



AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Meeting

Meeting Report January 31 – February 1, 2013

This meeting of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition focused on the intersections of children's rights, science and technology. Participants learned about the rights of children set out in international declarations and treaties, including the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child, and how the children's rights approach differs from others with which scientists, engineers and health professionals who study or work with children may be most familiar. Panels and workshops explored cutting edge issues including: new opportunities and challenges for research on children's rights; urgent children's rights issues in the United States on which science and technology could have an impact; the positive and negative effects of the Internet for protecting children's rights; and the implications of children's rights for research ethics and professional responsibility.

Table of Contents

Opening Plenary: What are Children’s Rights?	4
Workshop: Children’s Rights in the United States	6
Workshop: Introduction to Science, Technology and Human Rights	7
Evening Plenary: Children’s Rights in Scientific Research.....	8
Workshop: Children’s Rights Online	10
Workshop: Human Rights Committees and Affinity Groups in Your Society.....	12
Closing Plenary: Researching Children’s Rights.....	13
Working Group Report: Welfare of Scientists	15
Working Group Report: Ethics and Human Rights	17
Working Group Report: Service to the STEM Community.....	19
Working Group Report: Service to the Human Rights Community	22
Working Group Report: Education and Information Resources	24
Committee Report: Outreach and Communication	27
Appendix: Session Evaluations.....	29
Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations.....	39

Acknowledgements

The [AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition](#) is a network of scientific and engineering associations, professional societies, academies, and other formal networks of scientists, engineers and health professionals. The Coalition is devoted to facilitating communication and partnerships on human rights within and across the scientific and engineering communities, and between these and human rights communities. The Coalition strives to improve human rights practitioners' access to scientific and technological information and knowledge and to engage scientists, engineers and health professionals in human rights issues, including those that involve the conduct of science. Launched in January 2009, the Coalition is currently comprised of 50 professional associations and scholarly societies and 70 affiliated individuals.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition
thanks the
American Educational Resource Association
American Physical Society
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
National Center for Science and Civic Engagement
for their support of this meeting

Opening Plenary: What are Children's Rights?

Jessica Wyndham ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)) commenced the meeting with an overview of the Coalition's recent work and future goals. With the addition of the [Association for Information Science and Technology](#), the Coalition's membership has now grown to 50 member and affiliated organizations. The Coalition's recent projects and activities have included: the establishment of [guidelines](#) for scientists and human rights organizations working on human rights projects; a special [event](#) with Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) Michael Posner entitled "Science and Academic Freedom in the Digital Age"; and the completion of the focus group process to better understand the meaning of the right to benefit from scientific progress ([Article 15](#), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). Wyndham went on to highlight recent member activities including the American Sociological Association's recognition of [Judith Blau](#) for their Distinguished Career Award; the American Psychological Association's addition of a human rights page to their [website](#); and human rights webinars hosted by the [American Chemical Society](#) and the [American Society of Civil Engineers](#). Future events of the Coalition include the development of a survey on how scientists and engineers define their social responsibilities and a report of the findings from the Article 15 focus groups. Wyndham announced that the next Coalition meeting will be held at AAAS headquarters in Washington, DC on July 11-12, 2013.

Martha Zaslow ([Society for Research on Child Development](#)) (SRCD) moderated the morning plenary session. She spoke briefly about the children's rights work being done at the SRCD. The organization does both descriptive and evaluation research, defining questions for research, understanding how well the existing children's rights framework is being addressed, and drawing on research to secure the strongest resources for children's rights.

Jo Becker ([Human Rights Watch](#)) provided an overview of the existing children's rights framework. Becker traced the evolution of key international children's rights treaties from the United Nations [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#) (1948) to the International Labor Organization's [Worst Forms of Child Labor Convention](#) (1999). She commented that traditional children's rights dogma is shaped around the idea that children require extra protection because they are inherently vulnerable. Children are often subjected to human rights abuses *because* they are children (e.g. recruitment of child soldiers). However, children's rights guarantees are evolving and expanding dramatically. Becker identified the United Nations [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#) (1989) as an important turning point for children's rights. This treaty, often abbreviated "CRC," is the most widely ratified treaty in history with 193 signatory states. It defines a child as someone under the age of eighteen. Further, it guarantees basic rights for children such as the right to registration at birth, a nationality and protections within the justice system. The treaty is also important, she stressed, because it calls for protection of children's rights to expression, religious association, health, rest, leisure and play. These modern principles reflect the notion that children are autonomous beings and should have a say over their own lives.

The United States is one of only three countries that have not ratified the CRC. Though CRC provisions outlawing the death penalty and preventing imprisonment for life without parole for juvenile offenders were originally found to be in conflict with US law, Becker emphasized that politics are the true barrier to ratification of the CRC in this country. Some conservative and religious organizations have alleged that the CRC undermines the rights of parents by preventing parents from sending their children to church, disciplining them, and providing for home schooling. She explained that these claims misrepresent the aims of the CRC, which emphasizes respect for the family unit. Because of public opposition, the CRC has never been sent by the President to the Senate for a vote on ratification. In 2000, the US ratified two [optional protocols](#) developed to strengthen the CRC. These protocols call for additional protections

against the sale of child pornography and prostitution, and establishment of 18 as the minimum age for military recruitment. Ratification of these protocols necessitated a change in the recruiting practices of all four arms of the US military (previously, recruitment of 17-year old soldiers was allowed). This marked the first time in history that the US has changed its practices in order to ratify a treaty.

As a result of the growing and changing children's rights framework, Becker concluded, the incidence of child labor has decreased, international enforcement mechanisms are becoming stronger, and domestic legislation to implement children's rights strategies is more widespread.

Theresa Betancourt ([Harvard School of Public Health](#)) provided an example of human rights concerns that are unique among war-affected youth. It is estimated that 250-350,000 children worldwide are serving in armed forces at any given time. Involvement in such hostilities has many implications for the development of these children and raises numerous concerns for psychological recovery and social reintegration post-conflict. Much of the research involving these populations is cross-sectional, measuring only one point in time. In an effort to better understand the needs of this population, Betancourt and colleagues pursued a different, more developmental approach.

Following an 11-year civil war in Sierra Leone, only 7,000 of the 20,000 children involved in the conflict benefited from formal International Criminal Court (ICC) reintegration services. Services included psychosocial activities, care and support, child tracing and reunification with family, and community sensitization. Betancourt's study sought to determine the long-term success of such programs. Her study sample included 529 youths from three groups: those who had received ICC reintegration services; those benefiting from comparable services; and a self-reintegrated group. The study showed that the average age of abduction was 10, the average time served was four years, and that over 97% of the children were forced to join. Sexual abuse was commonly reported, 50% of the victims were forced to use drugs/alcohol, and 27% reported having to kill or injure others. Post-conflict, the children exhibited a wide range of behaviors, both internalizing (anxiety, depression) and externalizing (anger, hostility) their emotions. She noted that beneficial adaptive/pro-social behaviors were most prevalent if the children had more schooling and a higher level of community acceptance during their recovery.

Betancourt's study shows that children facing the greatest developmental risks are those with war experiences coupled with poor post-war reintegration experiences, especially for those who were unable to regulate emotion and anger. She suggested that the best protective processes include a reduction in stigma and increased community acceptance of these children. Betancourt described how various intervention techniques are being used to teach coping skills and reframe negative self-perceptions so that these children may seek opportunity, employment, and education. No matter how significant the emergency response, efforts will fail, she stressed, if there are no measures to provide for recovery in the 10 years following such a conflict.

Workshop: Children's Rights in the United States

This session, dedicated to exploring children's rights issues in the US, centered around discussions on why the US, a key player in drafting the [UN Convention on the Rights of the Child](#) (CRC), still has not ratified the treaty. The presenters began by highlighting different reasons why the CRC is unique from other treaties. **Robin Kimbrough-Melton** ([American Orthopsychiatric Association](#)) highlighted how the right of children to participate in their communities and societies, including having the freedom to express their opinions and to have a say in matters affecting their lives, sets the CRC apart from other treaties ([Article 12, CRC](#)). She commented that scientists must think differently about how questions are asked when conducting research to allow children to have a more active role as participants in research.

Jonathan Todres ([Georgia State University College of Law](#)) explained that new treaties are typically developed by taking an existing treaty and filling in the gaps in existing human rights law rather than starting from scratch. However, because it has been recognized that children are not just small adults, it was deemed insufficient to simply add children's rights to an existing human rights treaty. Instead, a new comprehensive treaty on children's rights was created. **Brian Gran** ([Case Western Reserve University](#)) added that the CRC is the most ratified human rights treaty, and also the most imitated in constitutions of other countries. Throughout the world, this treaty is taken seriously because of a global agreement on children's rights. Over the past 30 years the world has become a better place for children because of a shift in attitudes towards them.

The only three countries that have not ratified the CRC are the US, South Sudan and Somalia. Todres opined that even if the US were to ratify the treaty, it would be unlikely to result in significant changes in the US because US law is generally consistent with the children's rights framework. Todres argued that the real reason the United States is slow to ratify the treaty is due to technical legal constraints. The CRC uses expansive language, similar to a constitution, which ultimately weighs down ratification efforts. During the Congressional ratification process for any international treaty, current laws are evaluated for compliance with the treaty, and a determination is made about any steps needed to bring US law into compliance with the treaty. For example, juveniles committing criminal homicide in the United States can be charged as an adult and sentenced to life without parole. This is contrary to the CRC. Such instances could be addressed with a treaty reservation, an approach the US has adopted when ratifying other treaties.

Todres also noted that the US has a history of taking many years to adopt new treaties, even after signing them. For example, it took 40 years for the US to ratify the [Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide](#). Furthermore, the US only considers the ratification of one treaty at a time. The [Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#) is the US Department of State's current priority, however, a recent vote in the Senate failed. (A super majority of 67 senate votes is needed to ratify a treaty.) The [Convention to Eliminate All Forms of Discrimination Against Women](#) (CEDAW) is the next priority for the US. It is unlikely that the CRC will be considered in the near future.

Kimbrough-Melton observed that there is little education in the US on children's rights, which is a problem. Many countries have a Children's Ombudsman, a public authority that protects and promotes the rights of children and ensures the CRC is being implemented. Gran added that the Ombudsman's office in Norway educates children, parents and other people in the private sectors about children's rights. The presenters agreed there is not a good reason for the US not to ratify the CRC, but they also agreed it is difficult to get policy makers interested in international treaties unless they are relevant to current legislation. Most scientific organizations have a division that is interested in policy, which could serve as a platform for raising awareness of the importance of joining the CRC.

Workshop: Introduction to Science, Technology and Human Rights

Jessica Wyndham ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)) opened the workshop with a broad overview of the basic characteristics of human rights: human rights are fundamental entitlements, to be enjoyed by everyone by virtue of the fact of being human, and without discrimination. She briefly outlined the rights contained within the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#), the [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#) (ICCPR), and the [International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights](#), highlighting that the US has ratified three human rights instruments, the ICCPR, the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination, and the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discrimination Against Women.

Wyndham opened a discussion about the connections between science, technology and human rights by inviting participants to identify what they see as the connections. Participants identified ethical practices of research, applications of technology, access to science with a particular focus on vulnerable groups, and gathering evidence of human rights abuses.

In her presentation, Wyndham identified five connections between science, engineering and human rights: 1. scientists and engineers have human rights; 2. scientists and engineers can and have served as a constituency for human rights; 3. science and technology can be applied for human rights purposes; 4. in some circumstances, the conduct of science and applications of scientific knowledge and technology may have negative human rights implications; and 5. international law recognizes the right of everyone “to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.”

Wyndham then highlighted some past and ongoing activities of members of the [AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition](#). The work of the psychological community in informing the Supreme Court’s consideration of the death penalty for juvenile offenders was one example. AAAS’s [Geospatial Technologies and Human Rights Project](#) and the [On-Call Scientists](#) project were also mentioned. Finally Wyndham briefly outlined [Article 27](#) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and its parallel, [Article 15](#) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The right protected in these provisions is the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress. Wyndham discussed AAAS’s efforts to determine what scientists consider this right means in practice and how it can be applied to their specific disciplines and fields.

The remainder of the workshop was spent in an open discussion about the role of scientists in promoting human rights. The discussion covered four major themes; many participants were interested in the relationship of their research to human rights both in terms of ethics and of potential applications; many were also interested in providing tools or directly aiding human rights groups; and there was also a desire to link to scientific communities around the world. This included providing basic educational material, training scientists to talk to lay persons, and listening to the views of scientists outside of the United States. Finally, there was interest in developing better methods of measuring and evaluating projects seeking to advance human rights.

Evening Plenary: Children's Rights in Scientific Research

Jerry Menikoff ([Office of the Human Research Protections](#)) introduced the theme of human rights by pointing out that the [Declaration of Helsinki](#), which serves as the foundational ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects, mentions nothing about children. When the [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#) (CRC) was developed, it provided a framework for incorporating children's rights into national laws and policies. Menikoff then led the conversation from children's rights to scientific research, by drawing attention to the distinction between research and medicine. Both can involve experimentation with an uncertain outcome, he explained. The difference is the purpose: research involves thinking about the patient as well as the research question, which can cause a conflict of interest between the need for protecting the research outcome and the need for protecting individual research subjects.

Eric Kodish ([Center for Ethics, Humanities and Spiritual Care, Cleveland Clinic](#)) stressed that regulatory and ethical issues are not the same, and likewise that informed consent and parental consent are not the same. When consenting on behalf of a child, the parents, doctors and the child (if older) all have veto power, making the child's participation in research less likely. The ethical framework for conducting research on children dictates that research cannot cause any risk to a child; it is only ethical for children to participate in research if the risk of harm is equal to, or less than, if the child did not participate. Kodish questioned whether these standards are too restrictive, and suggested that a standard of avoidance of harm could be more attainable. He explained that research categorizes children as healthy, sick or at risk. As a result of protecting healthy children from undue risk of harm, the majority of research involving children in the United States is carried out on sick children. Kodish noted that the disproportionate amount of research that is carried out on sick children consequently compromises the potential benefits of science for healthy children. Furthermore, there is a difference, he stressed, between the interest of an individual child and of children as a group. Children present a paradox by being vulnerable yet resilient, by being regarded as important yet not being allowed to vote, and by not having money of their own or lobbyists to advocate for their interests.

Gary Melton ([University of Colorado School of Medicine](#)) contended that we should not be concerned if children have the same rights as adults, rather that they have the same rights as human beings. The CRC offers a framework for the issues relating to children's rights that we consider most important. At the same time, the document is aspirational yet minimal, only describing what is necessary and not what is optimal. Although the United States has not ratified the CRC, Melton explained that the United States has signed the treaty so it is not without legal power. For example, in the Supreme Court's decision in [Roper v. Simmons](#), where it was decided that capital punishment for juvenile offenders in the United States was unconstitutional, the Court specifically referenced the CRC in its reasoning.

Children with disabilities are entitled to human rights under the CRC, but through her research **Maya Sabatello** ([Institute for the Study of Human Rights, Columbia University](#)) has found rampant violations of rights amongst these children. Worldwide, 150 to 200 million children are living with disabilities, 80% of these living in developing countries. They are more likely to face sexual and physical violence and have diminished access to nutrition, medical care and education. These risks that children with disabilities face extend into adulthood. These problems, Sabatello explained, stem from multiple challenges, including:

- Medical approach - Disabled children are seen as irrational, incapable, inarticulate, and so the care provided is passive.
- Invisibility – Because being disabled is stigmatized, the status of persons with disabilities often is not recognized, addressed, or documented by the UN.

- Principle of non-discrimination but not inclusion – the segregation of people with disability remains intact.

Universal design, including accessibility for people with disabilities, requires more planning to develop. However, without accessibility there will be economic and social consequences for children with disabilities and their families. The rights of children with disabilities to play and recreation are often compromised because most countries do not implement the concept of reasonable accommodation. Sabatello concluded that while there are some provisions sensitive to children with disabilities, these children need to be better included in decisions affecting their personal welfare.

Michael Freeman ([Faculty of Laws, University College London](#)) discussed the controversial role that science currently plays in children's rights. Science has the potential to cause harm, but also to provide assistance. Scientific advancements have created issues that no one would have thought of when the CRC was first drafted. [Article 1](#) of the CRC, which defines a child as any human being below the age of 18, was originally controversial because of the end age, now it is controversial because it calls into question when life begins. Since the reproduction revolution began in 1979, a number of questions have been raised about life before birth. Freeman asked the audience to consider the scenario of a child that is conceived to save a dying sibling. He explained that this raises issues with [Articles 1](#) and [3](#) (because the interest of the second child is not being honored) of the CRC. Next he asked the audience to consider that the oldest known mother gave birth at 72, and whether postmenopausal mothers (as well as elderly fathers) are in the best interest of a child.

All of these examples highlight questions that advances in science have raised with respect to children's rights and what should be considered in "the best interests" of the child. Although the need for [Article 3](#) to govern science was not relevant when the convention was written, Freeman stressed that it would be dangerous to think that the only rights that children have lie within the existing text of the convention. He argued that children should have the right to responsible parents, and that parents are given rights to carry out their responsibilities to protect children, and for no other reason. Kodish emphasized the same sentiment earlier in the discussion when he noted that children are not the property of their parents, and that it is not possible to consider the rights of children without considering the responsibilities of parents and society.

Workshop: Children's Rights Online

Liepa Gust ([American Orthopsychiatric Association](#)) moderated the session. She noted that the role of citizens is changing in our technologically advanced society. Though many people lack the resources to be truly engaged in civics, the Internet has become a powerful tool for human empowerment by enabling social networking, information exchange, and political expression. Gust commented that the rise of Internet activism will undoubtedly have unique implications for children coming of age in this complex environment. Youth will need to choose how to engage in civics online. It is our duty to recognize that we must guide youth to ensure appropriate levels of digital literacy, organizational participation, community action, and political disclosure.

Emma Llansó ([Center for Democracy and Technology](#)) discussed the implications of laws and regulations related to children and the Internet. She stressed the importance of viewing such regulations through a human rights lens. Because the Internet is a global medium, a global framework is necessary to ensure that domestic and international laws are harmonized to protect rights of both children and adults around the world. The rights of children on the Internet include the right to receive and seek information, to participate in cultural and artistic life, and the right to privacy. However, in the development of laws and regulations to protect children's rights online, it is important to consider the competing rights of adults.

Though most would agree that it is important to restrict children's access to indecent content (such as pornography), courts have asserted that the First Amendment protects adult access to such content. Llansó noted the US Supreme Court's decision striking down the [Communications Decency Act](#) (1996) when the court held that online speech warrants the highest levels of protection. Age-verification measures (such as asking users to submit their age on a preliminary entrance screen, or requiring credit card or driver's license information) place an undue burden on publishers of this material. Additionally, such measures violate the rights of adults to access this information anonymously. Llansó pointed out that the Supreme Court drew a stark contrast between Internet content and speech broadcast over television and the radio. Parents have more control over what is brought into their home over the Internet compared to other broadcast media. Llansó stressed the difficulties in enacting legislation regarding age-based restrictions of information online because of these First Amendment concerns. She emphasized the need for alternative solutions, such as parental tools to guide children online and education of children in proper Internet use techniques.

Mark Latonero ([Annenberg Center on Communication Leadership & Policy, University of Southern California](#)) underscored the value of information and communication technology (ICT) in combatting human rights abuses such as sex trafficking of children. Latonero outlined the nearly ubiquitous nature of technology and media, especially among young populations. Studies have suggested that 95% of US teens aged 12-17 are online, and 80% of them use social media. Many teens under age 13 are using Facebook in violation of the site's terms of use. Though bad actors are exploiting ICT for illicit activities, ICT also creates new ways to monitor such activities. ICT alters the flow of information and changes traditional social dynamics, increasing the visibility of human activity and allowing us to observe behaviors that were previously hidden.

Latonero focused on the use of ICT to combat sex trafficking online. Many websites such as Craigslist and Backpage have been implicated in facilitating trafficking and commercial sex among adults and minors. It has become a standard practice of NGOs and law enforcement to scour these posts using key word searches to ascertain whether individuals involved are minors. This has proven to be a monumental task, as each post must be evaluated individually. He noted that the number of posts in cities across the

United States has become prohibitively large for successful execution of these surveillance methods. To aid in these efforts, new search technologies have been developed. These searches are more advanced and take into consideration indicators of age, ethnicity, and transience. By performing analytics on these data sets, researchers can extract dimensions of location (telephone number area codes), better understand the activities, and identify frequent posters. Facial recognition software is also being used to match photos of missing kids with those appearing in posts.

Unexpected actors in the private sector are pioneering these efforts. For example, JP Morgan Chase monitors illegal credit card activity. They have identified a financial footprint linked to involvement in child trafficking. Behaviors that may be used to determine involvement in such activities include travel to high-risk jurisdictions, foreign wires, and the use of DVD kiosks such as RedBox (DVDs are used to keep trafficking victims entertained). Microsoft has also undertaken several initiatives to combat child pornography. They developed an algorithm called Microsoft Photo DNA which can be used to scan large numbers of photographs. Every photo uploaded on Microsoft's Sky Drive is scanned in this manner, and Facebook has also adopted this technology. Latonero is hopeful for future improvements in such technologies. President Obama recently issued a statement highlighting our improved abilities to turn the tables on traffickers by harnessing technology to stop their activities. More information can be found at <http://technologyandtrafficking.usc.edu>.

Workshop: Human Rights Committees and Affinity Groups in Your Society

This workshop focused on how to move human rights issues forward within a scientific or engineering association through the creation of a committee or affinity group. The [American Chemical Society](#) (ACS) and the [American Sociological Association](#) (ASA) are two examples of organizations that have been able to successfully incorporate human rights issues into their structures. **Bradley Miller** (ACS) spoke about how human rights became integrated into the ACS, and **Margaret Vitullo** (ASA) described how human rights became a part of the structure of the ASA. The workshop provided working models from two very different types of organizations as examples for other people interested in introducing human rights into their own organization's agenda.

Headquartered in Washington, DC, the ACS is a congressionally chartered society, with 15-18% of members from outside the United States. Miller explained that many of the expatriates engaging in chemistry work in the United States will take the human rights values they have acquired through the ACS back to their home countries. In the mid-1980s, the political turmoil in the Soviet Union and China served as a catalyst for the ACS to take a stance on human rights violations, principally through letter writing, campaigns, fact-finding meetings with government officials, and outreach activities. In 2010, the ACS structure was reorganized. Instead of going through the human rights sub-committee, human rights issues are now brought directly to the ACS Board of Directors. This [change](#) allows anyone to bring a human rights case forward, including ACS members and staff, local sections, divisions or committees. Miller commented on the need to balance advocacy with the scientific activities of the organization.

It is useful to contrast the approaches of the ACS and the ASA because the ACS has over 160,000 members and 700 staff members, compared to 14,000 members and 29 staff members at the ASA. The ASA's initial involvement with human rights, like that at the ACS, was focused on human rights abuses towards members of the discipline. Vitullo described the structural arrangement within the ASA, and where human rights issues fit into it. The ASA is made up of 52 sections, or constituent parts, and each of these sections has the power to make association-wide changes. The development of a new section requires a written proposal and a petition with at least 200 members' signatures. After the Council approves the new section, the members of the section must pay dues and will start receiving funding from the ASA. The human rights section of the ASA was formed in 2009 and currently has 315 members. Vitullo added that the section has what she considers the two key components for a successful committee: a clear structure in place and micro individual capital – a few dedicated individuals who make things happen. Prior to the existence of the human rights section, the ASA worked with [Sociologists Without Borders](#). Vitullo recommended that those interested in being more involved with human rights could look within their organization for a section or sub-group that is involved with similar issues.

Questions from the workshop participants centered on how to make human rights important in organizations when there had been a conscious decision made not to address human rights either because of politics or because the organization is focused primarily on research. For example, the [Ecological Society of America](#) has not historically addressed human issues, but newer members have brought with them an interest in human rights as advocates for social policy in the context of global change. During the discussion, participants highlighted the different approaches that have been taken by societies, noting that some of these have originated from members while others have taken a more “top down” approach.

Closing Plenary: Researching Children's Rights

During the closing plenary, speakers discussed the array of the work they are doing at the forefront of children's rights. **Thomas Parsons** ([International Commission on Missing Persons](#)) began by explaining that he and his colleagues employ a DNA-led approach to identify victims following conflicts and disasters. These techniques have been applied in a human rights context following instances of "ethnic cleansing." Parsons mentioned that survivors of genocide, who are often women and children, need unique assistance. Women are often left as sole providers for their families, yet they find themselves in a state of legal limbo without their husband's death certificate to prove their status as a victim and subsequent rights to justice and reparations.

Parsons described his efforts to identify bodies following the 1995 Srebrenica massacre that took place during the Bosnian war. During that conflict, thousands of victims were buried in mass graves. Later, the bodies were moved to smaller, secondary graves around the country. Identification of these samples was difficult because much of the DNA was degraded, and many samples were contaminated. To match victims with surviving family members, blood was collected from a large number of individuals which ultimately led to numerous successful victim identifications. After the victims had been identified, the families were one step closer to emotional and legal closure, and efforts towards societal reconstruction were strengthened. He explained that when DNA data is collected it is stored and made available over long periods of time. However, it is critical that this genetic data is protected both technologically and by policy so that it is not misused. Parsons described unfortunate cases where women who had donated blood in order to find their loved ones were later prosecuted or murdered after damaging paternity information was revealed.

Similar efforts in family identification are being employed by an organization called [Asociación Pro-Búsqueda](#) in El Salvador. This organization seeks to reunite children who were abducted between 1979 and 1992 with their biological families. The organization received 898 tracing requests, found 373 children, and was able to re-unite 231 with their families. Notably, these efforts raised numerous cross-border issues as many of the children were residing in the US and other countries as adoptees.

Yvonne Rafferty ([Pace University](#)) discussed the concept of modern slavery, 50% of which occurs in Asian countries. Her research focuses on the girl child and commercial sexual exploitation. Victims of this type of abuse are subjected to labor, domestic servitude, organ trafficking and sexual exploitation. She added that the single best predictor for sexual exploitation is being female. Rafferty explained that men seeking to pay for sex and members of organized crime rings are the major facilitators of sexual exploitation. They employ violence, manipulation, and false trust to recruit their victims, and often subject them to emotional/physical trauma, fear, violence, torture, isolation and threats of harm. She also briefly discussed the prevalence and implications of sex tourism.

Child victims of commercial sexual exploitation suffer from educational deprivation, physical health problems, and behavioral problems. Thus, there is a great need and opportunity for research in this area. There is a need for strategy to identify facilitators, strengthening of the existing legal framework, and enhanced training of law enforcement personnel. Furthermore, future research efforts should focus on the identification of particularly vulnerable children, ensuring safe migration, creation of a protective environment, and effective strategies to minimize economic vulnerability, increase gender equality, and promote corporate responsibility. Rafferty also discussed numerous obstacles in this area, particularly the elusive and confusing nature of data. Trafficking is often clandestine in nature, programs are rarely monitored and evaluated, and impacts on the child victims are rarely measured. She also highlighted the need for special treatment in cases of HIV-positive children. She concluded by stressing that an

international approach is necessary to understand and implement research regarding commercial sexual exploitation.

Ian Kysel ([American Civil Liberties Union](#)) discussed a study of human rights violations in cases of juvenile solitary confinement. In this study, Kysel conducted interviews with 75 young people held in solitary confinement across the United States to define the impacts of such confinement. Kysel commented that US sentencing laws lead to the transfer of youths to the adult penal system. Though some states keep juveniles in separate facilities, most are kept in adult prisons. However, adult prisons do not provide for the special developmental considerations of juvenile offenders. In 2011, 92,000 juveniles were being held in the adult system. Many were subjected to weeks or months of solitary confinement for their own protection or to discipline them for misbehavior. None of the facilities employed specially trained staff to supervise juveniles. While in solitary confinement, juveniles are kept completely isolated for 22-24 hours per day and are often denied services for health and mental needs. The inmates are rarely allowed to visit with loved ones, and are forced to do so in a cage or behind glass. The impacts of these conditions on youths are particularly severe. Some youths reported worsened visual and auditory hallucinations while in solitary, and one woman housed under these conditions reported that she stopped menstruating.

Kysel underscored the role of science in his analysis and advocacy efforts. Neuroscience research on the development of adolescents allows for an enhanced ability to evaluate future consequences of solitary confinement. Kysel expressed hope that this and other research will lead to the implementation of a developmentally sensitive set of standards in these facilities.

Working Group Report: Welfare of Scientists

The Welfare of Scientists working group is devoted to the protection and defense of scientists, engineers and health professionals under threat, and will work to increase the effectiveness of professional societies in defending the human rights of our colleagues.

Co-Chairs: **Juan Gallardo**, American Physical Society (*interim Co-Chair*)
Alec Greer, Committee of Concerned Scientists

Progress Since Last Meeting

(1) *How has the group's work contributed to the successful protection of individual scientists and engineers from human rights violations?*

- To commemorate International Human Rights Day, the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program hosted Amnesty International's annual global Write-A-Thon on December 7. Members of the working group provided information on behalf of Professor Kemal Gürüz (a retired professor of chemical engineering from Turkey), Dr. Abdul Jalil Al-Singace (a mechanical engineering professor from Bahrain) and Omid Kokabee (a physics student imprisoned in Iran). Organizations and associations that contributed calls to action or had representatives at the event included American Chemical Society, American Physical Society Committee of Concerned Scientists, Physicians for Human Rights and Scholars at Risk.
- At the working group meeting we displayed and distributed two petitions for Professor Kemal [Gürüz](#) and for Cyril [Karabus](#). In addition we urged the attendees to write letters on behalf of Dr. Denis [Mukwege](#).
- Physicians for Human Rights shared information about eight medical professionals convicted for providing medical care to protesters in Bahrain.

(2) *How has the working group increased the capacity of Coalition members to address violations of the human rights of scientists and engineers?*

Attempts have been made to increase the awareness of members of the Coalition as a whole of the need to address the situation of scientists and engineers in prison, at risk, or under threat. It seems advisable to explore different mechanisms besides letter writing campaigns that could engage the capacity of the Coalition members in productive and effective ways. Our understanding and level of commitment to human rights will be strengthened by the actual activity of performing actions on behalf of scientists or engineers whose human rights have been violated.

(3) *How have the group's activities led to the applications of new and increasingly effective resources for communicating and collaboration to protect the human rights of scientists?*

- With the American Chemical Society Office of International Activities, the working group has published a [Primer on Scientific Freedom and Human Rights](#) as a resource for science and engineering societies looking to begin or to expand existing work supporting the human rights of scientists, engineers and health professionals.
- An action alert template to facilitate information among the societies working on behalf of individuals has been finalized and we are now discussing how to best implement this tool.

- (4) *How has the working group increased the recognition by international human rights bodies, human rights organizations and Coalition members of scientific freedom as a human rights issue with a special interconnection to other rights, as recognized by Article 15?*

Fundamental to scientific freedom as interpreted in Article 15, is the right of scientists and engineers to communicate, associate with others and to publish their research. In particular, international collaboration has become an important topic that has morphed into Science and Diplomacy as an expression of the ever greater interdependency of economies, communication and academic and technological endeavors throughout the world. These realities call for a more active and vigilant examination of “Internet Freedom” and its implications for scientific freedom, in the framework of Article 15. Working group members have started drafting a paper addressing this topic.

Goals for Next Six Months: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

- Alec Greer (Committee of Concerned Scientists) will prepare a 1-page summary of the concerns for scientists and engineers in Turkey; Bill Jones (Amnesty International USA) offered to help.
- For dissemination to the Coalition, the working group will send Theresa Harris (AAAS) information about positions their organizations have taken on behalf of individual scientists and engineers, and on human rights concerns affecting the rights of scientists and engineers.
- The templates for sharing information about work on behalf of individual scientists and engineers will be converted into an online form to make it easier for Coalition member representatives to complete and update them. Liezl Perez will help with this.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

An intern could help develop the online form.

Next Meeting Date

TBD

Working Group Report: Ethics and Human Rights

The Ethics and Human Rights working group is devoted to promoting the incorporation of human rights into scientific and engineering codes of ethics by fostering an appreciation among scientists, engineers and professional associations of the relevance of human rights to ethical standards, the conduct of science, the application of technology and human subject protections.

Co-chairs: **Robert Albro**, American Anthropological Association
 Douglas Richardson, Association of American Geographers

Progress Since Last Meeting

The working group has made definite progress in the ongoing development of its primary project: a report addressing the content and meaning of “scientific responsibility,” as this applies to the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications, as recognized in Article 15 of the ICESCR.

This progress has been on two primary fronts:

1. Working together with the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights, and Law Program, we have developed a draft pilot survey tool, to be administered to a diverse group of scientists and engineers, and designed to provide some initial information about how scientists and engineers understand the extent of their social responsibilities. This pilot survey tool has been vetted by a group of external experts, and we are almost ready to initiate the survey.
2. Working closely with working group member Maya Sabatello, we have identified a set of eight exploratory case study topics across different disciplines and engaged with a variety of fields, which will be incorporated into the body of the eventual report. We have also assigned responsibility for writing up these cases, including the cooperation of six working group members and two non-working group members.

Goals for Next Six Months: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

As discussed in our working group meeting, the primary goal of the working group is to complete its current report project. Our time line for completion of the report tentatively has been identified as July 1, 2013. In order to meet this deadline, we will need to complete the following steps in this order:

1. Collection and analysis of all pilot survey data
2. Completion of all eight (and any additional) case studies
3. Coordination with the Service to the STEM Community working group to be able to use relevant data collected through their focus groups for incorporation into the final report
4. Writing the draft report
5. Incorporating feedback of external peer reviewers and producing final report

Our tentative schedule for completion of these tasks looks like this:

1. Draft case completed by March 1
2. Feedback on draft cases, March-April
3. Pilot survey data collected by April 1
4. Final cases completed by April 15
5. Report outline completed by April 15

6. Integration of cases into report, May 1
7. Report draft completed by June 1
8. Final report completed by July 1

At present we are working with case writers to make sure the initial drafts of cases are completed in a timely fashion.

Ideas Generated

Several suggestions were advanced during our working group meeting about possible additional cases.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

We will need internship help with the following:

1. Administration and collection of pilot survey data, once the survey tool is ready
2. Organization of information coming from focus groups conducted by the Service to the STEM Community working group.

Next Meeting Date

We do not have any formal meeting of the working group scheduled at this time. Rather, we are in regular communication with working group members now actively engaged in the present report project. We are offering regular updates of progress through our working group email list-serve.

Working Group Report: Service to the STEM Community

The Service to the STEM Community working group is devoted to building the commitment and capacity of scientific and engineering associations to contribute meaningfully to human rights issues and activities, including through the application of their discipline's tools and techniques.

Co-chairs: **Clinton Anderson**, American Psychological Association
Margaret Weigers Vitullo, American Sociological Association

Member Reports

Clinton Anderson reported on the American Psychological Association (APA) Public Interest Directorate's communications through the web site for Human Rights Day.

Margaret Vitullo reported on some work the American Sociological Association (ASA) has done with the National Science Foundation.

Gabe Twose reported that the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) will be considering soon whether to include human rights as one of its longer term policy priorities and that the journal *Peace and Conflict* approved his proposal for a special issue on the psychologies of human rights.

Cliff Duke reported that the Ecological Society of America (ESA) paper on the ethics of data re-use includes a small section on Article 15.

Progress Since Last Meeting

Starter Kit Formation Evaluation and Revision

At the September meeting, it was recommended that the starter kit could provide more implementation information on important benchmarks for organizations that want to undertake specific human rights activities. This provided the jumping off point for a discussion of the formative evaluation process. The formative evaluation would focus on the organization member benchmarks identified in the 2012-2014 Coalition Plan of Action; in other words, the formative evaluation would seek to obtain from organizations information about what they would need as information resources in order to achieve the benchmarks.

The Starter Kit subcommittee met via conference call in early November and decided to undertake revisions of the starter kit on two tracks, one short-term to identify ways to make it more useful in its current form, and one long term to conduct a formative evaluation of the Starter Kit for more substantial revisions. Jerry Baker agreed to take the lead on the short-term track, which would involve a Sigma Xi chapter, perhaps one with a high proportion of students, as a focus group on the Starter Kit.

Clinton Anderson agreed to take the lead on the long-term track. The plan is to first identify a small set of high priority benchmarks from those for member organizations established by the Coalition for the 2012-2014 Plan of Action and then consult with Coalition member organizations that want to achieve one of the high-priority benchmarks to identify needed resources that the subcommittee can develop to support organizations' efforts. In mid-November, he sent the subcommittee members a request to rank order the member organization benchmarks according to priority as foci for the starter kit formative evaluation.

Webinar Subcommittee

At the September meeting, the subcommittee discussed the content of the webinar, its purpose, and how it fits with the working group's mission. The webinar will provide an introduction to human rights, science

and engineering in a way that can be tailored to a specific disciplinary audience. Having a template available for Coalition members to adapt to their discipline will equip societies with a resource on human rights education and training that they can implement on their own. These webinars offer a way to gauge interest among the society's members in human rights (based on webinar attendance numbers) and they could motivate organizations that are considering Coalition membership to join.

Using the webinar that was developed for the American Society for Civil Engineering's membership, the subcommittee has started to develop a template consistent with these objectives. Since the webinar template will include a follow-up survey of participants, a question was raised about IRB approval when conducting surveys, especially as it relates to publishing the findings from the data that is collected (which is one of the benchmarks included in the plan).

At the December meeting, Ed Butterworth agreed to chair the Webinar Subcommittee to replace Constance Thompson, who has resigned from the Working Group.

Article 15 Focus Group Research Project

During the September meeting, the Article 15 subcommittee reviewed 2012 and 2013 subcommittee goals from the Plan of Action, with discussion focusing primarily on completing focus group data collection, the process for communicating findings from the focus group analysis back to host disciplinary associations (included in both 2012/2013 goals) and approaches for helping associations integrate Article 15 related goals into their activities (2013 goal). Action items for the group included: conducting 5-6 additional focus groups and continuing analysis as well as developing technical focus group summaries (Jessica, Michael, Margaret); working from technical focus group summaries, develop two examples of focus group overviews written in a more narrative, newsletter style (Alyson); and develop a draft plan with specific strategies for working with individual associations to help them integrate Article 15-related concerns into their current and future activities (Cliff).

Since the September meeting, Margaret Vitullo and Jessica Wyndham have continued to code the transcripts of the focus groups and to write up the results.

Goals for next six months: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

Key Next Steps

1. Starter Kit
 - a. Revise Starter Kit in light of selected benchmarks set for coalition
 - b. Talk to organizations about what they need to fulfill benchmarks

2. Webinar
 - a. Identify stakeholder groups and discuss matching templates to their need; the webinar as it exists is not a template; it was designed for the particular organization.
 - b. Discuss how to certify or qualify people to lead webinars.
 - c. The polling questions can be used to help the society find out whether their members are interested in getting involved in human rights.
 - d. Should think about how much time in the webinar should be devoted to human rights generally versus to the connection with the discipline.
 - e. There is a template for five major connections between human rights and the discipline.
 - f. The questions that came out of the webinar from the participants might be a source for ideas about the template.

3. Article 15—work on coding and reporting results will continue.

The Working Group has a fourth objective in its action plan, but we don't have a subcommittee working on it. The group decided that because the fourth objective was really a "catch all" for all of the other activities, beyond the three core activities each of the other subcommittees should try to keep the fourth objective in mind as they move forward on their activities.

Ideas Generated

Webinar

1. Consider using polling questions to gauge whether members interested in getting involved in human rights.
2. Look at questions that came out of webinar from participants to guide progress on template.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

None

Next Meeting Date

April 17, 2013

Working Group Report: Service to the Human Rights Community

The Service to the Human Rights Community working group is devoted to bridging the scientific, engineering and human rights communities with the aim of encouraging and facilitating the greater engagement of scientists and engineers in efforts to advance human rights.

Co-chairs: **Brian Gran**, American Sociological Association
 Susan Hinkins, American Statistical Association
 Patricia van Arnum, Affiliated Individual

Progress Since Last Meeting

- Guidelines for Human Rights Projects -The document is available now at http://srhrl.aaas.org/coalition/WG/4/Projects/guidelines/Scientists_Human_Rights_Orgs.pdf
- Held a workshop on program evaluation for human rights organizations in New York City in January 2013
- Joint Initiative – Article 15 Indicators (more details below).

Goals for Next Six Months: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

1) **Workshops:** With approval from AAAS, plan and execute another workshop for human rights organizations, in Washington DC. Based on feedback from the Coalition meeting on Jan. 31, 2013 and feedback from NYC workshop, program evaluation continues to be a topic of interest, with a greater focus on specific tools/examples and case studies. The working group would like to set up a planning session with AAAS and interested participants to discuss the focus for such a workshop in Washington, DC.

With approval from AAAS, would like to plan and execute a NYC-based workshop for the Fall 2013. Several suggestions for topics were offered at the Coalition Meeting.

Next step: Discuss with working group at next regularly scheduled conference call on March 29.

2) **Knowledge-sharing:** Advance knowledge-sharing among human rights groups and scientists through content provided on AAAS portal/page. There is a strong interest in sharing practical knowledge, case studies.

Next step: The working group will form a subgroup to focus on how the working group can facilitate that effort through the AAAS.

3) **Indicators:** A subgroup has begun looking at three specific data sources as potential indicators for the right to benefit from scientific progress. These three data sources were selected to exemplify the three types of indicators: structural; process; and outcome. The goal is to learn more about how such indicators may be developed, as well as how our subgroup may move forward on this work most efficaciously, with the short term goal of preparing a report for discussion at the July meeting. The subgroup will try to meet electronically each month.

4) **Outreach:** The working group is setting up a meeting with Maria Luisa Chavez Chief, NGO Relations, at the UN Department of Public Information (DPI), to discuss ways in which the UN DPI and AAAS can work together in informing UN DPI NGOs of On-Call Scientists Program, participation in a monthly program

5) **Communication:** Scheduled monthly conference calls with working group (last Friday of each month) will provide a structured mechanism to engage working group members. A follow-up summary report will be issued.

Ideas Generated

1) Knowledge-sharing was an important theme discussed, including setting up a portal for sharing practical information, social media platforms, as well as webinars.

2) For outreach to human rights organizations, in addition to the informational package, one suggestion was to create a video with AAAS staff describing the On-call Scientists program and with human rights organizations and On-Call Scientists who have participated in the project. In outreaching to human rights organizations, links to those videos can be provided.

3) Several ideas for workshops were discussed, again including program evaluation. There was enthusiasm for expanding the workshops beyond the New York and DC areas. Atlanta was suggested as an area with many human rights organization offices. This could be done by coordinating with On-call Scientists volunteers in the area; coordinating with AAAS annual meeting travel; and webinars.

Next Meeting Date

Conference call: Friday March 29th at 12:00 noon ET

Working Group Report: Education and Information Resources

The Education and Information Resources working group is devoted to producing a variety of accessible information materials for the promotion and support of collaboration between scientists, engineers and human rights practitioners.

Co-chairs: **Mark Frezzo**, Sociologists Without Borders
Sam McFarland, Affiliated Individual

Progress Since Last Meeting

1. An EIR email list was created to facilitate communication among our members.
2. A conference call was held in August. During this call, decisions were taken to
 - create a single module for high schools on science and human rights, with Jennifer Bronson leading this project, and to review progress at the January 2013 meeting,
 - try to adopt a common format for our college-level modules on science and human rights
 - update the on-line information resources for the various sciences and human rights (e.g. relevant journal articles and books).
3. Six educational modules were completed for review by the EIR working group. These include:
 - A Very Brief Primer on Modern Human Rights (Sam McFarland)
 - Making Sense of Science as a Human Right (Sam McFarland)
 - How Psychologists Helped Improve the Human Rights of Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual People (Sam McFarland)
 - Information Technology, Information Access and Human Rights: Regulating the Internet and Wikileaks (Kimberly Black-Parker)
 - Connecting Science and Human Rights: Darfur as a Case Study
 - Geography module: Science and Human Rights (Sheryl Beach)

Twelve additional persons (or pairs of persons) have expressed interest in writing discipline-specific modules, but none of these are yet ready for EIR review.

4. All Coalition members representing scientific and engineering associations were surveyed and asked the following questions (replies were received from six representatives):
 - What are the three main ways your discipline (discipline listed) could contribute to the realization of human rights?
 - Can you identify ways or particular cases in which your discipline was used in the past to significantly advance human rights, or other ways or cases in which your discipline was used to violate human rights?
 - Can you suggest a few scholars in your discipline who would be able and willing to write one or two brief but good educational modules [for college students] on your science and human rights?

However, several goals for 2012 in the EIR Plan of Action (2012-2014) were not fulfilled as scheduled, specifically:

1. “By December 2012, place teaching modules on the SHRC website for use in undergraduate courses.” While the EIR working group has prepared six modules and is reviewing these prior to

recommending them to the Coalition Steering Committee, none are on the website as of February 2013.

2. “Augment the Bibliographic Database with more materials on science and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights . . . invite all SHRC members to review and suggest additions/deletions to the current bibliographic database.” This task is not yet accomplished.
3. “By July 30 [2012], edit and share these lists (e.g., three main ways in which each science may contribute to the realization of human rights) with at least four Human Rights NGOs and request their feedback and suggestions.” The responses received, mentioned under #4, above, have not yet been edited or shared with human rights NGOs.
4. “By July 30 [2012], request from at least four human rights NGOs examples of case studies of how science or technology has been used to advance their work.” This request has not yet been made.

In short, the EIR working group is considerably behind its proposed timeline for the Plan of Action (2012-2013). The co-chair can only attribute this tardiness to their own hectic fall semesters, and pledge make sincere efforts to try to catch up on this time line during the first half of 2013.

Goals for Next Six Months: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

The main goals for the EIR Working Group must be to fulfill the unfulfilled goals for 2012 and move toward fulfilling our goals for 2013.

1. By February 18, share this report with all members of the EIR Working Group, along with a tentative plan for fulfilling the 2012 goals by July 2013, specifically to:
 - elicit from Coalition members more responses to the three questions described above,
 - edit and share the results of these responses with four human rights NGOs,
 - request their feedback on these, and ask for ways in which they may have used science to advance their work
 - invite all SHRC members to suggest resources for augmenting the bibliographic database and revise the database.
2. By March 1, re-contact the twelve persons or pairs who expressed interest in preparing modules to obtain anticipated timelines for completion of their modules.
3. By March 15, complete the review of the six modules via the EIR mail list, with a view to passing them to the Coalition Steering Committee by April 1.
4. Conduct a conference call with EIR working group members in late March to review our progress toward achieving these tardy goals.
5. By the July 2013 meeting, have the current six modules website-ready or online, and at least three more ready for recommendation to the AAAS steering committee.
6. By July 2013, complete and review the single module on science and human rights for high school students.

7. By July 2013, complete the updating of the Information Resources website (<http://shr.aaas.org/coalition/WG/5/Projects/bibliography/index.shtml>)

Ideas Generated

During the January EIR meeting, most time was spent reviewing the status of the research regarding a potential science and human rights module for high schools and the first two modules listed above.

Several useful ideas were generated during the fall and at the January 2013 EIR working group meeting. These include:

1. Agree on a common template that includes stated learning objectives, assessment guidelines, questions for discussion before we devise teaching modules.
2. It is important that those who write modules receive publication credit for purposes of their academic careers. For that reason, when modules are published on the AAAS website, the authors should be identified for publication credit.
3. We should consider assembling all modules into a major book on science and human rights.

Following the meeting, six persons have agreed to join the EIR working group. These are:

- Heather Gingrich, International Medical Geology Association
- John Gardinier, Affiliated Individual
- Larry Krannich, American Chemical Society (ACS) and University of Alabama at Birmingham
- Bradley Miller, American Chemical Society
- Maia Smith, Statistics Without Borders
- Janet Stocks, Council on Undergraduate Research

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

We could use an intern's assistance later this spring in converting Word modules to webpages (when and if they are approved by the Coalition Steering Committee and AAAS).

Next Meeting Date

At the July meeting, EIR hopes to review at least three new science-specific modules and to be ready to submit them to the Steering Committee for its review.

Committee Report: Outreach and Communication

The Outreach and Communication committee is devoted to expanding the impact of the Coalition's work by increasing the Coalition membership and building bridges with scientific, engineering, and health professionals as well as the human rights community.

Co-chairs: **David J. Proctor**, Affiliated Individual
Jeffrey H. Toney, Sigma Xi

Progress Since Last Meeting

- 1 Student engagement plan has been developed.
- 2 Essay contest for engineering students has been proposed.
- 3 Student delegate roles have been proposed.

Goals for Next Six Months: Key Next Steps and Decisions Made

Of the three agenda items for the meeting (see above), only the student delegate proposal was discussed. It was favorably received, and we will now pursue this idea.

Student delegates

Goal: Establish a Student Delegate role for each member association with specific responsibilities for each delegate and rewards for participation

Action: We would like to invite each Coalition member association to appoint a Student Delegate. Responsibilities would include participation in one of the working groups, attending the Coalition meetings, and writing articles about the Coalition's activities for their associations' member communications. Each association could recruit this student in the manner that makes most sense within its own structure. For example, students from the association's student chapter could be invited to apply, the responsibility could be assigned to an existing student leadership position within the association, or the role could be assigned to an intern or fellow in the association's Washington, DC office. That process would be left up to each organization.

One of the benefits that we anticipate from student involvement is that they will bring their energy, vitality, and curiosity to the Coalition. In addition to involvement with their professional association, students will be supported in pursuing their own ideas. This will allow them the freedom to be creative in their engagement with the Coalition.

After these student delegates become actively involved in the Coalition, we can include a side meeting or event specifically for the students during the Coalition meetings.

The advantages of this approach are that the student engagement reinforces the purpose and structure of the Coalition as a network of associations. It provides a clear path of engagement for each member association to invite its student members to participate in the Coalition's activities, and it provides the associations with another person to help them with their overall involvement. Furthermore, it provides the students with a

professional development opportunity. Coalition members could further support this initiative with rewards, such as certificates for participation or course credit.

Output: Increased student engagement in Coalition activities, increased student engagement in member association activities, and increased student engagement in Coalition meetings

Ideas Generated

There was an extensive discussion of the connection between science and human rights and the role of the Coalition during the business meeting. The discussion highlighted the need to address such questions in advance of the meeting for new participants, or perhaps to host a separate discussion earlier in the meeting as an introduction or orientation for new participants. The Coalition has experimented with this sort of activity around the meeting; it may help to have the Human Rights 101 discussion alongside the morning members-only working group meetings so that “old hands” can have a regular working group meeting while participants who are new to the Coalition can learn about human rights, the role of the Coalition, and ask questions.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

It would be helpful to have an intern do the legwork to get the student delegate activity off the ground. This activity likely needs close coordination with the Secretariat, so it is a task well-suited for an intern.

Next Meeting Date

11 July 2013; additional *ad hoc* meetings will take place as well.

Appendix: Session Evaluations

Opening Plenary

What are Children's Rights? (80 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	3	12	19	6	4.47
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	4	14	14	4	4.31

Comments:

- For my personal purposes, beyond "Excellent" - imparted an additional dimension to my work.
- More accuracy is needed.
- Because I teach a course on human rights, I was already familiar with most of what was covered.
- I would have liked to see more discussion of constructive solutions (less complaining) in the first presentation.
- It would have helped to have more of an orientation to rights issues that intersect with different aspects of science, beyond an orientation to the CRC.
- Jo Becker was great!
- I thought this was an excellent session.

Business Meetings

	Response Count	Response Percent
Outreach and Communication	14	74%
Planning the January 2013 Coalition Meeting	9	69%
I did not attend a business meeting	18	--

Outreach and Communication Committee

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Format	0	4	5	3	2	0	3.21
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	3	6	3	1	0	2.93

Comments:

- Only managed to get through one item on the agenda. Questions coming from new members derailed the agenda slightly and should be handled in advance of the meeting in future, perhaps by email.
- Most group members were either completely silent or committed to a path of maintaining the status quo - not much the chairs can do with that in terms of increasing capacity and/or generating creative, innovative ideas.
- I wanted more discussion on how to involve other academic societies in the Coalition.
- Over half the session was spent introducing the Coalition to new people, which left very little time for planning next steps, etc.
- We didn't follow the agenda and the discussions were not focused.

Planning the July 2013 Coalition Meeting

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Format	0	0	1	3	5	0	4.44
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	1	6	0	4.11

Working Group Meetings

	Response Count	Response Percent
Welfare of Scientists	4	31%
Ethics and Human Rights	8	47%
Service to the STEM Community	2	22%
Service to the Human Rights Community	9	90%
Education and Information Resources	11	92%
I did not attend a working group meeting	7	--

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Welfare of Scientists							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	1	2	1	0	4.0
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	1	1	0	4.0
Ethics and Human Rights							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	2	4	2	0	4.0
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	1	1	0	3	0	4.0
Service to the STEM Community							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	1	0	1	0	4.0
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	0	1	0	4.0
Service to the Human Rights Community							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	1	2	1	4	1	4.0
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	1	2	2	3	1	3.88
Education and Information Resources							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	1	2	2	4	1	4.0
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	2	2	2	4	0	3.8

Comments:

- Welfare of Scientists:
 - Well organized.
- Ethics and Human Rights:
 - I think the topic (children's rights) seeped into the working group meeting a bit too much and things got a bit confusing for new attendees.
- Service to the Human Rights Community:
 - Projects are really coming along nicely! I look forward to helping with indicators for guidance regarding implementation of the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.
 - I found the meeting too nuanced and detailed. I wasn't clear how I could either contribute or benefit from the working group.
- Education and Information Resources:
 - Discussion unstructured.
 - More of a brainstorming/sharing best practices session - lots of fun with an energetic group!

What would be the most productive way to use working group meetings?

- General discussion. Specific work should be done in members-only meetings. With a large number of "outsiders" at Coalition general meetings, specific work is impractical.
- Agree to clear milestones and schedule regular meetings or teleconferences between biannual meetings in DC.
- To work on our specific projects and follow the agenda. While I enjoy and value suggestions from well-meaning newcomers, it makes it hard to follow the agenda and do our work when they have not done the background reading and preparation we have. We tried a split format, with working group in the morning and a related information session in the afternoon, and that was very effective to move our business agenda forward, then to recruit new people and ideas later on.
- To have an agreed agenda for the discussion and to follow it.
- A clear, concise presentation to bring new people up to speed and a list of objectives would help with productivity.
- Focus on a couple of items and stay on focus.
- Seemed fairly productive to me.
- Focus on and review current projects, catch up with each other, discuss new opportunities.
- Having 2 sessions with current projects reviewed and another for free discussion and brainstorming was helpful
- Be sure to have TWO sessions for EIR and other working groups who want them at each meeting, the first a working meeting open only to current members, the second open to all interested parties. I think that worked well for us this time.
- As a forum and sounding board for thinking through present and future project priorities, and as a basis for engaging people in the work of the group.
- I would make clear to new attendees that the working groups are not necessarily going to be talking about the topical focus of the meeting.
- Find a solution on global front and apply locally. Just mere experience and or sharing cannot produce results. Be realistic.

- Sending out materials ahead of time with members reading and working on the materials then coming together to discuss the next steps.
- For the open meetings (i.e. new participants will be in the room), focus on brainstorming and getting folks involved. For the closed meeting (i.e. currently members only), focus on existing projects.
- Spend some time having attendants contribute to a project by brainstorming or volunteering for specific steps, etc.
- Progress reports and then solicit ideas for new activities.
- Update on existing projects and development of concrete action items for next meeting.
- Develop more engagement with members, get more participation in projects.
- Engage individuals in our work.
- Continue to bring good leaders to stimulate discussion and share the experience of participants.
- Being concurrent it is impossible to attend other working group. I would like to participate in the discussions of other working groups.
- I like the idea of having the meetings of the current working group members before the coalition meeting began so that some ongoing business items can be addressed. That can help facilitate the working group meetings that are held later during the coalition meeting since there are often new people and new ideas to discuss, which can slow down discussion of ongoing efforts and business items.
- Discuss ideas for additional work and collaborations.

Workshops

	Response Count	Response Percent
Children’s Rights in the U.S.	20	53%
Introduction to Science, Technology and Human Rights	13	54%
Children’s Rights Online	8	36%
Human Rights Committees and Affinity Groups	14	82%
I did not attend a workshop	7	--

Children’s Rights in the US (38 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	2	2	5	11	0	4.3
Session Format	1	4	6	4	5	0	3.4
Usefulness of Presentations	2	1	4	6	5	0	3.8

Comments:

- I learned several new points on the CRC that I had not known.
- Skyping speaker into the discussion seemed more disruptive than constructive due to the technology difficulties. (This problem was noted by many participants.)
- Overall the session was very informative. It was a bit limited in that all three speakers were lawyers, so they had a narrow perspective, compared to the evening plenary speakers.
- Only issue was problem w Skype. But was a very good panel!
- Speakers were uncoordinated and lacked presentations. Failed to address topic as advertised. Moderator could not be heard well and did not handle the discussion well.
- Presentations very repetitive.

Introduction to Science, Technology and Human Rights (24 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	0	3	10	0	4.8
Session Format	0	0	0	5	7	0	4.6
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	0	5	6	0	4.5

Comment:

- A very good introduction - logical, easy to follow and with plenty of room for the participants to contribute ideas.

Children’s Rights Online (22 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	2	0	6	0	4.5
Session Format	0	0	2	3	3	0	4.1
Usefulness of Presentations	0	1	2	1	4	0	4.0

Comments:

- The presentations were really fascinating-- I loved the diversity of backgrounds of the speakers and interesting discussion that followed.
- The two presenters were excellent.
- Mark Latonero's presentation was very informative; one of the best at meeting.
- The first speaker could not be heard well -- even in the front. The last speaker had visuals and a clear, accessible message. The open discussion went quite well.

Human Rights Committees and Affinity Groups (17 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	3	4	7	0	4.3
Session Format	0	0	2	7	4	0	4.2
Usefulness of Presentations	0	1	2	5	5	0	4.1

Comment:

- If asked to rate the usefulness of the discussion, I would say "Excellent" - we had a strong group as well as strong presenters.

Evening Plenary

Children's Rights in Scientific Research (40 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	3	2	3	14	18	4.3
Usefulness of Presentations	2	4	2	7	5	16	3.5

Comments:

- I found the portrayal of children's rights as somehow being superior or in opposition to parental rights somewhat disturbing - this was in contrast to the notion of "strengthening the family" using a human rights approach presented in the opening session. Much of the presentation was a volume of personal opinion in the guise of legal interpretation.
- The first speaker kept his comments brief and pertinent. The others ran long, not leaving time for discussion. At that time of day, discussion rather than PPT slides would have been more interesting. But this was the fault of the speakers/moderator.
- The plenary would have benefited from a more cohesive focus among presenters, such as having a moderator ask some questions after brief remarks from the speakers. As it was, no one really had a chance to develop ideas, and the audience was too tired to come up with good questions. It would also have been good to hold the speakers' remarks to the allotted time, rather than letting them fill up the session with sometimes unfocused thoughts.
- Talks went long, so little time for questions and discussion.
- Mostly I was tired at the end of such a full day, but this session was least satisfying for me of the three plenaries. The speakers' topics did not coalesce well and went too long.
- Some individual presentations were much more focused than others-- it seemed the session didn't stick to the overall theme. Still, a couple of the speakers were wonderful.
- Three of the speakers were very good. They gave focused papers that were also very inspiring and thought provoking. One didn't seem to keep to the topic and spoke much too long.
- I was not able to hear all speakers, just first two. Well done.

Closing Plenary

Researching Children's Rights: Innovations, Opportunities and Responsibilities (50 attendees)

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	1	12	19	7	4.6
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	3	12	15	7	4.1

Comments:

- Aside from inducing “Brain Overload” and giving me more work to do, all good!
- The presentations on Child Trafficking and DNA matching were both superb, not necessarily better than other sessions, but they offered me more information that I did not know.
- The three presentations represented diverse perspectives and fields, and really hit home the different ways in which our community can contribute to and promote child rights.
- Excellent, particularly forensic scientist!
- Very interesting perspectives, nice discussion.

Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations

How did you hear about the Coalition meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Email from AAAS/Program	29	63%
Program Facebook Page	0	0%
AAAS/Program Website	1	2%
Word of Mouth	8	17%
Other	10	22%

Other responses:

- From a Coalition representative
- Professional society's human rights committee
- Program staff invited me to attend
- At work from colleagues
- Email from Statistics without Borders
- SPSSI email

Affiliation

	Response Count	Response Percent
Professional Society/Association	19	41%
University/College	14	30%
Government	3	7%
Human Rights Organization	3	7%
Business/Industry	0	0%
Nonprofit	4	9%

Press/Media	0	0%
Self-employed	2	4%

What was your main reason(s) for attending? (Check all that apply)

	Response Count	Response Percent (of total number of respondents)
To learn how my professional society can become involved in the Coalition	12	26%
To learn how I can personally become involved in the Coalition	21	46%
To learn more about science, technology and human rights	28	61%
To learn how my organization can respond more effectively	14	30%
To obtain help in engaging members of my discipline in human rights	16	35%
Other (see below)	7	15%

Other responses:

- Scoping out possible speakers for a Children's Environmental Health conference in Washington, DC in August 2013
- Panelist/Speaker
- To further the work of the EIR working group
- To learn from the excellent guest speakers

Overall, how satisfied were you with the meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Very satisfied	31	74%
Moderately satisfied	8	19%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	2%
Moderately dissatisfied	2	5%
Very dissatisfied	0	0%

What aspect of the meeting did you find the most valuable?

- Being able to share ideas in the smaller work groups.
- Focusing the meeting onto a specific topic
- Networking (multiple responses, including several welcoming the extra time allotted for this)
- Interactions with like-minded colleagues.
- The multitude of disciplines represented brought many different perspectives, everyone learned from one another.
- Getting information about children's rights and some of the projects that are ongoing.
- Workshops and Working Group meetings (multiple responses)
- Planning for future work
- I consistently find the invited speakers excellent, sharing very valuable information.
- Connections between children's rights/protections/opportunities and specific research agenda or technological innovation. Also, the extra time for talking and networking was really great.
- The plenary talks
- The Introduction to Science, Technology, and Human Rights workshop. The Human Rights Committees and Affinity Groups in Your Society workshop.
- I learned much and appreciated the opportunity to spread the word about SESAME.
- Wonderful connections with wonderfully diverse and enthusiastic attendees.
- First day-morning plenary and afternoon workshop science, technology and HR, second day children's rights on line.
- The in-depth information on children's rights. The stories were extremely compelling.
- Interaction with other participants to learn their issues and how they are addressing the scientific and human rights issues.
- The two panels on Monday and the session on the introduction to human rights, science and technology
- To the point, informative presentations
- Intersections between empirical research and application to human rights work and policy.
- The focus on the Rights of the Child and how we can move this discussion forward in the US.
- I liked meeting members of the scientific community.

What aspect of the meeting did you find the least valuable?

- This theme did not grab my attention, so the sessions held little interest for me. (This was noted by two other respondents in different ways: “not directly tied to the discipline of my association;” the overall topic was too narrow”).
- Business meeting.
- Lunchtime the first day was not organized in a way that I met anyone new -- it was a bit scattered.
- The evening plenary 'dragged' as the speakers (except for the first) did not follow the time limits, leaving no time for discussion. (This was noted twice by respondents.)
- Human rights trainings
- America-bashing.
- Speaker participating via Skype in workshop distracted from conversation. (Noted twice)
- The PowerPoints generally detracted from the presentations, although Theresa Betancourt had an excellent presentation.
- Working meetings did not feel useful enough for me. Although, perhaps if I was a society representative they would have been more useful.
- Lack of focus in the discussion of the Education Working Group Mtg
- The closing session on the last day was a bit drawn out.

How can future meetings be improved?

- The first day could end earlier in the evening.
- Perhaps we need to put the working groups sessions in succession so we can attend two or more.
- These meetings tend to bring together two populations: the old guard that attends every time, and new folks that are likely there because the theme interests them. Finding ways to engage both groups (and inform the latter before the meeting) would be helpful.
- Assure moderators and speakers with clear voices (Theresa Betancourt was terrific!). Encourage use of talks on topic, with definitive messages, with clear readable relevant graphics.
- Make sure any technology used actually works! (Several comments on this point)
- Incorporate a "trade show" - type exhibit space with booths that can be perused during breaks.
- I have no major suggestions -- I thought that overall it was very good.
- Include the private sectors (commercial sectors) too.
- This is about the right balance
- Have all introductions to what the Coalition is before business/working group meetings.
- Make clear which parts of the program are the topical meeting and which parts are the general business of the Coalition.
- I believe the format works well. As long as the themes of the meetings vary enough from meeting to meeting in order to appeal to a variety of disciplines, we should be able to appeal to a broad section of scientists.
- Assure time for questions and discussion. (Suggested by multiple respondents.)
- The lunch and breaks offered good networking opportunities for me and my granddaughter, a sophomore at GWU who is interested in human rights. Perhaps there could be more such opportunities.
- More interactions and flexible working groups, fewer presentations in the working groups.
- Perhaps a focus on practical applications of certain disciplines to address human rights issues would be useful.
- Focus on moving research findings into practice.
- No evening meetings.
- Perhaps have more opportunities for informal networking.

- Keep workshop focused.

What topics would you like to see covered at future meetings?

- Ways to get your community involved in human rights issues.
- Transnational crime and its impacts on human rights, and the role that science and technology can play in preventing/defeating crime that leads to abuses.
- Building an information resource infrastructure.
- Intersection of Human and Environmental Rights. LGTB Rights. Parental Rights. The Pros and Cons of Boycotting.
- Science diplomacy, groups like SESAME, how science can bring people of warring countries together and promote peace.
- How R&D and human rights practices in the private companies like life sciences, pharma, etc. including manufacturing sector
- Digital technologies, Use of scientific data and data collection methods in human rights practice, human rights and "big data"
- Perhaps a topic that drew in the social sciences: cultural anthropology, psychology, or economics.
- The role of science and research in promoting mental health (and/or civic participation)
- New technologies and their human rights implications
- Access to medicines/public health as a human right
- Engagement of NGOs with societies and scientists
- Practical applications of scientific tools, disciplines to address human rights issues.
- Genetics related issues
- Refugees, internally displaced persons
- Focus on the scientist.... How to help educate future scientist.
- Making science and human rights issues clearer and accessible to general public.
- Translation of Science to Policy with concrete ways of doing this well.
- Tools for human rights defenders

Finally, we welcome your testimony on the impact your involvement in the Coalition and/or this meeting has had on you and your work.

- To gather with like-minded people to argue and discuss, it is extremely stimulating. As someone said, we need to be put in "uncomfortable position" to be able to understand the magnitude of the work yet to be done for the realization of human rights in our lifetime.
- After attending this meeting, I completely restructured the international conference technical session I am co-chairing later this year in order to incorporate a human rights approach.
- It has been quite influential on both my personal work (highlight: the program on the right to development) and work with my society, the International Society of Political Psychology.
- It has been a tremendous resource for advocating for the promotion of rights and social justice, serving vulnerable populations through research and evidence-based practices.
- I made useful contacts and plan to become more involved.
- Much more attuned to human rights issues, organizations, and activities
- This meeting and my interactions with participants has made me aware of the efforts of so many others and energized me in my own human rights work.
- I loved this meeting. It was a great experience, very well organized, delicious food, friendly staff, and terrific mix of students/professionals. This is an excellent resource for the scientific and human rights communities and I'm very glad that AAAS is carrying out this commitment.
- I made some very useful connections.

- Each topic each year contributes a new perspective on my work on human rights. The high quality and commitment to human rights of many of the speakers is very much appreciated.
- The meeting provided me with some information as to how "science" can contribute to the discourse on human rights.
- It has been wonderful for my human rights work to know that there are those in the scientific community who are interested in getting involved. Very interesting overall!