**1) What is the purpose of having/following a "Code of Ethics" ?**

In my mind, the purpose of having a code of ethics is to give yourself a promise, to uphold certain standards of yourself. When you adhere to a code of ethics, you are saying "These are the moral lines I will not cross, and these are the moral lines I must cross if the situation arises". In times when ethical dilemmas arise, whether it be your boss giving the go-ahead to a dangerous product, or lying to future customers about a harmful bug, it gives you a law of ethics you must follow to stay true to yourself.

It's a modern-day version of a code of honor, that was given in service of some greater good, such as a knight's chivalry, which was to uphold themselves to principles appropriate for the time. These included such things as honorable fights, respect for fellow men and women, upholding religious practices, etc. These were the moral codes of their time, and the code of ethics we're talking about is the same idea except strictly in the lens of industry and modern society. When we obey a code of ethics, we place ourselves on a higher level of duty than simply engineering because we are told to, just like knights were on a higher level of duty from other soldiers because of their chivalry.

**2) When you are faced with an ethical situation, how do you, personally, go about making a decision?  What factors are involved in making your decision?   Be specific!**

Before this meeting, I thought that when I come across an ethical dilemma, my first response is not to act. I will not endorse nor oppose any course of action. My first step is to go home, and spend time on my own to think about my own feelings about the subject outside of the heat of the moment. If my boss plans to push a potentially dangerous product, my first response upon learning this news should not be instant retaliation. It's much better to go in with a plan.

However, after the meetings we’ve had here, it has made me realize that I might be necessary to act as soon as possible, and be willing to stand up to higher-ups. In the time it takes to make a decision about if it’s worth it to act against an unethical decision the company has made, the company could already implement that idea or put that product into production, at which point it could already be too late. If you know that an unethical practice is occurring at the firm you’re working in which could bring harm to others, it’s your responsibility to speak up about it, and try to prevent it. If you can’t prevent it, then it’s your duty to speak up about it, to prevent others from getting harmed by a dangerous product.

**3) What ethical issue was discussed during your meeting?   How did the ethical considerations introduced by your class differ from your own?   How were they alike?   Was your class able to come to a consensus on what the most "ethical" decision would be?**

We talked in our groups about what you would do in different ethical situations, and the scenario came up where a company’s product has a significant security problem which is found by you. The question was how do you communicate the security issue, do you contact the company, the public, or both? Thinking through this, it seemed dangerous to release the information straight to the public because others could exploit the security problem before it could be fixed. However, if you decide to only inform the company, they might not fix it.

Our class decided that the best middle ground is likely to tell the company first, wait for them to act, and if no action is taken to inform the public. It’d be difficult to gauge how long you should wait before informing the public, but that’s much more circumstantial.

We introduced some ethical considerations I had not thought about in the past. Things such as, if companies get away with unethical practices, those practices could continue past your time at the company, meaning that even if you decide to leave the firm because of unethical practices, that will not stop that company from continuing them. It’s a good idea to report the incident, either publicly or to a government entity regulating specific products the company produces.

**4)  Reflect on the "Virtue of Ethics" as it relates to the case study your group discussed.    Choose three of the six virtues that you feel are most related to your case study and briefly write about them.   Why did you choose the three you did?   How are they relevant to the case study?   Why are the other virtues less relevant?   Is there another ethical virtue you feel could apply to your case study that is NOT included in the "Virtue of Ethics? "   Why or why not?**

Our study focused on a scenario where the company you work for is planning on releasing a new medical product to many hospitals. During testing, its revealed that the product has a flaw which could cause the death of 1 of every 1000 patients which use it. However, the product also has the potential to save many lives. The company plans to go forward with production despite the flaw, and not release the details of the flaw.

The virtues which most closely relate to this scenario are Honesty, Responsibility, and Integrity.

Honesty is important in this case because it is important to be honest with the hospitals and patients about the risks of the products, so they can make a more informed decision about what solutions are best for the patients, and to maintain a good relationship between the company and the hospitals.

Responsibility is relevant to this study because if the hospital decides to use the product to help the patient without being informed about the risks, and at the same time having a better alternative if the risks were considered, then the responsibility for harm to the patient falls on the company for not informing the doctors about the risks of the product.

Finally, integrity is important to this case study as it is to all ethical and moral dilemmas, because if you can’t expect a company to have integrity, then there can’t be any trust that they will maintain ethical practices in the future.

The other virtues are less relevant because they aren’t the crux of the dilemma here. Self-discipline has nothing to do with the important information that hospitals need to know. Charity simply is not a theme of this study at all.