

Hi Anastasia,

Your post is a well-written and informative comparison of the ACM and BCS Code of Conduct based on the Corazón use case and the company's principles regarding the building, deployment, and maintenance of the implantable heart health monitoring device.

I examined the ACM code of conduct and played the devil's advocate with principle 3.7. The principle emphasizes the need to acknowledge and handle the systems integrated into society's infrastructure with special care. Although the vulnerability was insignificant at the time, Corazón acted responsibly and promptly by assessing the extent of the flaw to mitigate any harm. However, Corazón did not provide any action steps to prevent exploitation of the flaw in the future.

Principle 3.6 also discusses the need for care when modifying or retiring systems. Corazón should provide a strategic plan to alter the implant OS remotely in case a denial-of-service attack happens to an implant using the discovered vulnerability making the transfer of data between the implant and the mobile app almost impossible for a highly critical patient.

Thanks for bringing the ACM Code of Conduct to my attention through your post. This prompted me to review it more closely, and I realized that in my initial post, I failed to give it the consideration it deserved.

#### References:

Association for Computing Machinery (2018) ACM Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct. Available from:  
<https://www.acm.org/code-of-ethics> [Accessed 21 November 2023].

Hi Ruth,

Thanks for your post.

I absolutely agree that "workplace bullying is a serious issue that affects millions of workers daily. The case in question shows clear gender discrimination, which is illegal in the UK. Max's actions of removing the names of women team members from publications and refusing to let Diane join the team in a presentation violated the Equality Act 2010 and created a hostile work environment. This behaviour perpetuates the gender gap in the computing industry, violating the ACM and BCS codes of conduct." (Allison, 2023).

In my initial post, I analyzed Max and Jane's actions from legal, social, and professional perspectives. Max and Jane violated the BCS Code, damaging the reputation of the team, organization, and computing profession. Perpetuating an abusive work culture has severe social consequences. Research shows that workplace harassment leads to a decrease in job satisfaction, an increase in stress levels, and a decline in productivity. Such behaviour not only affects immediate victims but can also create a negative organizational culture that hinders collaboration and innovation. (Adeniyi, 2023).

#### References

Adeniyi, S. (2023). Initial Post. Available from <https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/forum/discuss.php?d=197559#p334028> [Accessed 21 Nov 2023]

Allison, R. (2023). Initial Post. Available from <https://www.my-course.co.uk/mod/forum/discuss.php?d=197754#p334445> [Accessed 21 Nov 2023]

[Permalink](#)[Show parent](#)[Reply](#)