:44 PM.