

Subject: conference call

Date: 10/26/98 6:27 PM

From: Joe Turner <turner@cs.clemson.edu>

To: d-frailey@ti.com

CC: turner@mailhost.cs.clemson.edu

Dennis,

I'm sorry that it has taken so long to get back to you. I was here (in my office) only one day last week and I have just completed the 5th of 6 straight weekend (plus some extra days at the beginning and end of the week) meetings, and I have really been scrambling to keep my real job afloat this month.

The main reason for the conference call is to discuss with you Council's deep concerns about the SWECC and its work and to make sure that we are all on the same page regarding the activities of the SWECC. Council's impression was that the SWECC was formed primarily to help the Texas people develop an exam for the licensing and also to continue the work of the previous joint task force, but the feeling that they got from the proposal and presentation was that it might be an advocate for licensing of software engineers. Council was quite clear that it did not want ACM's name to be linked in any way as supporting licensing. There was also a lot of concern that we must continue to raise objections to such things as the EIT exam and allowing any engineer with enough experience to obtain a software engineering license. (I know that my statements oversimplify the actual process, but the point is the same.)

The bottom line is that Council wants to be sure that the ACM reps on the SWECC contain at least one "skeptic" who will make sure that ACM's positions are made clear. Don't be misled or put off by my use of the term "skeptic" here. I put it in quotes because the word itself doesn't completely portray the kind of person that is intended. Certainly we don't (or at least many, and I think most, of us don't) want someone obstructing the work of the SWECC, nor do we even want someone who will not make positive contributions.

So we wanted to discuss with you how best to proceed on this, including getting some reaction from you about these issues. There is no reason that you cannot be considered the "skeptic" if you feel comfortable doing so. But if

you would rather be more of an advocate for the licensing process then we need to discuss how to balance the membership on the SWECC. (In light of the Council discussion we want to review the ACM representatives with you in any case.)

I hope that trying to summarize the situation by email doesn't give you the wrong impression. Please withhold any negative reactions until we have a chance to talk, to make sure that my terse summary hasn't given the wrong picture. We do have to deal with political realities, and as you know not everyone is realistic regarding the direction of certification and licensing of software engineering because of parochial views of what software engineering should be. I share many of the negative views myself, but I also recognize reality as well as the differences between what is needed for software engineering education and the computer science/engineering curriculum at many schools.

Again, the bottom line is that we wanted to discuss with you ways that we can satisfy Council's concerns while moving forward on this project. The fact that we are doing this as a group indicates the importance that we place on the project and the intensity of feeling about the issues among many of the Councillors. We want to make sure that we get this "right" to the extent that we can, and that we end up with a productive project that is beneficial to the computing profession(s).

Please feel free to contact me again by phone or email prior to the conference call if you wish.

Jo
e