



American International University- Bangladesh (AIUB)

Faculty of Engineering

Course Name: Engineering Ethics	Engineering Ethics	Course Code:	EEE 3107
Semester: Spring 21	Spring 2020-21	Section: E	

Item:	Demonstrates individual responsibilities based on norms of engineering practice (CO4)
Report Title:	Foisal - the whistle-blower

Student Name:	Foisal Ahmed	Student ID:	19-39512-1
Student's Department	EEE	Submission Date:	18-04-2021

Rubrics:

Category	Proficient [6]	Good [5]	Acceptable [4]	Unacceptable [2]	Secured Marks
Explanation of issues	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering relevant information necessary for full understanding.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined.	Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description.	
Influence of context and assumptions	Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position.	Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position.	Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa).	Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position.	
Student's position (perspective, thesis/ hypothesis)	Specific position (perspective, hypothesis) is imaginative, considering the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view and assumptions are synthesized within position (perspective, hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) considers the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view and assumptions are acknowledged within position (perspective, hypothesis).	Specific position (perspective, hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue.	Specific position (perspective, hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious.	
Innovative Thinking or uniqueness (of idea, claim, question etc.)	Extends a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product to create new knowledge or knowledge that crosses boundaries.	Creates a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	Experiments with creating a novel or unique idea, question, format, or product.	Reformulates a collection of available ideas.	
Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences)	Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence.	Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly.	Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are not clear.	Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified.	
Comments:				Total Marks (Out of 30):	

Case: Faisal - the whistle-blower

I am electrical engineer at “Interests Engineering Company”, where I am responsible for overseeing the work of subcontractors and handling their invoices and other claims. Because of my outstanding performance, I was recommended by my immediate boss, Raihan, for speedy promotion to fill a vacancy left by a senior engineer in another department.

In the meantime, I was assigned to supervise the wiring works for an audio system at a very large commercial complex. When Raihan was on leave one day, I was asked by the Accounts Department to sign off on an invoice for BDT 150,000 from a subcontractor called “First-line Cable Works” for the laying of cables in the complex.

Knowing that First-line was not involved in the project, I questioned Raihan about the matter when he returns to work the next day. Raihan told me to process the invoice as if it was a totally normal claim. He explained that the money is to pay an engineering staff at the client's company who helped them obtain the contract in the first place and who promised to ensure that the project runs smoothly. I realized that the payment meant an illegal bribe and urged Raihan not to offer the money. What Raihan did not tell me was that he was himself pocketing money from the project after conspiring with the client's engineering staff to inflate the project's tender price. To hide the malpractice, Raihan asked me to keep my mouth shut and to process the claim using a false work order. In return, he would help me secure my promotion.

I hesitate. I do not know what to do. Should I keep silent? I will be betraying my professional ethics if I do so. Or should I blow the whistle? But then won't I be betraying Raihan, my supervisor?

Reference: http://www.hkie.org.hk/cpd/icac/case_text.html

Case Study:

I realized that the payment meant an illegal bribe, Raihan was himself pocketing money from the project and asked me to keep my mouth shut and to process the claim using a false work order. In return, he would help me secure my promotion. So, here is the moral dilemma lies: should I keep silent? betraying my professional ethics to get the promotion. Or should I blow the whistle betraying Raihan, my supervisor?

I was asked by the Accounts Department to sign off on an invoice for BDT 140,000 from a subcontractor called “First-line Cable Works” for the laying of cables in the complex. Raihan explained that the money is to pay an engineering staff at the client 's company who helped them obtain the contract in the first place and who promised to ensure that the project runs smoothly. What he did not tell me was that he was himself pocketing money from the project after conspiring with the client's engineering staff to inflate the project's tender price.

In this whole scenario two main stakeholders were involved: Raihan who was trying to take bribe and me who noticed it.

Relevant options in resolving the ethical dilemma mentioned in this case would be keeping myself silent to get the promotion as well as betraying professional ethics and another option is to blow the whistle betraying my supervisor, Raihan.

Reasonable decision for myself would be to blow the whistle because in the long run my career will be ruined if it is found out that I have collaborated with Ryan. I would fail to fulfil my professional ethical responsibilities. I will face legal and disciplinary action from the company, my professional body, and the law enforcement authorities. It will reflect badly on me if the irregularities are detected, and it is discovered that I remained silent even though I knew what was going on. On the other hand, if I do not blow the whistle in this case, Raihan will continue to commit this kind of malpractice if no one stops him. He will face even heavier legal and disciplinary action if his illegal and unethical practices are detected by other people at a later stage. By blowing the whistle, it will stop him from committing even more serious instances of malpractice. Though relationship between Raihan and me might become complicated and I may not get the speedy promotion as a senior engineer but it's far better to defend my professional ethics rather than getting involved in bribery. Therefore, blowing the whistle is the best reasonable decision for myself to uphold the dignity and reputation of the profession.