DECEMBER, 1977

Professional Activities

A professional activities meeting is held on the second Wednesday of every month at the ITT Conference Center, 500 Washington Ave., Nutley, N.J. Discussions cover professional activities, working conditions, engineering surplus, salary, benefits, pensions, employment, etc.

Call Richard Tax (201) 391-9075 after 7 PM for additional information.

Student Night

The North Jersey Power Engineering Society will sponsor the 10th Annual Student Night at New Jersey Institute of Technology (formerly Newark College of Engineering) on Thursday, December 8, 1977.

Students from several colleges in the area will be invited to participate in the program outlined below:

4:30 PM — Tour: Electric Dispatch Center

7:00 PM — Speaker: A representative from PSE&G's personnel department will discuss "Your Job Interview: How to Plan and Prepare for it".

Students attending the tour will meet at the 80 Park Place entrance of the PSE&G building at 4:30.

Fetal Monitoring

“Advances in Fetal Monitoring” will be discussed at the January 4, 1978 meeting of the Metropolitan New York Chapter of the IEEE Group on Engineering in Medicine and Biology. Speakers at the meeting will be R. Trimby and J. Geisel of Hewlett-Packard, Waltham, Mass.


RESERVE MARCH 8, 1978
FOR SECTION BANQUET
SPOTLITE ON NORTH JERSEY

Do you belong to the Mob? No, not that Mob? Remember when you were in High School? There was a group of class leaders and there was the rest of the mob. Were you a class officer, athlete, musician, club member? Or did you occupy your time with non-school activities? Certainly there's nothing wrong with that and we each go in the direction that our talents and interests take us. But when you think back about those days do you have a vague feeling that you missed something by not being a member of the "in" group?

Do you have the same feeling about IEEE? When you talk about IEEE do you unconsciously think about "them" or do you think about "me". To paraphrase Pogo "We have met IEEE and they are US". Did you ever think that there is really no such thing as "IEEE"? You can't go anywhere and shake hands with "IEEE". Those initials are only a symbol for a collection of individuals who share a common interest. IEEE is a phantom, a spirit, an idea. It is a spirit from which you can gain strength and help but only if you are plugged in. So how do you get plugged in? One of the easiest ways is to become active in our North Jersey Section.

We have three groups of activities that you might consider. If you are an aspiring politician or administrator you might consider running for one of the elective offices. If you are socially inclined, consider one of these Standing Committees:

- Program
- Awards
- Education
- Nominating
- Membership
- Student Activities
- Group Coordination
- Publicity
- Publications
- History and Procedures
- Metropolitan Section Advisory Council
- Intersociety Relations
- Professional Activities
- Young Engineers' Committee
- Student Representative

And if you want to take a more active part in technical activities, these local chapters can help you get started:

- G-3/17 Antennas and Propagation/Microwave Theory and Techniques
- G-5/18/28/29 Multigroup
- G-7 Reliability
- S-16 Computer Society
- S-19 Communications Society
- S-23 Control Systems Society
- S-31 Power Engineering Society

We can't go back to high school but if you want to do more than just be part of the mob now, here's your chance. If you're not sure how to get started, call me at 465-2316.

D. G. Bathke
USAB Proposes Ethics Implementation Procedure

The IEEE has commenced action which if approved will lead the Institute to a unique and pioneering position with respect to adherence to high standards of ethical conduct. The Institute has adopted, as a primary objective, the establishment of procedures and mechanisms for supporting IEEE members who abide by the Code of Ethics and for taking appropriate action against those who violate the Code. If implemented, this would place the IEEE in an unusual position regarding the upholdng of high ethical standards because few, if any, organizations have mechanisms for support of a member who has run into employment difficulties because of adherence to a Code of Ethics.

The IEEE and its predecessor societies have subscribed to a Code of Ethics since 1912; however, over this period of time little attention has been given to the administration of the Code. With the advent of the USAB, the IEEE found a new awareness for the professional needs of its membership. In its efforts at enhancement of the profession and of fulfilling the needs of engineering professionals, the USAB recommended to the IEEE Board of Directors that a revised Code of Ethics be adopted to provide a more effective framework for the establishment of procedures for dealing with matters of ethical conduct.

In this context, the new policy statement on Ethics was submitted by USAB, and approved by the IEEE Board of Directors on September 23, 1976. The approved IEEE Policy Statement on Involvement in Matters of Ethical Conduct stated:

A. Infractions of the Institute’s Code of Ethics by members, when reported to and investigated and evaluated by the Board of Directors, or its designated representative, are subject to appropriate action by the Institute’s Board of Directors, on the basis of procedures established by that body.

B. Members who are placed in jeopardy as a consequence of adherence to the Institute’s Code of Ethics may be offered assistance, provided that, in the opinion of the Board of Directors, or its designated representative, such assistance is warranted.

The USAB Task Force accepted this mandate from the IEEE Board of Directors and commenced to formalize procedures for accomplishing both of the proposals (A & B). The Task Force consequently developed the mechanisms to accomplish the goals and prepared them for presentation to the IEEE Board of Directors.

Dr. Stephen Kowel, Chairman, Ethics Task Force, presented the Task Force’s proposals to the Board of Directors at its July 1977 meeting. The Board considered the motions and decided that the issues needed further review before action was taken. The Board postponed a decision on the Ethics motions until a later meeting at which time legal counsel would be available for consultation and at which time the Ethics proposals would have been sent to RAB, TAB, PUB, and EAB for analysis and comment.

As indicated before, these are pioneering steps for IEEE. Organizations have long been quick to censure or expel a member who breached the Code of Ethics; however, the IEEE will be taking new steps to enhance high standards of ethical conduct by providing a mechanism for support of a member placed in jeopardy because of adherence to the high ethical standards established by IEEE. This is a unique posture and one that takes a much more positive step toward a responsibility to protect the safety, health and welfare of the public and to speak out against abuses in those areas affecting the public interest. The precedent was set when IEEE filed the amicus curiae brief in connection with the BART case. In this context, the IEEE can now further enhance its position as a stalwart proponent of adherence to only the highest professional Code of Ethics by approving the implementation procedures proposed by the USAB Task Force.

(Returned from “Electrical Engineering”. October, 1977, No. 72, page 2D.)

Letters To The Editor

Thirty-one years ago I became an active student member in a technical society called the American Institute of Electrical Engineers because I was embarking on a profession, electrical engineering. The Webster’s dictionary defines a “Profession” as an occupation requiring advanced training in some liberal art or science as teaching, engineering, medicine, law or theology. That technical society provided the professional growth I needed to advance within my chosen profession.

In the 1960’s the AIEE was swallowed up by the Institute of Radio Engineers (IRE) with the net effect that the one time leadership of a profession has been replaced with back-biting, electronic technicians, consultants, academians and unionists who have as their prime concern union and government contracts with little concern for IEEE’s responsibility for technical advancements. The 1970’s brought the IEEE member USAB and the PAC which are said to be fighting for professionalism.

In the September issue of the Newsletter, the North Jersey Section’s PAC chairman told us that professionalism is “fighting wage busting, salary compression, age discrimination, poor pensions, unemployment and underemployment”, as he recommends who we should elect as IEEE president, vice-president and region 1 director. Perhaps the current leadership of IEEE will give us a new definition of “professionalism” to match that proposed by PAC. I personally take offense to having to contribute $10 per year to have USAB promote this new definition of “professionalism”.

While I remain concerned about the unemployed and underemployed engineers, I recognize that service to these engineers as an ancillary service, which was always provided first through the AIEE and recently through the Power Engineering Society.

We are fortunate that our PAC chairman realizes that the new definition of professionalism is splitting the IEEE. In this finding we agree. There are two viable options for the IEEE; either provide professional leaders who will lead us back to technical advancement, or resplit our organizations. Perhaps there is sufficient old stationary around that we can resume.
our former identification, AIEE and IRE. After more than thirty active years in our organization, I favor the separation which would allow both definitions of professionalism to exist and prosper.

Norman A. Bleshman, P.E.
Jr. Past Chairman,
North Jersey Section IEEE
Former Chairman, Power & Industrial Div.
N.Y. Section, IEEE

Dear Mr. Vaccari:
The item, “Quantity Instead of Quality: Engineering Shortage?” presented in the October 1977 IEEE Newsletter seems out of place in this publication, at least when presented without editorial disclaimer. It appears to me to be a very controversial article. Much of the data presented is, at best, opinion and inference; certainly it is not supported by the type of uncontroversial facts engineers are schooled to use. Moreover, the possibility of data being less than statistically accurate is not even recognized. The nature of questions in the “Feedback Card” corroborates this biased approach, e.g., question No. 1 presumes an “either, or” response when at least another group of replies relating to “quality” and discipline are very much part of the issue. Accordingly, I have replied rather negatively to what might have been a useful survey.

In closing let me urge that if such controversial topics are to be presented in the future in our North Jersey “Newsletter”, that appropriate introductory comments precede the item to alert busy readers to the type of presentation to follow.

C.B. Sharp

New 1978 Officers
Announced By IEEE

Election results for 1978 officers have been announced by the IEEE. The President will be Dr. Ivan A. Getting, President of Aerospace Corporation.

He defeated Mr. Irwin F. Feorst in the third contested election held by the Institute. Dr. Getting will succeed Dr. Robert M. Saunders, Professor of Electrical Engineering at the University of California—Irvine.

Elected Executive Vice President is Dr. C. Lester Hogan, who defeated Mr. Carleton A. Bayless for this office.

Donald T. Hess, chairman of the Tellers Committee of IEEE, announced that the new incoming president had received 28,161 votes and Mr. Feorst received 21,752 votes.

The incoming Executive Vice President received 24,793 votes. Mr. Bayless received 24,644 votes.

There were three Constitutional amendments on the ballot. Proposition One, which calls for submission of all board-nominated candidates for office by May 1 of each year and all petition candidates by June 1, instead of July and August as now specified, received 40,197 votes in favor, or 79 percent, and 7,852 votes opposed, or 16 percent. It passed.

Proposition Two, which proposed changes in the Regional representation of the Board of Directors so that there will be seven geographical Regions, six of them in the United States, and the seventh comprising all other areas, did not carry. The votes were 21,337 in favor or 42 percent, and 26,924 opposed, or 53 percent.

Position Three, which provides for concurrence of any dues or assessment increase by a simple majority vote on a ballot to members, did not carry. The votes were 27,733 in favor, or 55 percent, and 21,492 opposed, or 42 percent.

Others elected to IEEE offices included the following:

- Director of Region 1, Northeastern states, Dr. James E. Shepherd, a computer applications and communications consultant.
- Director of Region 3, Southeastern states, Mr. Roy H. Harris, of Western Electric Company, Inc.
- Director of Region 5, Southwestern States, Professor Darrell L. Vines, of Texas Tech University.
- Director of Region 7, Canada, Mr. E. F. Glass, of Westinghouse Canada, Ltd.
- Director of Region 9, Latin America, Mr. Carlos Rivera-Abrams, of Puerto Rico Water Resources Authority.

Divisional Directors, representing groups and societies, elected include the following:

- Division I, Dr. Robert E. Larsen, of Systems Control, Inc.
- Division III, Professor Mischa Schwartz, of Columbia University.
- Division V, Dr. Richard E. Merwin, of the U.S. Army Ballistic Missile Defense Program Office.
- Division VII, Mr. Walter F. Fee, of Northeast Utilities Service Company.

STATEMENT OF OWNERSHIP, MANAGEMENT AND CIRCULATION


CIRCULATION STATEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Average Prec.</th>
<th>Issue Nearest Filing Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Copies Printed</td>
<td>4882</td>
<td>4900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid Circulation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Than Mail Subscriptions</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>· Mail Subscriptions</td>
<td>4691</td>
<td>4702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Paid Circulation</td>
<td>4691</td>
<td>4702</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Distribution</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Distribution</td>
<td>4734</td>
<td>4735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Use, Left-Over, Unaccounted, Spoiled</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>4882</td>
<td>4900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IEEE Submits To Congress Position On Renegotiation

The Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, Inc. (IEEE) submitted to Senator William Proxmire and Representative Joseph G. Minish its position on the Renegotiation Act of 1951, and the amendments thereto, which were sponsored by these two legislators. The IEEE renegotiation position was adopted under the previously approved policy statement promoting increased investment in the national Research and Development effort.

The Renegotiation Board was established in 1951 to recoup "excess" profits realized by government contractors during the Korean War, and has been extended for 26 years. Opponents of the Act have argued that the Government Procurement Techniques of today are sophisticated enough to prohibit excess profits, and that the Board is an unnecessary and costly deterrent to potential contractors. The Cranston-Lugar measure, which was adopted by the Senate Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs Committee on September 15th by a vote of 8-6, would deactivate the Board except in time of national emergency when an Executive Order could reinstate the Renegotiation Process.

The IEEE position voiced concern that the Renegotiation Board, and legislative proposals which would establish renegotiation on a product line basis, reduced corporate funds available for Research and Development. The position stated that "IEEE feels it is in our national interest to facilitate and promote R&D funding in all product line areas regardless of the state of profit or loss which that product line might currently represent." Further, IEEE called for the exemption from the Renegotiation process of "any profits invested into an intracorporate pool for independent research and development, to be allocated at the discretion of the company. Further, we feel that such a funding pool should be independent from those R&D costs deemed allowable under federal contracts, and that the level of similar federal funding should not be reduced as a result of the establishment of such an intracorporate R&D pool."

In our October 1977 issue of this Newsletter we published an article "QUANTITY INSTEAD OF QUALITY: Engineering Shortage?" and a Feedback Card. The Feedback Card questions, answers, and results follow. Comments and letters that accompanied the returns are also included.

PAC NEWS

PAC FEEDBACK CARD RESPONSE - Oct. 1977

1. I believe there is a:  Shortage of engineers. — 15.2%  Surplus of engineers. — 80.4%
2. Would a discussion on the "Supply-Demand for Engineers" be of interest to you?  Yes 84.8%  No 13%  Don't know 2.2%
3. Should your Professional Activities Committee schedule a meeting to discuss Supply and Demand for Engineers?  Yes - 87%  No - 6.5%
4. Will you attend this meeting?  Yes - 76.1%  No - 15.2%
5. Do you believe that PAC and USAB news is of importance to you?  Yes - 93.5%  No - 4.3%
6. Would you like to see the coverage of PAC/USAB news continued in this Newsletter?  Yes - 93.5%  No - 2.2%
7. This Newsletter is published 11 times per year. How many issues do you read per year?  a. 0-2 2.2%  b. 3-5 0%  c. 6-8 17.4%  d. 9-11 78.3%

COMMENTS RELATED TO THE QUESTION 1.

Comment: Depends on what you call an engineer. -- Member  Reply: Since our discussion involves education, I assume discussing engineers with a minimum of a bachelor's degree in engineering. This does not include holders of a Bachelor of Engineering Technology degree since IEEE recognizes them as para-professionals and not as engineers. Apparently the engineering schools agree since BET degree credits are not transferable to the engineering curriculum.

Comment: Quite a few of the engineers I know are sorry they ever got into it. Counseling needs to be overhauled. Some have it, some do not. J. M.  Reply: I agree. After reviewing much of the student recruiting material it is most obvious that the high school student and their counselors have been shown only one side of the coin. Those that are sorry might expend some energy toward soliciting the aid of their congressman to bring more R&D funds to N. J. This will be difficult since such a thorough job was done convincing the government that there is a shortage of engineers and they believe there are few engineers available to utilize these funds.

Comment: I believe there is a shortage of qualified engineers. I've been involved in interviewing and hiring EEs for many years, and finding other than mediocre ones is extremely difficult. I couldn't care less how many poor engineers are out of work. J. V. L.  Reply: I presume you are directing your remarks toward graduate engineers. If the engineers you interview are mediocre, you might consider these points.
The following letter was received.

Dear Sirs:

Since you requested additional comments, here are mine. I would like to see all PAC/USAB activities dropped by the IEEE. My only interest in IEEE is as a technical society. I prefer to separate my professional interests from your political ones. I happen to feel that the law of supply and demand should have their impact on the market place — in contrast to the implied position being taken by Mr. Alpern that the supply should be controlled — I presume by restrictive procedures devised by the NSPE. Sincerely, B. J. B. — Senior Member.

Although I cannot agree with you in all cases, you do bring some interesting points into view.

First, PAC/USAB activity will only be discontinued if the majority of the members act to revise the constitution and delete professional activities. I doubt that this will happen. Members are now too aware and this is a plus. I believe PAC/USAB will not only benefit the profession, but the electrical and electronics industry as well. Both the engineer and the industry are important and they cannot be separated just as technical, educational, and professional activities are inseparable. Each affects the other.

I do agree that the law of supply and demand should have an effect in a free market place but do we have a free market place for engineers? Mr. Alpern addresses “Engineer Shortage Propaganda”, its effects on the profession and the public, evidence of oversupply, and erroneous predictions by EMC that are aimed at the high school student.

If Mr. Alpern is correct, should we sweep his findings under the rug? If we do then we contribute to an artificial market, a market controlled by propaganda and not the free market you espouse. Squelching reports such as this defeat a free economy and further, permit the deception of young high school students to continue.

There is much evidence to support the engineer oversupply syndrome. Wage-busting, salary compression, poor pensions (the golden carrot), age discrimination, unemployment, under-employment, bull pens and poor working conditions for engineers are all indicators of a surplus and not a shortage.

Mr. Alpern does not imply that controls should be imposed by NSPE to restrict entry into the profession. He does, however, stress that erroneous predictions by EMC be discontinued, that the existing controls through propaganda be removed. He implies that the professional societies and practitioners take an active part in preventing this propaganda from continuing to permeate our society.

The entire picture, both sides, all the facts and evidence must be made public if a free market is to exist. We have you to approach this condition. I believe Milton Alpern has made a significant contribution toward this goal. He is to be commended for this accomplishment. Sincerely, R. F. T — Senior Member.

Summary

The response to the Feedback Card was quite poor, but typical of the general response to previous Newsletter Feedback Cards. In this case, only 46 responses were tabulated with 4 more arriving too late to be counted. This response was just over 1% of our total section membership of 4620.

As a comparison, we had 55 votes cast in our 1976 section election and 95 votes counted in this years section election. It looks like we must make some changes. The members of your Executive Committee are very much concerned. This “isn’t a one way gap”. (See November 1977 issue, page 2, “SPOTLITE”)

The lack of interest is indeed quite unfortunate. In this example each individual return carried more than 2% of the total response. This is significant. It is indicative of how very valuable each active member can be. Active members can play a very important role in the IEEE in North Jersey and better serve themselves, their family, their associates and the profession.

Of the members responding, 76% indicated that they would attend a meeting focused on Supply and Demand. Therefore, we will schedule a meeting to deal with the subject. Mr. Alpern has agreed to participate. He would like this discussion to be productive and so would your Professional Activities Committee. To assure success we will require membership participation to set up this meeting, invite local and state representatives, student counselors and members of the press. Membership attendance will be very important at this and all of our meetings. Attendance at these meetings means you care and are concerned. We will do our part, the rest is up to you.

The year is at its end. I sincerely wish we could have accomplished something more. To all those that have responded, you have our appreciation for your participation and your interest. To ALL, you have our best wishes for a HAPPY HOLIDAY AND A BETTER NEW YEAR.