



FIT5136 Assignment 4 - Code of Ethics Case Study

Team 48

Xiaohui Ding 31291252
Haorong Ren 31526152
Manyan Wen 30497426
Mihir Raj Bhanushali 30912148

Case Study # 6

Alex, Barry and Charlie employed as software engineers by Monash Pty Ltd were working on the CMS project.

The process model used in the project was the Unified Process. The project was in the final stage and the delivery deadline was getting close.

The head of the IT department was concerned that the project may not be completed on time and the software may not be ready for deployment in the store on the day specified in the contract.

To hasten the process, the head decided to employ a new person David to join the team so that the progress can be quicken and the project can be completed on time. Alex, Barry and Charlie were very concerned, stating that for someone to join the team so late in the project will surely cause a lot of problems, potentially may cause further delay and increase the project cost.

The head assured the team that it should be fine because David was an expert in testing. He rationalised that since the Test Workflow is the final workflow in the Unified Process, David will have no problem in contributing and helping the team in the final stage of the project focusing on testing the software.

The team decided to submit a formal complaint to the CEO, but the head refuted their claim and stopped the complaint in its tracks. He insisted that the team should accept David as the new member and should focus more on completing the CMS project.

Analysis of the case study

Ethical and Professional instances identified:

1. Person A Alex, Person B Barry, Person C Charlie

Type: Ethical and Professional

- The team stated their reasonable concerns about the change, and this is due to their professional experience. This is ethical and professional.
- The team submitted a complaint to the CEO, which is good for preventing unnecessary cost and potential delay. This is ethical and professional.

2. Person D David

Type: Ethical and Professional

- David should have known that he is not suitable for this project, but he still accepts the recruitment from the head. This is unethical and unprofessional.

3. Person E Head of IT

Type: Ethical and Professional

- The head of IT didn't trust the ability of the team, which is unethical and unprofessional.
- The head of IT is too easy to get anxious and have a messy management on the project, which is unprofessional.
- The head of IT didn't hear others' suggestions and had a rude attitude about other's complaint. This is unethical and unprofessional.

Person A Alex, Person B Barry, Person C Charlie

Good actions:

1. Alex, Barry and Charlie were very concerned, stating that for someone to join the team so late in the project will surely cause a lot of problems, potentially may cause further delay and increase the project cost.
 - a. **Principle 3: PRODUCT, Principle 7: COLLEAGUES**
 - b. **Causes:**
 - 3.01. Strive for high quality, acceptable cost and a reasonable schedule, ensuring significant tradeoffs are clear to and accepted by the employer and the client, and are available for consideration by the user and the public.
 - 3.09. Ensure realistic quantitative estimates of cost, scheduling, personnel, quality and outcomes on any project on which they work or propose to work and provide an uncertainty assessment of these estimates.
 - 7.07. Not unfairly intervene in the career of any colleague; however, concern for the employer, the client or public interest may compel software engineers, in good faith, to question the competence of a colleague.
 - c. **Justification:**

The project is in its final stage of Unified Process, so there is little need to hire another person to help. By the definition of Unified Process, the implementation phase and test phase can happen at the same time. So the situation is fine. The behaviour of the Head of IT will increase the cost and complexity of the project. Team members stated their reasonable concerns, so this is a good action.
2. The team decided to submit a formal complaint to the CEO
 - a. **Principle 6: PROFESSION**
 - b. **Causes:**
 - 6.12. Express concerns to the people involved when significant violations of this Code are detected unless this is impossible, counter-productive, or dangerous.
 - 6.13. Report significant violations of this Code to appropriate authorities when it is clear that consultation with people involved in these significant violations is impossible, counter-productive or dangerous.
 - c. **Justification:**

Hiring David may cause more serious issues than the original situation. The team stated their concerns, but the head held a different opinion. Thus, seeking help from a higher authority is a good action to judge the current situation.

Person D David

Bad actions:

1. For David to join the team so late in the project will surely cause a lot of problems, potentially may cause further delay and increase the project cost.
 - a. **Principle 3: PRODUCT**
 - b. **Causes:**

- 3.04. Ensure that they are qualified for any project on which they work or propose to work by an appropriate combination of education and training, and experience.

c. **Justification:**

Unified Process allows implementation and testing to happen at the same time. David as an expert should have realized that this project isn't appropriate to accept a new member and refused this offer.

Person E Head of IT

Bad actions:

1. The head of the IT department was concerned that the project may not be completed on time and the software may not be ready for deployment in the store on the day specified in the contract.

a. **Principle 7: COLLEAGUES, Principle 2: CLIENT AND EMPLOYER**

b. **Causes:**

- 2.06. Identify, document, collect evidence and report to the client or the employer promptly if, in their opinion, a project is likely to fail, to prove too expensive, to violate intellectual property law, or otherwise to be problematic.
- 7.04. Review the work of others in an objective, candid, and properly-documented way.
- 7.07. Not unfairly intervene in the career of any colleague; however, concern for the employer, the client or public interest may compel software engineers, in good faith, to question the competence of a colleague.

c. **Justification:**

The head didn't trust the team. He didn't have any evidence that the team would delay, but he still got anxious and made bad decisions. This is unethical and unprofessional.

Also, the head thought that the project may face the problem of delaying, but he did not report to the client, which is unethical as well.

2. To hasten the process, the head decided to employ a new person David to join the team.

a. **Principle 5: MANAGEMENT**

b. **Causes:**

- 5.01 Ensure good management for any project on which they work, including effective procedures for promotion of quality and reduction of risk.
- 5.05. Ensure realistic quantitative estimates of cost, scheduling, personnel, quality and outcomes on any project on which they work or propose to work, and provide an uncertainty assessment of these estimates.

c. **Justification:**

The head should have had an overview of the whole process. He didn't know the detailed situation of the project, but he still made a decision other than listening to the team. This is not a good estimate of the whole project. Last minute onboarding is very difficult and inefficient, so this is also unprofessional.

3. The head of IT refuted engineers' claim and stopped the complaint in its tracks.
 - a. **Principle 7: COLLEAGUES**
 - b. **Causes:**
 - 7.05. Give a fair hearing to the opinions, concerns, or complaints of a colleague.
 - c. **Justification:**

Engineers' concerns are legitimate, and suggestions should be listened to fairly, rather than rejected and prevented from reaching higher levels of leadership