Mike Moceri
IPRO 323
Ethics Report
November 11, 2009

IPRO 323's project is to design a zero energy community.  This project statement is fairly flexible in its interpretation as to what a community consists of and how to go about reaching the goal of net zero energy.  This flexibility allowed for a wide variety for design options regarding the building, site, and systems designs.   While such flexibility is great for exhausting options and learning about a lot of different technologies, team members of this IPRO had a conflict in efficiently choosing systems and producing the necessary calculations we feel are required for a successful final IPRO day presentation.

The first way team members are able to relate to each other in a manner that is far, equitable and honest is to not separate the members into subgroups based solely on their major.  The underlying purpose of an IPRO is to help foster the necessary 'real' life experience of interdisciplinary work that all of us will encounter upon graduation and entering the work force.  By mixing team members into group containing the various majors it produces a fair and equitable environment.  It reduces the risk of particular majors working on only material they are comfortable with.  While it is a good thing if a member can help with their previous background there would be no growth if a team member doesn't contribute to something outside of their major.

 Also, if subgroups are made up of only members from one major honesty issues can arise.  The only option other groups have is to trust the information another group is presenting.  If someone without the common knowledge required for a particular subgroup is present they act as a check for the other members, making sure their information is in fact true and valid. Ex, engineering students could present figures that require calculations but instead of doing them because they won't be caught they present

arbitrary figures, or architecture designs elements could be aided purely for aesthetic reasons but non architecture students wouldn't know the difference.

An ethical challenge that is imbedded in this IPRO is the inherent work structure it requires. There are basically two sides to designing this zero energy community; the technology aspect and the architectural design. We initial formed groups based on major, most architecture students were in the design subgroup while the engineering and aerospace students took the task of researching and calculating the various technologies we used. This seems like the most efficient way, put team members on the task they are most familiar with. However, this limited our possible solutions because we all went into the project with our already acquired knowledge where as it would have been more beneficial to tackle the problem with an open mind and no preconceptions of what the final project would be.

This structure resulted in a lack of results from all groups, so midway through the semester we changed some of the groups to mix majors to push each other to gain the information required by the project.

While IPRO 323 didn't necessarily have many issues that ethically could have cause harm or the feeling of unfairness to team members it did have a problem with structuring subgroups in a manner that would effectively produce results.