

2010
NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS
MILTON F. LUNCH ETHICS CONTEST
(Fact Situation)

FACTS

Two professional engineers with similar backgrounds and competencies in the same discipline are assigned to the same project because of time constraints and other factors, but are given responsibility for different parts of the project. Engineer A, a PE with experience in electrical engineering, prepares, designs, and stamps the design documents for which he is responsible and Engineer B, a PE with expertise in electrical engineering, prepares, designs, and stamps the design documents for which he is responsible. The project and design documents are released for construction. A change in project scope requires revision to a subset of design documents. Both Engineer A and Engineer B make their respective changes and revise the design documents for which they are responsible.

It is the practice of the company that the engineers work requires a professional engineer to manually "initial" the revision block of the drawing being revised, identifying the responsible engineer. Engineer A delays release of his revisions which causes completed revisions by Engineer B to also be held until all design documents are ready to be released. Management strongly encourages Engineer A to complete his work so that all design documents can be released. Engineer A completes his work at a point in time when neither Engineer B nor immediate management is available. In completing his work at the behest of management, Engineer A makes minor changes to design documents prepared and revised by Engineer B without consulting with Engineer B.

It is understood that Engineer A was technically competent to make the revisions of Engineer B's work.

QUESTION

Was it unethical for Engineer A to make minor changes to design documents prepared and revised by Engineer B without consulting with Engineer B?

NSPE CODE REFERENCES

(To be submitted by the contestant(s). Use NSPE Code of Ethics references only.)

DISCUSSION

(To be submitted by the contestant(s). Use the BER format as used in the attached sample case.)

CONCLUSION

(To be submitted by the contestant(s).)

NOTE: *In order to maintain anonymity for purposes of judging, the actual body of the entry should not include any reference to the state society, chapter, member, student, university, or any other individual group(s) who submitted the entry. However, be sure to provide the name(s), address(es), email address(es), and phone number(s) of (1) your NSPE chapter or state society, and (2) each of the individual(s) responsible for submitting the entry, on a separate cover sheet accompanying your entry. Submissions failing to include this information will be returned to submitter(s) and will not be eligible for the contest.*