**AWS Group Exercise**

**Section 1 Principle – 1.4 Be fair and take action not to discriminate**

In the case study, it is noted that there were “several complaints from visually impaired users, who noted that the mixture of red and green text obscured important disclaimers about the product.” This is clearly an example of ethical misconduct as it either intentionally discriminates against colorblind people (technically not provable but can be inferred from the managers’ conversations) or it is negligent of these impairments. According to Section 1.4 of the ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct, Stewart should “take action not to discriminate” by taking this issue up the chain of command until he finds someone willing to reprimand his managers.

**Section 2 Principle – 2.2 Maintain high standards of professional competence, conduct, and ethical practice**

Clearly, upgrading customers to a higher price level and adding a warranty without confirmation from the user is an ethical concern. By telling Stewart to implement these new arrow buttons which perform actions that do not match the buttons themselves, the managers are failing to “maintain high standards…of ethical practice” as denoted by Section 2.2 of the ACM Code of Ethics. While Stewart sees this as an ethical issue right away, the managers need to do a better job of “recognizing and navigating ethical challenges.”

**Section 3 Principle – 3.4 Articulate, apply, and support policies and processes that reflect the principle of the Code.**

In the case study, the company leadership clearly displays a lack of discouragement towards unethical practices. When Stewart brings his concerns to the attention of his supervisor he gets blown off and other members of the leadership are heard in support of their success through unethical means. These leaders are not following section 3.4 in the Code, that specifically states “Leaders should pursue clearly defined organizational policies that are consistent with the Code and effectively communicate them to relevant stakeholders” and that they should “…encourage and reward compliance with those policies, and take appropriate action when policies are violated,” which is exactly the opposite of what they did in this case study.