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|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice** | **ACM Code of Conduct Clauses** | | **Your Comments on Mismatches** | |
| **PREAMBLE** |  | |  | |
| Computers have a central and growing role in commerce, industry, government, medicine, education, entertainment and society at large. Software engineers are those who contribute by direct participation or by teaching, to the analysis, specification, design, development, certification, maintenance and testing of software systems. Because of their roles in developing software systems, software engineers have significant opportunities to do good or cause harm, to enable others to do good or cause harm, or to influence others to do good or cause harm. To ensure, as much as possible, that their efforts will be used for good, software engineers must commit themselves to making software engineering a beneficial and respected profession. In accordance with that commitment, software engineers shall adhere to the following Code of Ethics and Professional Practice. | Computing professionals’ actions change the world. To act responsibly, they should reflect upon the wider impacts of their work, consistently supporting the public good. The ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct (“the Code”) expresses the conscience of the profession. | | One potential mismatch between the two codes is their level of specificity. The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice provides more detailed guidance on the specific actions and responsibilities of software engineers. In contrast, the ACM Code of Conduct is more general, emphasizing the broader impact of computing professionals' actions.  Another potential mismatch could be the scope of the two codes. The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice focuses primarily on the role and responsibilities of software engineers in the development of software systems. In contrast, the ACM Code of Conduct applies to all computing professionals, including software engineers, but also encompasses a wider range of computing-related activities.  However, despite these differences, both codes share a common goal of promoting ethical behavior and social responsibility among computing professionals. | |
|  |  | |  | |
| The Code contains eight Principles related to the behavior of and decisions made by professional software engineers, including practitioners, educators, managers, supervisors and policy makers, as well as trainees and students of the profession. The Principles identify the ethically responsible relationships in which individuals, groups, and organizations participate and the primary obligations within these relationships. The Clauses of each Principle are illustrations of some of the obligations included in these relationships. These obligations are founded in the software engineer’s humanity, in special care owed to people affected by the work of software engineers, and the unique elements of the practice of software engineering. The Code prescribes these as obligations of anyone claiming to be or aspiring to be a software engineer. | The Code is designed to inspire and guide the ethical conduct of all computing professionals, including current and aspiring practitioners, instructors, students, influencers, and anyone who uses computing technology in an impactful way. Additionally, the Code serves as a basis for remediation when violations occur. The Code includes principles formulated as statements of responsibility, based on the understanding that the public good is always the primary consideration. Each principle is supplemented by guidelines, which provide explanations to assist computing professionals in understanding and applying the principle.  Section 1 outlines fundamental ethical principles that form the basis for the remainder of the Code. Section 2 addresses additional, more specific considerations of professional responsibility. Section 3 guides individuals who have a leadership role, whether in the workplace or in a volunteer professional capacity. Commitment to ethical conduct is required of every ACM member, and principles involving compliance with the Code are given in Section 4. | | The first mismatch is in their focus. The SE Code of Ethics is specific to software engineering, while the ACM Code of Conduct is applicable to all computing professionals. The ACM Code of Conduct is broader in scope, encompassing a wider range of professionals beyond just software engineers.  Another mismatch is in the structure of the two codes. The SE Code of Ethics is organized around eight principles, while the ACM Code of Conduct is divided into four sections. While the two codes have a different structure, they both cover similar areas, such as ethical conduct, responsibility, and leadership.  Finally, the SE Code of Ethics places a particular emphasis on the unique aspects of software engineering, such as the need to prioritize human safety and well-being when developing software systems. The ACM Code of Conduct, on the other hand, takes a more general approach, focusing on ethical principles that are applicable across different computing disciplines. | |
|  |  | |  | |
| It is not intended that the individual parts of the Code be used in isolation to justify errors of omission or commission. The list of Principles and Clauses is not exhaustive. The Clauses should not be read as separating the acceptable from the unacceptable in professional conduct in all practical situations. The Code is not a simple ethical algorithm that generates ethical decisions. In some situations standards may be in tension with each other or with standards from other sources. These situations require the software engineer to use ethical judgment to act in a manner which is most consistent with the spirit of the Code of Ethics and Professional Practice, given the circumstances. | The Code as a whole is concerned with how fundamental ethical principles apply to a computing professional’s conduct. The Code is not an algorithm for solving ethical problems; rather it serves as a basis for ethical decision-making. When thinking through a particular issue, a computing professional may find that multiple principles should be taken into account, and that different principles will have different relevance to the issue. | | It's important to note that the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct Clauses both stress the complexity of ethical decision-making in the computing profession. They caution against using their principles as a simple algorithm or checklist for determining ethical conduct in all situations. Instead, they emphasize the need for ethical judgment and a holistic understanding of the ethical implications of actions.  Mismatches between the principles of the Codes and the real world can occur in situations where different ethical principles may come into conflict, or where external pressures, such as economic or political factors, make it difficult to adhere to ethical standards. In such cases, computing professionals must use their judgment and knowledge of the Codes to determine the most ethical course of action, even if it is not the easiest or most profitable one.  It's also worth noting that the Codes are not static, and may evolve over time to address new ethical challenges and concerns that arise in the computing profession. As such, computing professionals must stay up-to-date on the latest developments in the field, and be willing to critically evaluate their own practices and beliefs in light of evolving ethical standards. | |
|  |  | |  | |
| Ethical tensions can best be addressed by thoughtful consideration of fundamental principles, rather than blind reliance on detailed regulations. These Principles should influence software engineers to consider broadly who is affected by their work; to examine if they and their colleagues are treating other human beings with due respect; to consider how the public, if reasonably well informed, would view their decisions; to analyze how the least empowered will be affected by their decisions; and to consider whether their acts would be judged worthy of the ideal professional working as a software engineer. In all these judgments concern for the health, safety and welfare of the public is primary; that is, the "Public Interest" is central to this Code. | Questions related to these kinds of issues can best be answered by thoughtful consideration of the fundamental ethical principles, understanding that the public good is the paramount consideration. | | There are slight differences in the language used in the two codes. The SE Code uses the phrase "ethical tensions" while the ACM Code refers to "questions related to these kinds of issues." Additionally, the SE Code emphasizes the importance of considering the least empowered, while the ACM Code does not explicitly mention this.  Despite these minor differences, both codes ultimately convey the same message: that software engineers have a responsibility to act ethically and consider the impact of their decisions on the public good. | |
|  |  | |  | |
| The dynamic and demanding context of software engineering requires a code that is adaptable and relevant to new situations as they occur. However, even in this generality, the Code provides support for software engineers and managers of software engineers who need to take positive action in a specific case by documenting the ethical stance of the profession. The Code provides an ethical foundation to which individuals within teams and the team as a whole can appeal. The Code helps to define those actions that are ethically improper to request of a software engineer or teams of software engineers. | None | | The preface of the ACM code of conduct document makes no reference to the dynamic and demanding context of software engineering. | |
|  |  | |  | |
| The Code is not simply for adjudicating the nature of questionable acts; it also has an important educational function. As this Code expresses the consensus of the profession on ethical issues, it is a means to educate both the public and aspiring professionals about the ethical obligations of all software engineers. | The entire computing profession benefits when the ethical decision-making process is accountable to and transparent to all stakeholders. Open discussions about ethical issues promote this accountability and transparency. | | The SE Code of Ethics emphasizes the educational function of the code in promoting ethical behavior among software engineers, while the ACM Code of Conduct highlights the importance of accountability and transparency in the ethical decision-making process. | |
| **PRINCIPLES** | |  | |  | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 1: PUBLIC** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall act consistently with the public interest. In particular, software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | 1.1: "Contribute to society and to human well-being, acknowledging that all people are stakeholders in computing." | | This clause emphasizes the responsibility of software engineers towards society and human well-being. It recognizes that the development and use of technology has far-reaching implications for individuals and communities, and that software engineers must consider the interests of all stakeholders when designing and implementing systems. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.01. Accept full responsibility for their own work. …………………………………………………………………………. | | Professionals should be cognizant of any serious negative consequences affecting any stakeholder that may result from poor quality work and should resist inducements to neglect this responsibility. | | The clause emphasizes the importance of accepting full responsibility for one's work as a professional. It also highlights the responsibility of professionals to be aware of the potential negative consequences that their work could have on stakeholders and to resist any inducements to neglect this responsibility. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.02. Moderate the interests of the software engineer, the employer, the client and the users with the public good. | | An essential aim of computing professionals is to minimize negative consequences of computing, including threats to health, safety, personal security, and privacy. When the interests of multiple groups conflict, the needs of those less advantaged should be given increased attention and priority.  A system for which future risks cannot be reliably predicted requires frequent reassessment of risk as the system evolves in use, or it should not be deployed. Any issues that might result in major risk must be reported to appropriate parties. | | The principle of the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct emphasizes the importance of considering the public good when making decisions as a software engineer. It highlights the need to balance the interests of different stakeholders, including the software engineer, employer, client, and users, with the overall welfare of the public. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.03. Approve software only if they have a well-founded belief that it is safe, meets specifications, passes appropriate tests, and does not diminish quality of life, diminish privacy or harm the environment. The ultimate effect of the work should be to the public good. | | 2.5 Give comprehensive and thorough evaluations of computer systems and their impacts, including analysis of possible risks.  Computing professionals are in a position of trust, and therefore have a special responsibility to provide objective, credible evaluations and testimony to employers, employees, clients, users, and the public. Computing professionals should strive to be perceptive, thorough, and objective when evaluating, recommending, and presenting system descriptions and alternatives. | | The clause of the ACM Code of Conduct highlights the responsibility of computing professionals to ensure that the software they approve is safe, meets specifications, passes appropriate tests, and does not diminish quality of life, diminish privacy, or harm the environment. Moreover, it emphasizes that the ultimate effect of their work should be to the public good. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.04. Disclose to appropriate persons or authorities any actual or potential danger to the user, the public, or the environment, that they reasonably believe to be associated with software or related documents. | | A system for which future risks cannot be reliably predicted requires frequent reassessment of risk as the system evolves in use, or it should not be deployed. Any issues that might result in major risk must be reported to appropriate parties. | | This clause highlights the importance of being accountable for the potential risks associated with software development and deployment. It requires software professionals to be vigilant about identifying any potential dangers to users, the public, or the environment, and disclosing these risks to appropriate persons or authorities. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.05. Cooperate in efforts to address matters of grave public concern caused by software, its installation, maintenance, support or documentation. | | Even the simplest computer systems have the potential to impact all aspects of society when integrated with everyday activities such as commerce, travel, government, healthcare, and education. When organizations and groups develop systems that become an important part of the infrastructure of society, their leaders have an added responsibility to be good stewards of these systems. | | The principle of the ACM Code of Conduct emphasizes the importance of cooperating in efforts to address matters of grave public concern caused by software and its related aspects. This principle highlights the fact that software, even the simplest ones, can significantly impact various aspects of society, such as commerce, healthcare, education, government, and travel. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.06. Be fair and avoid deception in all statements, particularly public ones, concerning software or related documents, methods and tools. | | Additionally, a computing professional should respectfully address inaccurate or misleading information related to computing. | | The ACM Code of Conduct's Principle highlights the importance of fairness and honesty in all public statements, especially those related to software or computing tools. This principle recognizes that computing professionals have a responsibility to provide accurate information and to avoid deceptive practices that could harm users or stakeholders. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.07. Consider issues of physical disabilities, allocation of resources, economic disadvantage and other factors that can diminish access to the benefits of software. | | Computing professionals should foster fair participation of all people, including those of underrepresented groups. Prejudicial discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, ethnicity, family status, gender identity, labor union membership, military status, nationality, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, or any other inappropriate factor is an explicit violation of the Code. | | The clause highlights the importance of ensuring fair participation of all people, regardless of their backgrounds or identities, in the computing profession. It explicitly prohibits any form of prejudicial discrimination based on a wide range of factors, including age, disability, ethnicity, gender identity, race, religion, and sexual orientation, among others. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 1.08. Be encouraged to volunteer professional skills to good causes and contribute to public education concerning the discipline. | | Efforts to help others by contributing time and energy to projects that help society illustrate a positive aspect of this principle. Such efforts include free and open source software and work put into the public domain. | | The clause highlights the importance of volunteering professional skills for the betterment of society and promoting public education about the discipline. As professionals in the field, we have a responsibility to use our knowledge and expertise to make a positive impact on the community. By contributing to open-source projects or creating works that are put into the public domain, we can share our knowledge and resources with a wider audience and help advance the field of computing. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 2: CLIENT AND EMPLOYER** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall act in a manner that is in the best interests of their client and employer, consistent with the public interest. In particular, software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | Computing professionals should insist on and support high quality work from themselves and from colleagues. The dignity of employers, employees, colleagues, clients, users, and anyone else affected either directly or indirectly by the work should be respected throughout the process. | | The clause highlights the need to respect the dignity of all stakeholders involved in the software development process, including employers, employees, colleagues, clients, and users. This includes treating them with honesty, fairness, and respect and avoiding any behavior that could harm their interests. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.01. Provide service in their areas of competence, being honest and forthright about any limitations of their experience and education. | | 2.6 Perform work only in areas of competence.  A computing professional is responsible for evaluating potential work assignments. This includes evaluating the work’s feasibility and advisability, and making a judgment about whether the work assignment is within the professional’s areas of competence. If at any time before or during the work assignment the professional identifies a lack of a necessary expertise, they must disclose this to the employer or client. The client or employer may decide to pursue the assignment with the professional after additional time to acquire the necessary competencies, to pursue the assignment with someone else who has the required expertise, or to forgo the assignment. A computing professional’s ethical judgment should be the final guide in deciding whether to work on the assignment. | | Clause of the ACM Code of Conduct highlights the importance of computing professionals to perform work only in areas of their competence. This clause emphasizes that professionals must evaluate their potential work assignments to determine whether they possess the necessary expertise to undertake the task at hand. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.02. Not knowingly use software that is obtained or retained either illegally or unethically. | | 1.5 Respect the work required to produce new ideas, inventions, creative works, and computing artifacts.  Developing new ideas, inventions, creative works, and computing artifacts creates value for society, and those who expend this effort should expect to gain value from their work. Computing professionals should therefore credit the creators of ideas, inventions, work, and artifacts, and respect copyrights, patents, trade secrets, license agreements, and other methods of protecting authors’ works. | | This principle emphasizes the importance of respecting intellectual property rights and legal means of obtaining software.  The ACM Code of Conduct also includes clause, which highlights the importance of respecting the work required to produce new ideas, inventions, creative works, and computing artifacts. This clause recognizes the value of intellectual property and encourages computing professionals to credit the creators of such works. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.03. Use the property of a client or employer only in ways properly authorized, and with the client's or employer's knowledge and consent. | | Individuals and organizations have the right to restrict access to their systems and data so long as the restrictions are consistent with other principles in the Code. Consequently, computing professionals should not access another’s computer system, software, or data without a reasonable belief that such an action would be authorized or a compelling belief that it is consistent with the public good. A system being publicly accessible is not sufficient grounds on its own to imply authorization. | | The principle highlighted in clause 2.03 of the ACM Code of Conduct emphasizes the importance of obtaining proper authorization and consent before using a client or employer's property or data. It recognizes the need to respect the privacy and confidentiality of the information that computing professionals may have access to in the course of their work. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.04. Ensure that any document upon which they rely has been approved, when required, by someone authorized to approve it. | | Not Applicable | | ACM document does not mention that any document upon which they rely has been approved | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.05. Keep private any confidential information gained in their professional work, where such confidentiality is consistent with the public interest and consistent with the law. | | 1.7 Honour confidentiality.  Computing professionals are often entrusted with confidential information such as trade secrets, client data, non-public business strategies, financial information, research data, pre-publication scholarly articles, and patent applications. Computing professionals should protect confidentiality except in cases where it is evidence of the violation of law, of organizational regulations, or of the Code. In these cases, the nature or contents of that information should not be disclosed except to appropriate authorities. A computing professional should consider thoughtfully whether such disclosures are consistent with the Code. | | This clause emphasizes the importance of maintaining confidentiality as a fundamental ethical principle for computing professionals. Computing professionals often have access to sensitive information such as trade secrets, client data, financial information, and research data, which they must keep confidential. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | Not Applicable | | ACM document does not talk about steps to deal with failing projects. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.07. Identify, document, and report significant issues of social concern, of which they are aware, in software or related documents, to the employer or the client. | | A computing professional has an additional obligation to report any signs of system risks that might result in harm. | | The SE Code of Ethics places a greater focus on issues of social concern and expects professionals to report such issues to either their employer or client. This implies that the professional should be proactive in identifying such issues and taking the initiative to report them.  On the other hand, the ACM Code of Conduct is more concerned with reporting signs of system risks that could result in harm. This implies that the professional should be vigilant in identifying such risks and taking the initiative to report them. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.08. Accept no outside work detrimental to the work they perform for their primary employer. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document makes no reference to the issuance of varying work. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 2.09. Promote no interest adverse to their employer or client, unless a higher ethical concern is being compromised; in that case, inform the employer or another appropriate authority of the ethical concern. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address concerns regarding the promotion of interests that may be contrary to those of an employer or client. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 3: PRODUCT** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall ensure that their products and related modifications meet the highest professional standards possible. In particular, software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | Computing professionals should insist on and support high quality work from themselves and from colleagues. | | There are no mismatches between the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct clauses mentioned. Both emphasize the importance of ensuring high-quality work and meeting professional standards in the field of software engineering. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document fails to address the tradeoffs involved in product optimization. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.02. Ensure proper and achievable goals and objectives for any project on which they work or propose. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document fails to address the concern of setting goals that cannot be achieved. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.03. Identify, define and address ethical, economic, cultural, legal and environmental issues related to work projects. | | Computing professionals should insist on and support high quality work from themselves and from colleagues. | | There are no significant mismatches between these two codes. Both codes emphasize the importance of considering and addressing ethical, cultural, economic, legal, and environmental issues related to work projects. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | 2.6 Perform work only in areas of competence.  A computing professional is responsible for evaluating potential work assignments. This includes evaluating the work’s feasibility and advisability, and making a judgment about whether the work assignment is within the professional’s areas of competence. If at any time before or during the work assignment the professional identifies a lack of a necessary expertise, they must disclose this to the employer or client. The client or employer may decide to pursue the assignment with the professional after additional time to acquire the necessary competencies, to pursue the assignment with someone else who has the required expertise, or to forgo the assignment. A computing professional’s ethical judgment should be the final guide in deciding whether to work on the assignment. | | There is a slight mismatch in the level of detail provided by the two codes. The SE Code explicitly states that professionals should have an "appropriate combination of education and training, and experience," while the ACM Code encourages professionals to use their ethical judgment in determining their areas of competence. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.05. Ensure an appropriate method is used for any project on which they work or propose to work. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM documents lack any mention of appropriate methods-related issues. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.06. Work to follow professional standards, when available, that are most appropriate for the task at hand, departing from these only when ethically or technically justified. | | 2.3 Know and respect existing rules pertaining to professional work.  “Rules” here include local, regional, national, and international laws and regulations, as well as any policies and procedures of the organizations to which the professional belongs. Computing professionals must abide by these rules unless there is a compelling ethical justification to do otherwise. | | SE Code allows for departure from professional standards when ethically or technically justified, while the ACM Code specifies that professionals must abide by rules unless there is a compelling ethical justification to do otherwise. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.07. Strive to fully understand the specifications for software on which they work. | | Computing professionals should strive to be perceptive, thorough, and objective when evaluating, recommending, and presenting system descriptions and alternatives. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the importance of understanding the specifications for software on which professional’s work, while the ACM Code of Conduct highlights the need for computing professionals to be perceptive, thorough, and objective when evaluating and presenting system descriptions and alternatives. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.08. Ensure that specifications for software on which they work have been well documented, satisfy the users’ requirements and have the appropriate approvals. | | Computing professionals should strive to be perceptive, thorough, and objective when evaluating, recommending, and presenting system descriptions and alternatives. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the importance of ensuring that software specifications are well-documented, meet users' requirements, and have appropriate approvals. On the other hand, the ACM Code of Conduct clauses urge computing professionals to be perceptive, thorough, and objective when evaluating and recommending system descriptions and alternatives. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address matters related to optimization. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.10. Ensure adequate testing, debugging, and review of software and related documents on which they work. | | Not Applicable | | The topic of testing issues is not addressed in the ACM document. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.11. Ensure adequate documentation, including significant problems discovered and solutions adopted, for any project on which they work. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address the problem of insufficient documentation. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.12. Work to develop software and related documents that respect the privacy of those who will be affected by that software. | | 1.6 Respect privacy.  The responsibility of respecting privacy applies to computing professionals in a particularly profound way. Technology enables the collection, monitoring, and exchange of personal information quickly, inexpensively, and often without the knowledge of the people affected. Therefore, a computing professional should become conversant in the various definitions and forms of privacy and should understand the rights and responsibilities associated with the collection and use of personal information. | | Based on the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and ACM Code of Conduct clauses, it is clear that both organizations emphasize the importance of respecting privacy in the development and use of technology. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.13. Be careful to use only accurate data derived by ethical and lawful means, and use it only in ways properly authorized. | | Computing professionals should establish transparent policies and procedures that allow individuals to understand what data is being collected and how it is being used, to give informed consent for automatic data collection, and to review, obtain, correct inaccuracies in, and delete their personal data. | | There appears to be a mismatch between the two statements. While the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the importance of using accurate data obtained through ethical and lawful means and using it only in authorized ways, it does not explicitly address the need for transparency in data collection and management practices. On the other hand, the ACM Code of Conduct focuses on the importance of establishing transparent policies and procedures to allow individuals to understand data collection and usage, give informed consent, and have control over their personal data. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.14. Maintain the integrity of data, being sensitive to outdated or flawed occurrences. | | This requires taking precautions to prevent re- identification of anonymized data or unauthorized data collection, ensuring the accuracy of data, understanding the provenance of the data, and protecting it from unauthorized access and accidental disclosure | | The SE Code of Ethics emphasizes the importance of maintaining the integrity of data by being sensitive to outdated or flawed occurrences. This suggests that software engineers should be aware of potential issues with the data they are working with and take steps to ensure that it is accurate and up-to-date.  On the other hand, the ACM Code of Conduct includes several clauses related to data protection and management, such as preventing re-identification of anonymized data, ensuring the accuracy of data, understanding the provenance of the data, and protecting it from unauthorized access and accidental disclosure. These clauses go beyond just being aware of potential issues with the data and include specific steps to take to protect and manage the data. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 3.15 Treat all forms of software maintenance with the same professionalism as new development. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document makes no reference to the problem of inadequate maintenance efforts. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 4: JUDGMENT** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall maintain integrity and independence in their professional judgment. In particular, software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | 2.2 Maintain high standards of professional competence, conduct, and ethical practice. | | The SE Code of Ethics focuses on the specific ethical considerations that are unique to software engineering, such as ensuring the safety and reliability of software systems, respecting privacy and confidentiality, and avoiding conflicts of interest. In contrast, the ACM Code of Conduct is more general and applies to all computing professionals. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 4.01. Temper all technical judgments by the need to support and maintain human values. | | 3.1 Ensure that the public good is the central concern during all professional computing work. | | The SE Code emphasizes the importance of considering human values when making technical judgments, while the ACM Code emphasizes the need to prioritize the public good. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 4.02 Only endorse documents either prepared under their supervision or within their areas of competence and with which they are in agreement. | | 2.6 Perform work only in areas of competence. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice specifically refers to endorsing documents prepared under the individual's supervision, while the ACM Code of Conduct does not mention this. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 4.03. Maintain professional objectivity with respect to any software or related documents they are asked to evaluate. | | 2.5 Give comprehensive and thorough evaluations of computer systems and their impacts, including analysis of possible risks. | | SE Code of Ethics emphasizes maintaining professional objectivity, the ACM Code of Conduct highlights the importance of giving comprehensive and thorough evaluations, including analysis of possible risks. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 4.04. Not engage in deceptive financial practices such as bribery, double billing, or other improper financial practices. | | Making deliberately false or misleading claims, fabricating or falsifying data, offering or accepting bribes, and other dishonest conduct are violations of the Code. | | The mismatch between the two codes is not significant, as they both aim to promote ethical behavior and prevent dishonest conduct. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 4.05. Disclose to all concerned parties those conflicts of interest that cannot reasonably be avoided or escaped. | | Computing professionals should be forthright about any circumstances that might lead to either real or perceived conflicts of interest or otherwise tend to undermine the independence of their judgment. | | Both the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct highlight the importance of disclosing conflicts of interest that cannot be avoided. This means that computing professionals should be transparent about any potential situations that may lead to a conflict of interest or may compromise their independence and impartiality. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 4.06. Refuse to participate, as members or advisors, in a private, governmental or professional body concerned with software related issues, in which they, their employers or their clients have undisclosed potential conflicts of interest. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address the issue of individuals holding conflicting interests while being members at the same time. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 5: MANAGEMENT** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineering managers and leaders shall subscribe to and promote an ethical approach to the management of software development and maintenance . In particular, those managing or leading software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | While these principles apply to all computing professionals, leaders bear a heightened responsibility to uphold and promote them, both within and through their organizations. | | Both statements emphasize the importance of ethical behavior in the software development profession, and highlight the responsibility of managers and leaders to uphold and promote ethical principles within their organizations. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.01 Ensure good management for any project on which they work, including effective procedures for promotion of quality and reduction of risk. | | 2.1 Strive to achieve high quality in both the processes and products of professional work.  Computing professionals should insist on and support high quality work from themselves and from colleagues. | | The SE Code's wording specifically mentions "good management" for any project, whereas the ACM Code's wording focuses more on striving to achieve high quality in both processes and products of professional work. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.02. Ensure that software engineers are informed of standards before being held to them. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document fails to address the requirement of informing individuals about the standards before holding them accountable to those standards. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.03. Ensure that software engineers know the employer's policies and procedures for protecting passwords, files and information that is confidential to the employer or confidential to others. | | Robust security should be a primary consideration when designing and implementing systems. Computing professionals should perform due diligence to ensure the system functions as intended, and take appropriate action to secure resources against accidental and intentional misuse, modification, and denial of service. | | There is a clear mismatch between the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct when it comes to the emphasis placed on ensuring that software engineers are aware of their employer's policies and procedures for protecting confidential information. While the SE Code of Ethics stresses the importance of this knowledge, the ACM Code of Conduct focuses more on the need for robust security measures in designing and implementing systems, and the due diligence required to ensure that systems are functioning as intended. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.04. Assign work only after taking into account appropriate contributions of education and experience tempered with a desire to further that education and experience. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address concerns related to prior experience. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address the topic of precise estimation. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.06. Attract potential software engineers only by full and accurate description of the conditions of employment. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address precise job descriptions. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.07. Offer fair and just remuneration. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not solely focus on discussing remuneration. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.08. Not unjustly prevent someone from taking a position for which that person is suitably qualified. | | Computing professionals should foster fair participation of all people, including those of underrepresented groups. Prejudicial discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, ethnicity, family status, gender identity, labor union membership, military status, nationality, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, or any other inappropriate factor is an explicit violation of the Code | | There is a clear mismatch between the two statements provided. The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the importance of not unjustly preventing someone from taking a position for which they are qualified, while the ACM Code of Conduct explicitly prohibits discrimination on the basis of various factors including age, ethnicity, gender identity, religion, and sexual orientation. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.09. Ensure that there is a fair agreement concerning ownership of any software, processes, research, writing, or other intellectual property to which a software engineer has contributed. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document lacks discussion on equitable agreements pertaining to ownership. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.10. Provide for due process in hearing charges of violation of an employer's policy or of this Code. | | In addition, leaders should encourage and reward compliance with those policies, and take appropriate action when policies are violated. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the need for due process in hearing charges of violation of an employer's policy or the Code itself. This indicates a fair and just approach to resolving potential violations.  On the other hand, the ACM Code of Conduct clauses call for leaders to encourage and reward compliance with policies and take appropriate action when policies are violated. This suggests a more proactive stance towards enforcing policies and potentially disciplining employees who violate them. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.11. Not ask a software engineer to do anything inconsistent with this Code. | | Designing or implementing processes that deliberately or negligently violate, or tend to enable the violation of, the Code’s principles is ethically unacceptable. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice places the responsibility for compliance solely on the software engineer, whereas the ACM Code of Conduct places responsibility for designing or implementing processes that violate the Code's principles on both the software engineer and the organization they work for. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 5.12. Not punish anyone for expressing ethical concerns about a project. | | Therefore, leaders should encourage full participation of computing professionals in meeting relevant social responsibilities and discourage tendencies to do otherwise. | | The first statement from the SE Code of Ethics emphasizes the importance of creating a safe space for professionals to express their ethical concerns without fear of punishment. This encourages open dialogue and constructive criticism, which can help identify and resolve ethical issues before they cause harm.  The second statement from the ACM Code of Conduct emphasizes the responsibility of computing professionals to participate in social responsibilities and discourage actions that go against these responsibilities. This highlights the importance of professionals taking an active role in promoting ethical behavior and contributing positively to society through their work. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 6: PROFESSION** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall advance the integrity and reputation of the profession consistent with the public interest. In particular, software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | 2.7 Foster public awareness and understanding of computing, related technologies, and their consequences. | | There does not appear to be any significant mismatches between the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct clauses mentioned in the prompt. Both codes emphasize the importance of promoting the public interest and fostering awareness of computing and related technologies. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.01. Help develop an organizational environment favorable to acting ethically. | | Organizations—through procedures and attitudes oriented toward quality, transparency, and the welfare of society—reduce harm to the public and raise awareness of the influence of technology in our lives. | | Firstly, the SE Code of Ethics emphasizes the responsibility of individual software engineers to act ethically, while the ACM Code of Conduct emphasizes the role of organizations in creating an ethical environment. While individual responsibility is important, it is also important for organizations to promote ethical behavior through policies, procedures, and culture.  Secondly, the SE Code of Ethics is specific to the field of software engineering, while the ACM Code of Conduct is broader and applies to all professionals working with technology. This difference in scope may result in different approaches to ethical behavior within organizations. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.02. Promote public knowledge of software engineering. | | As appropriate to the context and one’s abilities, computing professionals should share technical knowledge with the public, foster awareness of computing, and encourage understanding of computing. These communications with the public should be clear, respectful, and welcoming. | | There is no direct mismatch between the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct clauses mentioned. Both codes emphasize the importance of promoting public knowledge and awareness of computing and encouraging understanding of the same. However, it is worth noting that the SE Code is more specific to the field of software engineering, while the ACM Code applies to all computing professionals. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.03. Extend software engineering knowledge by appropriate participation in professional organizations, meetings and publications. | | Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education. | | The SE Code suggests that software engineers should extend their knowledge by participating in professional organizations, meetings, and publications. This implies a more formal approach to continuing education, such as attending conferences and publishing research papers. On the other hand, the ACM Code uses more inclusive language that acknowledges the value of both formal and informal education, including independent study and attending conferences or seminars. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.04. Support, as members of a profession, other software engineers striving to follow this Code. | | Therefore, leaders should encourage full participation of computing professionals in meeting relevant social responsibilities and discourage tendencies to do otherwise. | | The SE Code specifically mentions supporting other software engineers who are striving to follow the code. This suggests a focus on individual responsibility and accountability within the profession. On the other hand, the ACM Code speaks more broadly about the responsibility of leaders to encourage computing professionals to meet social responsibilities. This suggests a more collective responsibility for the profession as a whole, rather than just individual practitioners. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.05. Not promote their own interest at the expense of the profession, client or employer. | | Computing professionals should be forthright about any circumstances that might lead to either real or perceived conflicts of interest or otherwise tend to undermine the independence of their judgment. | | There is a clear mismatch between the two statements. While the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes not promoting one's own interests at the expense of the profession, client or employer, the ACM Code of Conduct highlights the importance of disclosing any circumstances that may lead to conflicts of interest or undermine independent judgment. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.06. Obey all laws governing their work, unless, in exceptional circumstances, such compliance is inconsistent with the public interest. | | 2.3 Know and respect existing rules pertaining to professional work.  “Rules” here include local, regional, national, and international laws and regulations, as well as any policies and procedures of the organizations to which the professional belongs. Computing professionals must abide by these rules unless there is a compelling ethical justification to do otherwise. | | The SE Code allows for exceptional circumstances where compliance with laws may be inconsistent with the public interest, while the ACM Code strictly requires computing professionals to obey all existing rules unless there is a compelling ethical justification to do otherwise. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.07. Be accurate in stating the characteristics of software on which they work, avoiding not only false claims but also claims that might reasonably be supposed to be speculative, vacuous, deceptive, misleading, or doubtful. | | A computing professional should be transparent and provide full disclosure of all pertinent system capabilities, limitations, and potential problems to the appropriate parties | | The SE Code explicitly states that professionals should avoid making "speculative, vacuous, deceptive, misleading, or doubtful" claims about software characteristics. In contrast, the ACM Code simply requires professionals to provide "full disclosure" of system capabilities, limitations, and potential problems. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.08. Take responsibility for detecting, correcting, and reporting errors in software and associated documents on which they work. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document fails to address the matter of identifying errors in software. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.09. Ensure that clients, employers, and supervisors know of the software engineer's commitment to this Code of ethics, and the subsequent ramifications of such commitment. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address the Code's expectations for employee commitments. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.10. Avoid associations with businesses and organizations which are in conflict with this code. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not provide guidance on how to avoid organizations that do not adhere to the Code. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.11. Recognize that violations of this Code are inconsistent with being a professional software engineer. | | 4.2 Treat violations of the Code as inconsistent with membership in the ACM.  Each ACM member should encourage and support adherence by all computing professionals regardless of ACM membership. ACM members who recognize a breach of the Code should consider reporting the violation to the ACM, which may result in remedial action as specified in the ACM’s Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct Enforcement Policy. | | It seems like there may be some overlap and similarities between the two codes of ethics, as both emphasize the importance of professional behavior and the consequences of violating ethical standards. However, there are also some differences in language and focus. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 6.12. Express concerns to the people involved when significant violations of this Code are detected unless this is impossible, counter-productive, or dangerous. | | Each ACM member should encourage and support adherence by all computing professionals regardless of ACM membership. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the importance of speaking up when significant violations are detected, but acknowledges that there may be circumstances where doing so could be difficult or counter-productive. In contrast, the ACM Code of Conduct simply encourages members to support adherence to ethical standards without specifically addressing how to address violations or concerns. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | ACM members who recognize a breach of the Code should consider reporting the violation to the ACM, which may result in remedial action as specified in the ACM’s Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct Enforcement Policy. | | The SE Code uses the phrase "clear that consultation with people involved in these significant violations is impossible, counter-productive or dangerous," while the ACM Code simply suggests that members "consider reporting the violation." This difference in language could potentially create a mismatch in expectations for individuals who are trying to determine whether or not to report a violation. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 7: COLLEAGUES** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall be fair to and supportive of their colleagues. In particular, software engineers shall, as appropriate: | | Computing professionals should insist on and support high quality work from themselves and from colleagues. | | There are no significant mismatches between the two statements. Both the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct emphasize the importance of supporting and valuing one's colleagues and promoting high-quality work. While the wording and specifics of the statements may differ slightly, the underlying principles and values are the same. It is important for software engineers to adhere to these ethical guidelines to promote a positive and respectful work environment and ensure the development of high-quality software. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.01. Encourage colleagues to adhere to this Code. | | Each ACM member should encourage and support adherence by all computing professionals regardless of ACM membership. | | The SE Code uses the term "colleagues" when referring to encouraging adherence to the code, which may be interpreted as limited to only those in the same profession or workplace. In contrast, the ACM Code of Conduct is more inclusive, using the phrase "all computing professionals" regardless of ACM membership, which extends the scope of responsibility beyond just colleagues. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.02. Assist colleagues in professional development. | | Computing professionals should insist on and support high quality work from themselves and from colleagues. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct both aim to promote ethical behavior and professionalism among computing professionals. They recognize that collaboration and support among colleagues are essential for achieving these goals. Therefore, it is important for computing professionals to uphold both sets of codes and to strive for excellence in their work and in their relationships with others in the field. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.03. Credit fully the work of others and refrain from taking undue credit. | | Not Applicable | | The issue of stealing credit is not addressed in the ACM document. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.04. Review the work of others in an objective, candid, and properly-documented way. | | Computing professionals should also provide constructive, critical reviews of others’ work. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct both emphasize the importance of providing constructive, candid, and properly documented reviews of others' work. However, there does not appear to be any significant mismatch between the two codes regarding this specific point. Both codes recognize that objective and critical feedback is essential to maintain high standards of professionalism and ethical behavior within the computing industry. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.05. Give a fair hearing to the opinions, concerns, or complaints of a colleague. | | Not Applicable | | The ACM document does not address concerns related to a fair hearing | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.06. Assist colleagues in being fully aware of current standard work practices including policies and procedures for protecting passwords, files and other confidential information, and security measures in general. | | Computing professionals should perform due diligence to ensure the system functions as intended, and take appropriate action to secure resources against accidental and intentional misuse, modification, and denial of service. | | There does not seem to be any significant mismatches between the two codes of ethics mentioned. Both the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct emphasize the importance of protecting confidential information and ensuring the security of resources. They both also stress the importance of maintaining current knowledge and best practices in the field of computing.  In terms of specific clauses, the SE Code of Ethics recommends assisting colleagues in being fully aware of current standard work practices, including those related to security measures, while the ACM Code of Conduct states that computing professionals should perform due diligence to ensure the system functions as intended and take appropriate action to secure resources against misuse, modification, and denial of service. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 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. | | Fairness requires that even careful decision processes provide some avenue for redress of grievances. | | There seems to be a mismatch between the two statements. The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice emphasizes the importance of not unfairly intervening in the career of any colleague, whereas the ACM Code of Conduct Clauses highlight the importance of providing avenues for redress of grievances.  While both statements focus on the importance of fairness, the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice prioritizes the respect and consideration of colleagues, while the ACM Code of Conduct Clauses prioritize the provision of a fair process for addressing grievances. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 7.08. In situations outside of their own areas of competence, call upon the opinions of other professionals who have competence in that area. | | Whenever appropriate, computing professionals should seek and utilize peer and stakeholder review. | | Both the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct recognize the importance of seeking help and advice from other professionals when dealing with situations that are outside of one's area of expertise. This is a crucial aspect of professionalism in any field, including computing. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| **Principle 8: SELF** | |  | |  | |
| Software engineers shall participate in lifelong learning regarding the practice of their profession and shall promote an ethical approach to the practice of the profession. In particular, software engineers shall continually endeavor to: | | Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education.  Computing professionals should consider whether the results of their efforts will respect diversity, will be used in socially responsible ways, will meet social needs, and will be broadly accessible. | | There do not appear to be any significant mismatches between the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct. Both codes emphasize the importance of lifelong learning and continuous professional development, and both stress the need for ethical behavior and responsible use of computing technologies. Additionally, both codes encourage software engineers to consider the broader social implications of their work, including issues of diversity, social responsibility, and accessibility. Overall, these two codes align well with each other and provide a strong foundation for ethical and professional behavior in the field of software engineering. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.01. Further their knowledge of developments in the analysis, specification, design, development, maintenance and testing of software and related documents, together with the management of the development process. | | Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education. Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education. | | There is a mismatch in the wording and specificity of the two codes. The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice focuses on the technical aspects of software development, such as analysis, design, development, testing, and maintenance. In contrast, the ACM Code of Conduct is more broad and open-ended, mentioning independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education as ways to upgrade skills. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.02. Improve their ability to create safe, reliable, and useful quality software at reasonable cost and within a reasonable time. | | Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education. | | The SE Code emphasizes the importance of creating safe, reliable, and useful quality software at a reasonable cost and within a reasonable time, while the ACM Code focuses on the ongoing process of upgrading skills through independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other forms of education. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.03. Improve their ability to produce accurate, informative, and well-written documentation. | | Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education. | | One potential mismatch is that the SE Code emphasizes the importance of producing accurate documentation, whereas the ACM Code emphasizes the importance of ongoing education and skill development. While accurate documentation is undoubtedly an essential aspect of software engineering, it is just one component of a broader set of skills and practices necessary for success in the field.  On the other hand, the ACM Code's emphasis on ongoing education and skill development can help ensure that software engineers stay up-to-date with the latest technologies and best practices. However, while ongoing education is critical, it is not the only factor that contributes to ethical behavior and professional conduct. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.04. Improve their understanding of the software and related documents on which they work and of the environment in which they will be used. | | Upgrading skills should be an ongoing process and might include independent study, attending conferences or seminars, and other informal or formal education. | | There appears to be no significant mismatch between the two statements. Both the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct emphasize the importance of software professionals continuously upgrading their skills and knowledge. The SE Code of Ethics stresses the importance of software professionals understanding the software and its environment thoroughly. Meanwhile, the ACM Code of Conduct highlights that upgrading skills should be an ongoing process that includes various formal and informal education methods. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.05. Improve their knowledge of relevant standards and the law governing the software and related documents on which they work. | | “Rules” here include local, regional, national, and international laws and regulations, as well as any policies and procedures of the organizations to which the professional belongs. | | There may be some differences in the scope and level of detail in the standards and laws covered by the two codes. For instance, the SE Code may focus more on specific standards related to software development, whereas the ACM Code may have a broader scope covering various aspects of computing and information technology. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.06 Improve their knowledge of this Code, its interpretation, and its application to their work. | | 4.1 Uphold, promote, and respect the principles of the Code.  The future of computing depends on both technical and ethical excellence. Computing professionals should adhere to the principles of the Code and contribute to improving them. | | There doesn't seem to be any obvious mismatches between the SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct. In fact, both codes emphasize the importance of upholding ethical principles and promoting excellence in the field of computing. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.07 Not give unfair treatment to anyone because of any irrelevant prejudices. | | Prejudicial discrimination on the basis of age, color, disability, ethnicity, family status, gender identity, labor union membership, military status, nationality, race, religion or belief, sex, sexual orientation, or any other inappropriate factor is an explicit violation of the Code. | | The SE Code of Ethics and Professional Practice and the ACM Code of Conduct clauses have a similar stance on discrimination based on irrelevant factors. However, there is a mismatch between the two in terms of the comprehensiveness of the list of inappropriate factors. The SE Code only mentions "any irrelevant prejudices," while the ACM Code explicitly lists a comprehensive set of inappropriate factors that includes age, disability, gender identity, labor union membership, and more. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.08. Not influence others to undertake any action that involves a breach of this Code. | | Computing professionals who recognize breaches of the Code should take actions to resolve the ethical issues they recognize, including, when reasonable, expressing their concern to the person or persons thought to be violating the Code. | | The SE Code specifically states that professionals should not influence others to undertake actions that breach the code. In contrast, the ACM Code encourages computing professionals to take action to resolve ethical issues, including expressing their concern to those violating the code. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
| 8.09. Recognize that personal violations of this Code are inconsistent with being a professional software engineer. | | 4.2 Treat violations of the Code as inconsistent with membership in the ACM.  Each ACM member should encourage and support adherence by all computing professionals regardless of ACM membership. ACM members who recognize a breach of the Code should consider reporting the violation to the ACM, which may result in remedial action as specified in the ACM’s Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct Enforcement Policy. | | The SE Code suggests that personal violations of the code are inconsistent with being a professional software engineer, while the ACM Code of Conduct implies that violations are inconsistent with membership in the ACM. | |
|  | |  | |  | |
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