



THE INSTITUTE OF
ELECTRICAL AND
ELECTRONICS
ENGINEERS, INC.

TECHNICAL ACTIVITIES BOARD
COMMITTEE ON SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS OF TECHNOLOGY

Columbia University
Mudd Engineering Building
Conference Room, 1306A

March 6, 1979

MINUTES OF THE MEETING*

1. Call to Order and Attendance

Chairman Unger called the meeting to order at 10:15 AM. Those present for all or part of the meeting were:

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Stephen H. Unger, Chmn. Pro Tem
Jack Andresen
R. J. Bogumil
David C. Cook
Richard Grow
Richard W. Harris
Richard J. Jerril

Joseph S. Kaufman
Victor Klig
Richard F. Koch
Frank Kotasek
Gerald Rabow
David Redfield
Naresh Sinha

VISITORS

Stella Lawrence

IEEE STAFF ATTENDEES

Joseph E. Baker, Jr.
Irving Engelson

(Staff Secretary)
(Manager, TAB Technical
Committees & Special
Projects)

Neil D. Pundit

(Staff Director, Technical
Activities)

2. Approval of January 6, 1979, Meeting Minutes

The Minutes of the January 6, 1979, CSIT meeting were approved with the following correction:

- a. Exhibit A, 4th line of paragraph (D), change "should" to "must."

*Unapproved; subject to confirmation.

3. CSIT Chairmanship

It was reported by Stephen Unger that his chairmanship of CSIT is somewhat in doubt, since TAB Chairman, Lester Hogan, who must approve the election of Unger as CSIT chairman, indicated that he preferred J. Malvern Benjamin to continue as Chairman of CSIT. This is somewhat ironic since previous TAB Chairman Eric Herz had suggested that CSIT should rotate its chairmanship. Benjamin subsequently spoke to Hogan when they met at the February TAB meeting in Atlanta, and apparently Hogan now seems willing to go along with Unger as CSIT Chairman.

Irving Engelson pointed out that to make the change in the CSIT Chairman from Benjamin to Unger official, it would have to appear in the Roster to be published by the IEEE staff upon notification by TAB Chairman Hogan. No such notification has yet been received.

The Committee decided unanimously to appoint a subcommittee consisting of Mal Benjamin to follow up on the confirmation.

ACTION
Benjamin

4. "Technology and Society"

Frank Kotasek reported that the September 1978, issue of "T & S" had been mailed. The December 1978, issue is expected to be mailed around April 1. This issue was delivered to IEEE February 1 for processing, but processing was not begun until three weeks later.

Unger suggested putting dates of delivery of "T & S" to IEEE into the CSIT Minutes. Further measures for calling attention to delays in processing "T & S" at IEEE were discussed, but the concensus was that measures were not warranted at the present time. Richard Jerril reported that Pilgrim Press had offered a lower price of publishing than IEEE's price, if Pilgrim Press could print all six issues.

Unger emphasized that "T & S" is looking for material to publish, and he called upon all CSIT members to submit articles and to solicit articles from other interested authors.

Engelson reported that hundreds of readers had returned the coupon printed in "T & S", many with comments. The coupon was ambiguously worded, leading some responcees to believe that they had to return the coupon to receive the '79 issues of "T & S." Engelson has ordered mailing label lists of the CSIT Newsletter subscribers. Since the CSIT meeting, Joseph Baker has mailed the coupons and the lists to Unger for appropriate action.

ACTION
Unger

Neil D. Pundit introduced the possibility that the CSIT Newsletter could be upgraded to magazine status. According to Pundit, the envisioned magazine would have to be published at least quarterly, with at least one technical article and 16 pages per issue.

5. IEEE Policy on Position Papers

Neil Pundit reported that a new policy on IEEE Position Papers and Entity Position Statements Policy 14 had been adopted by the IEEE Executive Committee and Board of Directors. The complete text was not available at the CSIT meeting, but on the basis of the information

that was available, a number of CSIT members expressed concern about the new policy. Pundit promised that the full text of Policy 14 would be made available for these Minutes, and it is included as Exhibit A.

EXHIBIT A

ACTION
COOK; OTHER
CSIT Members

The issue of Policy 14 will be brought up at the next CSIT Meeting. David Cook will prepare a proposal on Policy 14. It is asked that other CSIT members present inputs on Policy 14.

5. WG-SEPT

Because of the change in IEEE Position Paper Policy, the "CSIT Position Paper on the Applications of Systems Engineering to Societal Problems" was not taken up at the February TAB meeting. Gerald Rabow will present recommendations on how to proceed with this position paper in view of Policy 14, at the next meeting of CSIT.

ACTION
Rabow

6. Energy Committee Representative

David Redfield reported that he had been nominated IEEE representative on the Photovoltaic Advisory Committee to the Department of Energy.

Redfield stated that the Energy Committee has issued a revised (and strengthened) policy statement on solar energy.

The Energy Committee is also considering a policy statement on fission breeder reactors; Redfield is the only one there against them.

ACTION
Redfield,
Balabanian

According to Redfield, an important pending issue is the solar power satellite. The solicitation of articles on this subject for "T & S" was suggested.

7. Ethics Cases

Stephen Unger reported the continuing difficulty in obtaining the publication of the Edgerton Report; see Exhibits B & C. Exhibit C is a letter Unger is submitting for the Forum section of Spectrum. No action has been taken on the article that Unger submitted to Spectrum. Computer Magazine will not publish the Edgerton Report on space grounds, but advised a letter to the editor plus putting the Report in their paper depository. Unger had done that.

EXHIBITS B
& C

In the other case originally investigated by the CSIT Ethics Committee, the patent case, Unger reported that the draft report by Fairman is not supporting the individual involved.

8. CSIT Award

The CSIT Award for Outstanding Service in the Public Interest will be presented to Virginia Edgerton at Electro '79 on April 24, 1979. The presentation will take place at 1 PM, preceding a panel discussion at 2 PM on the subject of "The Engineer and Public Policy," in which Ms. Edgerton will participate; see Exhibit D. (In a change of plans, Unger will not be on the panel). The CSIT Award will be listed in the Electro '79 program.

EXHIBIT D

Potential invitees for the award presentation were discussed. Suggested names include IEEE President Suran; Executive Vice President Leo Young; Past IEEE Presidents Saunders, Guarrera and Stern; Chairman of Past IEEE Member Conduct Committee Fairman; IEEE Director Emeritus Emberson; and N.Y.C. Police Commissioner McGuire. An award is also to be made by USAB to Hans Cherney; it was suggested and agreed by all that it would be a good idea to make the Cherney award at the same session as the Edgerton award. Jeff Bogumil will try to arrange this.

ACTION
Bogumil

9. Next Meeting of CSIT

It was decided to have the next CSIT meeting on Tuesday, April 24, 1979, at Electro '79. A split session was suggested, starting prior to the award session and continuing after the panel session. This would provide adequate time and allow having the topics which would appeal to a larger number of visitors following the panel discussion.

10. Award Funds

The award to Ms. Edgerton will be a certificate plus \$750. Funds in the award account are presently \$180. David Cook reported that the IEEE Nuclear and Plasma Sciences Society (NPS) will contribute \$300. J. Malvern Benjamin has approached the IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Society (AES) and the IEEE Electrical Insulation Society (IE) for contributions. Jack Andresen will approach the Professional Activities Committees for contributions.

ACTION
Andresen

Chairman Unger asked CSIT members to contribute. Checks should be made to the IEEE Foundation, Inc., Account # 325.3, and sent to Joseph Kaufmann; Bell Laboratories; Room 3B-526; Holmdel, NJ 07733.

ACTION
Kaufman; Other
CSIT Members

It was reported that Joseph Dillon, President of the IEEE Foundation, might oppose withdrawal of funds from the account for the award. It was observed that CSIT had all the necessary approvals to make the award. The action agreed on is that Kaufman will call Richard Emberson to resolve this problem.

ACTION
Kaufman

11. IEEE Employee Committee

A motion to approve the Draft Proposal on IEEE Employee Committee (Exhibit B of January 6, 1979, Minutes of CSIT Meeting) was carried unanimously. The phrase "including Intersociety Employment Guidelines" was added to the Draft, so that its third last sentence now reads "They should be willing to devote the time to acquaint themselves with the state of the art of enlightened employment practices, the desires of the IEEE membership, and the Intersociety Employment Guidelines."

Gerald Rabow is to draft a covering letter for submitting the proposal to the IEEE Executive Committee (with a copy to Eric Herz, the Executive Director), and Stephen Unger will sign it. The proposal is also to be published in T & S.

ACTION
Rabow, Unger,
Balabanian

12. International Traffic in Arms Regulation (ITAR)

It was reported that Mal Benjamin had brought up this subject at the last TAB meeting, and that Robert Lucky had suggested that CSIT look into the matter. Richard Harris volunteered to investigate the subject and write an article for "T & S." It was suggested that he contact Larry Stine (Chairman, W/G-Information Technology) for inputs. It was noted that this topic also falls in the sphere of W/G-National Security, whose chairman is Otto Friedrich.

ACTION
Harris

Frank Kotasek observed that ITAR is similar to the Soviet law under which Shcharansky was convicted.

13. Relation with Professional Activities Committees (PAC's)

Jack Andresen will provide liaison with the PAC's. There is a national PAC workshop. Joel Snyder is the PAC coordinator in Regions and Divisions.

ACTION
Andresen

14. Congressional Fellows

It was reported that Joel Snyder sent a letter re appointment of one of the CSIT candidates to the Congressional Fellows Selection Committee. Jack Andresen reported that there is a conflict of interest problem in having a company paying half the salary of an employee serving as a fellow. It might be preferable to have companies contribute to the salaries on a pool basis.

15. Conferences

Richard Jerril observed that the SMC meeting, October 8-10, 1979, in Denver, on Cybernetics and Society, might be a source of new contacts for the Western CSIT.

The Edison Centennial Symposium, April 1-4, in San Francisco, on Technology and the Human Prospect, is by invitation, plus \$100. Hilton Brown of the Energy Committee will represent IEEE. Jerrill will send an invitation to Robert Burdu in San Francisco.

ACTION
Jerril

16. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 3:30 PM.

Gerald Rabow, Secretary
April 11, 1979

NEW POLICY STATEMENT 14

(Adopted at IEEE ExecCom and BoD meetings, February 14-17, 1979)

NEW SECTION 14 - IEEE POSITION PAPERS
AND ENTITY POSITION STATEMENTS14.1 - Objectives

The Institute recognizes the need for public statements on topics within the scope and purposes of IEEE. Such statements and papers can provide timely information to the public, media and public agencies.

Such statements and papers can be developed and used primarily by an individual IEEE entity, under the title of "Entity Position Statement," or they may be developed with a broader Institute-wide base in mind under the title of "IEEE Position Paper."

Although these guidelines are designed primarily to provide a consistent and formalized basis for the preparation and issuance of IEEE Position Papers, the Institute encourages those IEEE entities developing their own position documents to follow these guidelines. Entity Position Statements may then be carried further to become IEEE Position Papers, as appropriate, without time consuming revision.

14.2 - Definition of Terms

The following definitions of terms are provided:

- A. An IEEE Entity is a formally-constituted body within IEEE. An entity has a formally adopted and approved Charter and/or scope and has a formal place within the hierarchical structure of IEEE. It is understood that the word "entity" as used in these guidelines will be replaced by the actual name of the entity in the actual position document developed.
- B. Entity Position Statement - A document, issued in the name of an entity, developed to express an opinion by an IEEE entity on a specific topic. This document should be subjected to a review procedure by the entity in accordance with Sections 14.3 and 14.4.
- C. IEEE Position Paper - A document, issued in the name of the Institute, developed to express a formal opinion by an IEEE entity on a specific topic. This document shall be subjected to a formal review procedure in accordance with Sections 14.5 through 14.8.

14.3 - Requirements to Issue
an Entity Position Statement

An Entity Position Statement may be prepared and issued by any entity of the IEEE provided that:

- A. The subject of the Entity Position Statement lies within the purposes of the IEEE as set forth in the IEEE Constitution, Bylaws, or Policies and Procedures.
- B. The subject of the Entity Position Statement lies within the approved scope of the entity developing and issuing the Entity Position Statement.

- C. The issuing entity specifies the need for and the intended use of a particular Entity Position Statement.
- D. The identity of the entity issuing the statement is given in the first sentence and the statement is signed and dated by the highest officer of that entity or, in the case of his unavailability, by a responsible officer acting in his name.
- E. The entity shall send a copy of the Entity Position Statement to the IEEE General Manager, upon issuance.
- F. When the Entity Position Statement has been approved and issued, it is recommended that it (or a suitable summary) be published in the issuing entity's newsletter or other publication.

14.4 - Procedure for Approval of
an Entity Position Statement

The completed Entity Position Statement may be issued when either of the two following conditions is met.

- A. The Entity Position Statement has been approved by the highest officer of that entity or, in the case of his unavailability, by a responsible officer acting in his name.
- B. The Entity Position Statement has been approved by a majority of the AdCom, OpCom, or other similar Executive Committee of the entity.

14.5 - Requirements to Issue an IEEE Position Paper

An IEEE Position Paper may be prepared and issued by any entity of the IEEE provided that:

- A. The subject of the IEEE Position Paper lies within the purposes of the IEEE as set forth in the IEEE Constitution, Bylaws, or Policies and Procedures.
- B. The subject of the IEEE Position Paper lies within the approved scope of the entity developing and issuing the IEEE Position Paper.
- C. The issuing entity specifies the need for and the intended use of a particular IEEE Position Paper, and follows the procedures set forth in these guidelines.
- D. The identity of the entity issuing the paper is given in the first sentence and the paper is signed and dated by the highest officer of that entity or, in the case of his unavailability, by a responsible officer acting in his name.
- E. The paper has been approved by the Chairman of the IEEE Major Board of which the entity is a part, and the IEEE Executive Committee.

14.6 - Preliminary Review and Approval of the Outline of an IEEE Position Paper

A. When an entity of IEEE has decided to develop one or more IEEE Position Papers, the highest officer of that entity is to report that action to the Chairman of the IEEE Major Board containing the entity (and, if applicable, the IEEE Director associated with that entity) and then provide a copy of the outline described in 14.6.B.

B. A terse outline shall be prepared, insofar as possible, which:

- (1) Describes the need for the contemplated IEEE Position Paper and any requirement for speed;
- (2) Describes the intended purpose of the IEEE Position Paper;
- (3) Indicates the scope of the IEEE Position Paper;
- (4) Sets forth the principal elements of the position to be taken.

C. The outline shall be circulated to all members of the IEEE Major Boards for their information.

D. The outline shall be submitted for approval to the Chairman of the IEEE Major Board of which the entity is a part.

14.7 - Preliminary Release of a Full-Length Draft of a Position Paper

A. If time is of the essence and approval of the outline has been obtained, a completed full-length draft Position Paper may be transmitted to a limited audience, e.g., a congressional committee, in the name of the issuing IEEE organization. The fact that this is a "draft" should be clearly noted along with the date of this version.

B. If a full-length draft Position Paper is transmitted outside the IEEE, a copy shall be sent to the IEEE General Manager.

14.8 - Procedure for Final Approval of an IEEE Position Paper

A. The completed IEEE Position Paper and a one-page Position Digest are to be sent to the Chairman of the applicable IEEE Major Board, who shall send them to all the members of that Board (and, as determined by the Chairman of that IEEE Major Board, to individuals named by the Chairman of any other IEEE Major Board or Committee). Suggested changes shall be incorporated or resolved between the parties concerned, if possible.

B. The final version of the IEEE Position Paper shall be issued as a paper of the IEEE when any of the following conditions is met:

- (1) The IEEE Position Paper has been approved by the Chairman of the IEEE Major Board of which the entity is a part, and by the IEEE Executive Committee.
- (2) The IEEE Position Paper has been approved by the Executive Committee, OpCom or other similar executive function authorized by the IEEE Major Board to grant approval, and by the IEEE Executive Committee.
- (3) A statistically significant polling of the originating entity's membership constituency indicates at least two-thirds support of the Position Paper, and approval is given by the Executive Committee, OpCom, or other similar executive function of the IEEE Major Board, and by the IEEE Executive Committee.

C. A copy of every approved IEEE Position Paper shall be sent to the IEEE General Manager at the time of issuance.

D. When an IEEE Position Paper is approved and issued, it (or a suitable summary) shall be published in an Institute-wide publication. (Should the issuing entity have a newsletter or other publication, it is recommended that the IEEE Position Paper also be published therein.) A listing of extant IEEE Position Papers shall be published periodically in an Institute-wide publication.

E. A review for current applicability shall be made by the approving IEEE Major Board at intervals of no longer than five years. Extension or interpretations may result from such reviews, as well as withdrawals.

14.9 - Character of the IEEE Position Paper

A. To the extent possible, the IEEE Position Paper should state what the issues are, the facts at issue, the conclusions drawn by the developers of the IEEE Position Paper, and the recommendations being made. An IEEE Position Paper need not contain conclusions nor recommendations, but may simply collect all of the key facts at issue for the edification of the members of the profession, the public, the media, or the public agencies.

B. Every attempt should be made to make an IEEE Position Paper statesmanlike, unemotional, and to give balanced treatment to all sides of the issue. Suggested formats for Outlines, one-page Position Digests, complete IEEE Position Papers, and Summaries are available from the Staff Secretary to each of the IEEE Major Boards, as well as the IEEE General Manager.



THE INSTITUTE OF
ELECTRICAL AND
ELECTRONICS
ENGINEERS, INC.

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT - PUBLICATIONS ACTIVITIES

PLEASE REPLY TO:
Robert W. Lucky
Bell Laboratories
600 Mountain Ave.
Murray Hill, NJ 07974
(201) 582-4131

February 28, 1979

Professor Stephen H. Unger
Columbia University
Department of Electrical Engineering
and Computer Science
Seeley W. Mudd Building
New York, N.Y. 10027

Dear Dr. Unger:

At its February 8 meeting, the IEEE Publications Board considered the proposal to publish, for the record, the proceedings of ethics cases coming before the IEEE Ethics Committee--specifically, the final reports of the committee concerning cases which it judges.

After comprehensive discussion, the Board voted that such publication should not be mandatory nor would such publication be generally appropriate. Among the factors the Board weighed was the non-archival nature of SPECTRUM.

Nevertheless, the Board felt that each case could be considered on its own merit as the basis for a potential article in SPECTRUM or for coverage by THE INSTITUTE.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Robert W. Lucky".

Robert W. Lucky
Vice President
Publication Activities

Publication of Reports on Ethics Support CasesFor the Forum section of IEEE Spectrum

2/17/79

Stephen H. Unger

Dept. of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science

Columbia University

According to 2 recently released reports by the Committee on Social Implications (MCC), IEEE member Virginia Edgerton was unprofessionally treated by New York City's Criminal Justice Steering Committee in 1977. She was peremptorily discharged as a result of her efforts to protect the public safety by alerting Committee members to the possibility that proposed additions to the load on the computer running the city's police car dispatch system would degrade the response time of that system.

A brief account of the case is in the December, 1978 issue of The Institute, where members were invited to write to the Technical Activities Board (TAB) office for copies of an issue of Technology and Society (a CSIT publication) in which the reports appear. Neither the Spectrum nor any other archival IEEE journal plans to print MCC reports as a matter of general policy, and, given the significance and particularly interesting nature of the Edgerton case, it is unlikely that any future cases will be judged more worthy of fuller coverage on their own merits.

I believe that this is a most unfortunate state of affairs, eroding, to a large extent, the foundation of the ethics support procedures embodied in bylaw 112. These are based on the publication and wide disseminations of carefully prepared reports documenting improper treatment of conscientious engineers. The following is a proposal for a practical policy that would achieve this, and a discussion of its justification.

The Proposal

In general, publish in Spectrum complete MCC reports on ethics support cases.

Where certain special considerations exist (e.g. the engineer involved might prefer anonymity) MCC or the Board of Directors might wish to suppress names and identifying information, or in some other way modify the published version. If a report is deemed to be excessive in length, perhaps 5 Spectrum pages might be set as a limit, then MCC (not the editors) might be asked to prepare an abbreviated version for publication. In that event, the full report should be available in a permanent repository where copies can be ordered by interested individuals.

Why should the output of this particular committee receive such special treatment by Spectrum? Would this not lead to other IEEE bodies demanding similar privileges, so that Spectrum would eventually be filled with financial statements, committee reports and publicity releases, thereby driving off both readers and advertisers?

There is, of course, no way to prevent other groups from requesting such treatment. Indeed some may be able to make sufficiently strong cases as to merit routine publication of certain of their documents. However, the arguments for handling MCC reports on support cases (censure cases are not being discussed here) are of a unique and compelling nature not easily matched. It should also be noted that the number of such reports expected to be issued annually is expected to be quite modest.

Rather than being reports or publicity releases describing the output of MCC, the ethics case reports, when published in a widely accessible journal, are the most important and fundamental output of the committee. Of what use is a report by MCC supporting the behavior of an ethical engineer, if its contents are made known only to a few people? Even if a brief summary of the conclusions is more widely publicized, it will carry little weight because the reader has little basis for evaluating the fairness of the procedure and insufficient information to understand what the case is about.

There are several goals that can be furthered by publication. First, to educate students, engineers and their employers in the area of ethics there is no substitute for accounts of real cases involving real, identifiable people and organizations. Having lectured in this area to both students and working engineers, I have been struck by the way descriptions of the BART case or the DC-10 disaster, for example, perk up the interest of an audience and stimulate discussion.

Second, publication of carefully prepared reports exposing improper treatment of ethical engineers can help deter repetitions by the same or other managers. This is an eminently civilized sanction in that its effectiveness is related directly both to the credibility of the investigation-publication process and to the severity of the abuse exposed, which each reader can judge for himself.

Third, such publication can effectively call attention to possible threats to the public as a whole, and hence can help minimize such threats, both in the case involved and in potential future cases, by making organizations more likely to pay attention to concerns expressed by engineers and less likely to allow narrow, short term considerations to override sound engineering practice.

Fourth, publication can often serve to help restore the professional reputation of an engineer who may have been unfairly maligned as a result of adherence to the ethics code under difficult circumstances.

4

A few words are in order concerning why summaries written by journalists are unlikely to be satisfactory even apart from the length factor. In order to be able to select the essential points, a deep understanding of all of the arguments and facts of a case is essential. Those who investigated a case or who were compelled to render and justify a judgement are far more likely to have this understanding than is a journalist starting from scratch and working under a deadline. Furthermore, the journalist, trained to produce an interesting "story" is likely to produce an unbalanced account, highlighting certain aspects and omitting supporting data. While such an account may be valuable in drawing attention to the situation, it is not sufficient for the purposes envisioned in the bylaws on which the support procedure rests.

A crucial element of the support procedure is to present IEEE members and other interested parties with a clear, balanced picture of the events that compel an IEEE committee to condemn the treatment meted out to a conscientious engineer. A journalistic summary, however well done cannot fully accomplish this function.

Background Information on the Forthcoming Presentation
of an Award for Outstanding Service in the Public
Interest to be made at ELECTRO '79

S.H. Unger 2/28/79

On April 24 at Electro '79, the IEEE Committee on Social Implications of Technology (CSIT) will present its second Award for Outstanding Service in the Public Interest to IEEE member Virginia Edgerton. Consisting of a certificate and \$750, the award recognizes engineers who have, in the course of their professional duties, acted to protect the public interest, particularly where such action was taken despite personal risk.

Ms. Edgerton, in her position as Senior Information Scientist in the employ of the Criminal Justice Coordinating Council of the City of New York, encountered a situation in May, 1977 that she judged might degrade the response time of SPRINT, the city's police car dispatching system. Should such a slow down occur, the delay in responding to emergency calls would, over a period of time, almost certainly result in lives being lost.

The basic problem was whether the computer on which SPRINT was running could also handle a second system PROMIS, a data processing system for prosecutors. Ms. Edgerton, who was involved in the installation of PROMIS, saw that no investigation had been made to determine if the increased load might slow down the operation of SPRINT. When she called this to the attention of Project Director Sarwar A. Kashmeri, who was her immediate supervisor, he rejected out of hand her proposal that a careful study be made of the problem. After repeated efforts to persuade him, and after he refused to consider a memorandum that she wrote on the subject, she sent copies to the membership of the CJCC, who constituted the next level of supervision. Mr. Kashmeri then (June 21, 1977) peremptorily discharged her on grounds of insubordination.

Appeals for a hearing addressed to District attorney Robert M. Morgenthau, CJCC Chairman, went unanswered. Ms. Edgerton applied to the IEEE for advice and assistance. She was referred to CSIT's Working Group on Ethics and Employment Practice. A committee consisting of R.J. Bogumil, J.S. Kaufman and S.H. Unger (Chairman) carefully investigated the case, concluding that Ms. Edgerton had been unprofessionally treated and that her "action (at considerable personal sacrifice) was in the highest tradition of professionalism in engineering". Subsequently the matter was referred to the newly founded IEEE Member Conduct Committee, chaired by J.F. Fairman, Jr., who reviewed the matter and further endorsed Ms. Edgerton's conduct. Their report was approved by the Executive Committee of the IEEE Board of Directors last fall and released for publication. This was the first case under IEEE's new bylaw designed to provide support for IEEE members placed in jeopardy by their adherence to the IEEE Code of Ethics. Both reports appear in full in issue No.22 of Technology and Society (published by CSIT), and a summary appears in the December, 1978 issue of The Institute.

There have since occurred several changes in the management of the PROMIS project (Mr. Kashmeri is no longer employed by the city) and it is not clear as to whether that system will ultimately share the same computer with SPRINT.

The award to Ms. Edgerton will be presented at a special session of Electro'79 to be held in room ____ of the Sheraton Center Hotel on Tuesday April 24 at 1:00PM. Subsequently, at 2:00PM of the same day, Ms. Edgerton will participate as a panelist in a session entitled "The Engineer and Public Policy: Servant, Guardian, Gadfly?".

The first IEEE CSIT Award for Outstanding Service in the Public Interest was presented last year at WESTCON to Max Blankensee, Robert Bruder, and Holger Hjortsvang for their efforts, as engineers in the BART system, to protect the public safety.

For further information

contact Dr. Stephen H. Unger
229 Cambridge Avenue
Englewood, N.J. 07631
phone (home) (201)567-5923
office (212)280-3107 or 3104

Copies of issue No.22 of Technology and Society can be obtained from the TAB office of IEEE (355 East 47th Street, NYC, NY 10017)