

## Project Part II

### ENG4A03 FA24

In the past few weeks, you have been introduced to some concepts around the topic of ethics as it relates to engineering and technology. The purpose of this Second Part of the Project is to assess your understanding of these concepts as well as your capacity to apply these concepts as a well-adjusted citizen and a contributing (future) engineer.

In Part I of the Term Project, you conducted a literature review on an emerging field. In Part II of the project, your group will focus on the same emerging field in an engineering discipline that you focused on in Part I.

For this second part of the term project, your group is required to conduct and submit a *case study* on **ethical misconduct** and **whistleblowing** that followed misconduct within an organization, research facility, project, country, et.c. in your selected field.

Learn about the case using the internet or other literature and use the information you learn to discuss the ethical issues, challenges, and decisions around the case in order to identify the ethical dilemma (and if possible, suggest a potential solution)

You will: Describe the key facts / events surrounding the case study. Describe the ethical issues / challenges surrounding the case study, including the whistleblowing.

Choose and specify a person or a group of people involved in the case as your primary subject(s).

Using the EGAD Framework as discussed in class, describe the ethical responsibilities of the primary subject(s) in relationship to this case including the ethical issues, challenges, and/or dilemmas faced by the primary subject(s).

Describe three or more alternative options the primary subject(s) may choose to follow in response to the ethical challenge(s) they face.

Analyze the alternative options using one of the ethics theories identified in class – consequentialism, deontology, and virtue ethics and ethics of care – state which approach you used.

Describe which alternative option is the ethical one that you believe the primary subject(s) should follow (or should have followed).

It should be clear from your analysis why you have chosen this option.

#### **Note:**

You should present the case and your analysis in a way that a layperson with no knowledge of the case can understand your perspective on the above topics. Avoid lingo or overly technical terms.

You may cite your resources using APA or IEEE citation formats.

Word Limit 1500 words (or 5 pages). The TA will stop reading at 1500 words (or 5 pages). Your references are not included in your word limit. Footnotes are included in the 1500 word limit.

To enhance accountability and equality, all group members that contributed to the project should fill the **Group project participation form** and submit it together with this assignment. Fill the form in MS Word, Convert to PDF and Attach this form as a PDF to the last page of your assignment. Your assignment is incomplete without the submission/inclusion of this form.

On top of meeting the above requirements, the rubric below will be used in grading your work. **It should be noted that the TAs will grade the assessment as a whole and will not focus only the rubric.**

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Excellent</b>	<b>Good</b>	<b>Satisfactory</b>	<b>Needs Improvement</b>	<b>Poor</b>
<b>Topic Relevance</b>	The selected case is highly relevant to the field of engineering, and the connection to ethical misconduct and whistleblowing is clear and well-established.	The case is relevant to engineering, and its connection to ethical misconduct and whistleblowing is evident.	The case has some relevance to engineering but may lack clarity in connecting to ethical misconduct and whistleblowing.	The relevance of the case to engineering is weak, and the connection to ethical misconduct and whistleblowing is unclear.	The selected case is not relevant to the field of engineering and lacks any connection to ethical misconduct or whistleblowing.
<b>Research Depth</b>	The case study is based on thorough and comprehensive research. It demonstrates a deep understanding of the case, including its background, implications, and ethical aspects.	The research is substantial, covering a wide range of relevant sources and providing a good understanding of the case's background and ethical dimensions.	The research is adequate, but there may be some gaps in information or depth of understanding.	The research is superficial, and critical aspects of the case are not adequately explored.	The research is lacking, and the case study relies on minimal information.
<b>Analysis of Ethical Misconduct</b>	The analysis of ethical misconduct is insightful, detailed, and well-supported with evidence from the case. It	The analysis of ethical misconduct is thorough and supported with evidence from the case, offering a good	The analysis of ethical misconduct is present, but it may lack some depth or detail.	The analysis of ethical misconduct is limited and lacks sufficient supporting evidence.	The analysis of ethical misconduct is practically absent or highly inadequate.

	provides a clear understanding of the ethical issues involved.	understanding of the ethical issues.			
<b>Discussion of Whistleblowing</b>	The discussion of whistleblowing is comprehensive and includes insights into the role of whistleblowers, the ethical dilemmas they face, and the consequences of whistleblowing.	The discussion of whistleblowing is good, covering key aspects of the role of whistleblowers and ethical dilemmas.	The discussion of whistleblowing is present but may lack depth or overlook some important elements.	The discussion of whistleblowing is limited and may miss critical points.	The discussion of whistleblowing is absent or barely touched upon.
<b>Organization and Clarity</b>	The case study is exceptionally well-organized, with a clear structure and logical flow. It is easy to follow and understand.	The case study is well-organized and has a clear structure, making it generally easy to follow.	The organization is satisfactory, but there may be some confusion in the structure or flow.	The organization is somewhat disorganized, making it challenging to follow the case study.	The case study lacks structure and is highly disorganized.
<b>Grammar and Writing</b>	The case study is exceptionally well-written, with no grammatical or spelling errors. It demonstrates professional writing.	The case study is well-written, with minimal grammatical or spelling errors.	The writing is generally good, but some grammatical or spelling errors may be present.	The writing has noticeable grammatical or spelling errors that affect clarity.	The case study is poorly written, with numerous grammatical and spelling errors.
<b>Citations and References</b>	Citations and references are properly formatted, comprehensive, and demonstrate a high level of academic integrity.	Citations and references are properly formatted and generally comprehensive.	Citations and references are somewhat lacking or may have formatting issues.	Citations and references are inadequate or not properly formatted.	Citations and references are practically absent.
<b>EGAD Framework</b>	Provides a comprehensive,	Shows a clear understanding	Addresses primary	Touches on some	overlooks significant

	<p>analysis of the position, demonstrating a thorough understanding of the EGAD framework. The analysis considers multiple perspectives and clearly identifies significant factors impacting the primary person(s) and the decisions they make.</p>	<p>of the EGAD framework. Key considerations are present but may not be as thoroughly examined as in an excellent response.</p>	<p>perspectives and identifies some significant factors but lacks comprehensive depth or may overlook certain details impacting the primary person(s) and their decisions. Connections are general or partially developed.</p>	<p>perspectives and factors but lacks detail and clarity, with key aspects either briefly mentioned or not adequately explored. connection between the framework and the primary person(s) decision-making impacts the overall insight.</p>	<p>factors impacting the primary person(s) and their decisions. There is little to no connection to the EGAD framework, resulting in a disorganized or unclear evaluation.</p>
--	---	---	--	---	--