

Michael Chin
A98115479
5/20/2015
MGT 172
Homework #6

Each of the following six mini-case scenarios involve ethical dilemmas associated with project management. How would you respond to each situation, and why?

1. Jack is known to be an emotional person, so it is in my best interest not to inform him of his future. If I was to tell Jack that his promotion was not going to happen, then I am risking the completion of the project. Additionally, if Jack is to ask about the status of his new assignment, I would tell him that the request is still processing with the director.
2. I would ignore the incident. Since it seems like the culprit understood the consequences of his action, I would not try to pursue him any further. If I was to pursue the culprit, then I would be stirring up unnecessary tension that may negatively affect the progress of the project.
3. I would be honest with my client. In the best case, we are able to complete project without the client ever learning about the significant technical problem. If the project does not meet the deadline however, then we will get in trouble for both lying and not finishing our task. As for the client, they should be as understanding as possible to both the technical error, and the environment in which we work.
4. I would not sign the document. Although this decision affects the progress of the project, my own personal integrity is more important. In my opinion, one failed project can be overlooked, but personal integrity is something that carries on with an individual throughout their life and career.
5. I would not disclose this information with the project team. Their minds are already set on the agreed upon timeline. Additionally, the extra time can be used as a surprise if the project were to ever face a potential delay.
6. I would not purchase the stock. It is illegal to delve in insider-trading, and I would not want to get in legal trouble.

Assume that you have the following decision-making options: (1) make the decision on your own with available information, (2) consult others before making a decision, and (3) call a meeting and reach a consensus, seeking to arrive at a final decision everyone can agree on. Which approach would you use to make each of the following decisions and why?

- a. Since there are no immediate deadlines to make in writing this check, I would recall a meeting with my group, and reach a new consensus.
- b. I would call a meeting and reach a consensus on this action as this change must be approved by my client, Trysting Tree Golf Club, before I can implement it

- c. I would consult others before making a decision. I am the leader, so I should be deciding whether or not the product will finish completion. Additionally, the members of the product probably will not worry too much since they are only 50% of the way there.

1. Why does this attempt at project partnering appear to be failing?

Karin did not correctly define everyone's roles and responsibilities. If she had precisely outlined everyone's responsibilities, then the consultant who refused to complete his work would have understood the importance of his work to the task force member. There also seems to be a problem with a shared common goal between the teams. For example, one of the contractors complained that they "could not be liable for delays caused by others". This means that they only care about completing their own work, instead of completing the project as a whole.

2. If you were Karin, what would you do to get this project back on track?

If I was Karin, I would try and meet with all of the individual teams. I would then try and stress the importance and significance of their work so that they would understand how their projects would work in the big picture. This would also enable them to be conscious of how their own progress affected the progress of other teams.

3. What action would you take to keep the project on track?

To keep the project on track, I would meet with the leaders of each division to see how individual progress was going. One problem that Karin is doing, is that she is ignoring her responsibility as a mitigator. For example, when one of the task members complained to her, she told the task member to solve the problem on his own. Instead, Karin should be proactive and reach out to the contractor on her own to try and solve the problem. This way Karin removes the risk of these two groups arguing with each other.