Aaron is a third year mathematics graduate student, and Professor Brown is one of the members of his thesis committee (not his advisor, but one who will scrutinize his thesis and decide the fate of his dissertation). Professor Brown is an associate editor of a well-known journal in his field and his job is to find anonymous reviewers for articles submitted to the journal. Reviewers are asked to carefully review the article and comment on the originality, scholarly merit, mathematical correctness/completeness, etc. Prof. Brown asks Aaron to review an article that was written by a colleague and old friend of his. In passing off the assignment, Prof. Brown hints that he'd really like to see a positive review of this one. Aaron reads the paper and finds that the article is not as good as it claims to be (overly restrictive assumptions, incomplete review of related works, generally sloppy writing, etc., etc.). How should he write his review of the paper? He is anonymous to the author but not Prof. Brown.

1. Write a vague and wishy-washy review of the paper. After all it's the editor's decision whether or not to publish it.
2. Write an objective negative review of the paper, clearly pointing out the deficiencies.
3. Write a short positive review and thank Professor Brown for the opportunity to be involved in the process.
4. Tell Prof. Brown that you're too busy to review this one, and suggest another student (who does not have him on their committee).
5. Other?

Kelly asks Chris Patel, a software engineer in Colossus's information technology department, to monitor the Web accesses and the information transmitted by the office workers. To analyze this voluminous amount of data, Chris recommends that Colossus purchase a data mining program from Chris's domestic partner Robin Finelli. An independent software contractor, Robin had developed this program while previously employed by Banana Computers, without the awareness of anyone at Banana Computers.

Please answer all of the following questions. There is no limit on the length of your response; use as much space as you wish.

- What ethical issues does this case raise?
- Who is affected by this case? What are their perspectives on the case?
- What actions might the characters consider to resolve the ethical issues?
- Among these actions, which should the characters choose? For what reasons?

Case B

Analyze the case below individually. Do not consult other students. Do not consult any references.

The executive editor of the *Journal of Wondrous Technology Research* asks Professor Randy Gonzales to review a manuscript from the laboratory of Professor Morgan Nelson. Examining the manuscript, Randy discovers that although the theoretical ideas are novel and promising, the manuscript has numerous flaws: the literature review is incomplete, the description of the experimental method is internally inconsistent, the illustrations lack labels, and the statistical analysis is incorrect. Randy plans to refer the manuscript to a third-year doctoral student, Dana Wong, to enable Dana to learn from the manuscript's mistakes, and to give Dana experience in reviewing a manuscript, an important professional duty. In addition, Randy thinks that two theoretical ideas in the Nelson manuscript might help Dana overcome some obstacles that have blocked Dana's research progress for the last three months. One idea indicates that Dana's current approach is likely to be fruitless, and a second idea suggests a different path for Dana to take. Randy had previously speculated that the theoretical ideas might be true.

Please answer all of the following questions. There is no limit on the length of your response; use as much space as you wish.

- What ethical issues does this case raise?
- Who is affected by this case? What are their perspectives on the case?
- What actions might the characters consider to resolve the ethical issues?
- Among these actions, which should the characters choose? For what reasons?

Michael C. Loui
Purdue University and University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, mloui@purdue.edu

Michael C. Loui is the Dale and Suzi Gallagher Professor of Engineering Education at Purdue University. He was previously a professor of electrical and computer engineering and University Distinguished Teacher-Scholar at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. At Illinois he served as an associate dean of the Graduate College and as the campus's research integrity officer. He directed the theory of computing program at the National Science Foundation from 1990 to 1991. Loui currently serves as editor of the Journal of Engineering Education *and as a member of the editorial boards of* College Teaching *and* Accountability in Research. *He is a Carnegie Scholar and an IEEE Fellow.*

Renata A. Revelo recently completed the PhD in education policy, organization, and leadership at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, with a concentration in higher education. She also earned BS and MS degrees in electrical and computer engineering there. Her research interests include engineering education, experiences of underrepresented students, identity development, student engagement, and mentoring.