AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Meeting

Report

July 14-15, 2014
AAAS Headquarters
Washington, D.C.

Moving Forward - Since the launch of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition in 2009, this growing network of science and engineering associations has collaborated to build bridges between science and technology organizations and the human rights community. The Coalition has created new human rights resources for science and engineering associations, tools for human rights organizations that seek to incorporate science and technology in their work, increased awareness of the opportunities for scientists and engineers to contribute to human rights, and advanced international discussions regarding the significance of the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications, as guaranteed in Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.

The Coalition's fifth anniversary provides an opportune moment to celebrate our progress and share the network's accomplishments. At this time of reflection, it is also fitting to look toward the next five years, identify emerging challenges, and map out the Coalition's next steps. Thus, to mark the anniversary, this meeting is organized around the connections between science and human rights that guide the Coalition's working groups.

AAAS
ADVANCING SCIENCE, SERVING SOCIETY

Table of Contents

Session Reports

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.

Summaries of the meeting sessions were written by Joshua Ettinger and Bethelhem Girma. The report was compiled and edited by Theresa Harris.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition thanks the

American Educational Research Association
and
Capital Area Social Psychological Association

for their support of this meeting.

Welcoming Remarks

Jessica Wyndham, Associate Director of the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program, welcomed attendees to this meeting of the Science and Human Rights Coalition. She described the changing terms of Coalition membership and the introduction of annual contributions.

She then described several member organization initiatives expanding on the Coalition's work. Societies such as the Association of American Geographers (AAG), Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), the National Center for Science and Civic Engagement (NCSCE) and the American Psychological Association (APA) have all held sessions on human rights topics at conferences. Likewise, the Council for Undergraduate Research (CUR), the National Center for Science & Civic Engagement (NCSCE) and SPSSI published articles on the Coalition's work, engaging their members on science and human rights issues.

Following the January 2014 Coalition meeting, the AAAS Board of Directors adopted a statement urging ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. Several societies have since endorsed the statement or adopted analogous statements, and more societies are currently in the approval process. Wyndham reminded the audience of the Coalition's upcoming 5th anniversary celebration, which will take place on October 23, 2014. She lastly described the recent creation of the Andrew M. Sessler-AAAS Science, Education and Human Rights Fund in memory of renowned physicist and AAAS Fellow Andrew Sessler, who was a vocal proponent for human rights.

Keynote Address: Patricia A. Davis

Patricia Davis, Director of the Office of Global Programs, Bureau of Democracy, Human Rights and Labor (DRL) at the U.S. Department of State, outlined the bureau's goal of protecting individuals and organizations promoting human rights that are at risk of persecution by governments or non-state actors. Through the implementation of rapid response funds, Davis said that DRL has aided over 1600 individuals from 37 countries, 127 of whom were human rights defenders with scientific backgrounds. In addition, the Bureau occasionally helps individuals relocate to a safer region or country. In related but separate work, DRL also takes a venture capital approach, providing seed money for innovative ideas that protect human rights.

Davis originally became involved with DRL through a AAAS Diplomacy Fellowship. Fifteen years later, she has remained at the State Department. In her position at the State Department, she oversees 350 international projects. She described two types of relevant projects on which her team has focused: forensics and internet freedom. With regard to forensics, DRL has many projects devoted to the documentation of human rights abuses of authoritarian regimes. It attempts to build an accurate assessment of regional circumstances and consistent log of violations. For example, DRL has supported scientific documentation of mass graves and efforts to hold governments accountable with accurate statistics. State Department resources provide access to many original and electronic documents that are not otherwise available to human rights non-governmental organizations. Data collection efforts can also have positive localized impacts. Davis told the story of a Guatemalan boy who was reunited with his father after a conflict left both isolated from one another. This was made possible by DRL's support for extensive data management. While on this subject, Davis commended a AAAS Kosovo refugee flow analysis published in 2002, which was ultimately used in an International Criminal Court (ICC) tribunal for the former Yugoslavia. As these examples illustrate, rigorous research is an important asset for effective human rights work.

DRL also manages internet freedom programs aimed at countering online censorship and persecution of individuals in other countries. One tactic, for example, is DRL's support for the development of new anti-censorship technologies. "Slingshot," for example, is a type of software that helps reveal censored content, and "MESH" technology creates localized secure communication networks without a centralized access point. Davis pointed out that it is sometimes more productive to not publicly bully governments, which is why the State Department often works hidden from the public eye. This opens up opportunities for governments to make concessions without the barrier of public image concerns, but at the same time, limits detailed public knowledge of DRL's activities.

Davis expressed pride in the work she has done and noted the "real difference the program makes in real people's lives." Davis noted that there is greater room for the State Department to become more involved with professional societies such as those involved in the Coalition and hopes to increasingly utilize their expertise in the future.

Plenary: Innovations in Science and Technology for Human Rights

The plenary, moderated by Coalition Steering Committee member **Sue Gunawardena-Vaughn**, highlighted new avenues that scientists, engineers, and human rights practitioners have taken in order to tackle complex human rights violations around the world. Speakers addressed ways in which analyzing DNA, using geospatial technologies and global databases, and effectively understanding the effects of economic and social rights violations can all be utilized to address complex human rights issues across continents.

Jennifer K. Wagner, 2014-2015 AAAS Congressional Fellow, discussed the methods with which relevant DNA technologies can be applied towards victim identification and family reunification. Markers such as Y-DNA, mtDNA, and autosomal DNA are analyzed with new technologies such as whole genome sequencing and rapid DNA analysis and matched with samples of other DNA to conduct kinship comparisons. Wagner noted the challenges involved in the project, including but not limited to, difficulties in data collection, the vulnerabilities of intended beneficiaries, and the social and cultural challenges of reuniting families. Audience members asked how data would be gathered from large urban populations in Wagner's project, raising concerns about the feasibility of family reunification if missing family members could not even be located. Wagner acknowledged this challenge; however, they have still had progress and successes in identifying people from vulnerable populations. For example, families have been able to use post-mortem identification to identify missing family members and find closure to unsolved cases. Additionally, the project has been applied to many human rights contexts, including mass disasters, missing persons, and illicit adoption. Therefore, though difficulty locating people has been a limitation of the project, it hasn't prevented its successes.

Eric Ashcroft, Geospatial Technologies and Human Rights Project in the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights, and Law Program, presented on the use of geospatial technology to monitor land use and land cover change in Bahrain. The AAAS geospatial group partnered with the Bahrain Center for Human Rights to analyze environmental changes, including island expansion, vegetation loss, and urbanization for the years 1987-2003. The results indicated island expansion of 680 to 730 kilometers, or 12% of the total land area, and urbanized area grew from 75 to 155 kilometers. Ashcroft discussed how land growth and land use changes can be indicators for what is occurring to human populations in the area and can serve as a foundation for further research designed to understand the human rights implications of this data. The knowledge gained from this geospatial study can lead to more studies that examine the human rights of the populations more critically.

Ana Ayala, O'Neill Institute for the National and Global Health Law at the Georgetown University Law Center, discussed the development of a free online database focusing on global health and human rights. This database offers to bring people from different disciplines and from various regions together to advance human rights around the globe. It can also serve as a starting point for different research projects and can provide information for comparative legal analysis across regions. The selection of material to be included in the database is reviewed based on a set of criteria that examines whether the material is adjudicated by an international,

regional or domestic court, whether it implicates a specified health topic, and whether it addresses a right of individuals or groups.

Nahal Zamani, Center for Constitutional Rights, argued that "daily hassles," a social science concept, should be considered to be manifestations of economic, social and cultural (ESC) rights violations, and taken into account in the current metrics used to indicate these violations. Zamani described daily hassles as disruptions in a person's control of their surroundings and their ability to respond and recover as a consequence of ESC violations. Unlike other metrics used in ESC violations, daily hassles are an accumulation of chronic effects rather than a singular event in a person's life. She argued that incorporating daily hassles and stressful impacts as indicators of ESC violations better illustrates the severity of ESC rights violations. Several audience members noted the difficulty of quantifying "daily hassles" in Zamani's project, as it becomes unclear when something turns from being a handicap unrelated to ESC violations to becoming a "daily hassle" that is a result of ESC violations.

Concurrent Session: Teaching Human Rights in Science and Engineering Courses

Moderator **Karen Oates**, National Center for Science and Civic Engagement, started the discussion by describing a world where access to resources, food, and water does not always come easily. With a growing population and limited resources, these challenges will pose a greater threat to global human rights in the years to come. Though human rights issues once seemed to solely fit into the humanistic disciplines, politics, and diplomacy, the changing global environment has brought human rights and the sciences closer together than ever before. Oates, stated that STEM professionals must adapt their perspectives and research to address these growing challenges. Oates maintained that integrative learning in the sciences would give STEM professionals the necessary foundational knowledge to best incorporate human rights with STEM in their careers. If human rights are to be addressed in the future, educators should enable their students to start critically examining them today.

Jiva Manske, Amnesty International USA, discussed methods with which human rights can be incorporated into classroom curricula. Manske proposed that when teaching human rights, educators focus on teaching the background of human rights (what it means, its history), teaching with a human rights mentality (teaching about issues from a human rights perspective), and teaching for human rights (how to take action to solve these issues).

Manske used the topic of water to demonstrate how students can brainstorm ways to tackle a specific global issue. In a ten minute discussion, audience members discussed ways in which people can improve the human right to water, including but not limited to:

1) Implementing changes in technology and purification
2) Creating changes in people's perspectives about the importance of water
3) Having a public service campaign to increase awareness about water
4) Understanding the legal impediments to water
5) Creating a progressive pricing system to change how people value water

Manske proposed that educators use a brainstorming and hypothesis method such as the one practiced in the meeting. This allows students to learn by developing their own ideas and by exploring all the sectors involved in protecting specific human rights.

Sheryl Luzzadder-Beach, Association of American Geographers (AAG), shared her experience with incorporating human rights in teaching a geography course at the University of Texas at Austin. Luzzader-Beach explained the goals of the Coalition's Education & Information Resources working group, as well as the goals of the AAG's Geography and Human Rights initiative and their efforts to promote human rights teaching in school curricula.

By incorporating human rights in a two-day Physical Geography Lab, Luzzadder-Beach was able to teach human rights without sacrificing the substantive material of the course. She

created a module of the lab class in order to aid other educators in their efforts to integrate human rights lessons into their classes. The module was for a lab course entitled GGS 121-201 Lab: Dynamic Atmosphere and Hydrosphere. The module included teaching students about Article 15 (the 'right to science'), mapping human rights challenges, proposing solutions to these challenges, and cooperating between groups to negotiate aid strategies. Luzzadder-Beach's module demonstrated how human rights can be included in lesson plans and can encourage cooperative learning among students.

In the question and answer portion of the session, audience members discussed how efforts can be made to increase awareness about human rights in the scientific and teaching communities so that educators understand the importance of including human rights in their curricula. Audience members concluded that meetings like the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition have made an important contribution to increasing awareness amongst scientists. Suggestions included reaching out to more scientific organizations and emphasizing the broader applications of their disciplines to human rights. Members also discussed using national grant proposals to have a widespread impact on the incorporation of human rights education in STEM classes and to measure the civic engagement of those students who have learned about human rights. Understanding the civic engagement of students who have received human rights education can be a significant step to showing the benefits of incorporating human rights into STEM education. Participants also raised concerns about the practicality of teaching human rights when educators are expected to focus on relaying technical information. The speakers emphasized that technical teaching and human rights education are not mutually exclusive, and educators can certainly find a balance without sacrificing substantive material, as Luzzadder-Beach's example demonstrates.

Concurrent Session: Evaluating Effective Tactics for Protecting Colleagues at Risk

Sophie Cook, Committee of Concerned Scientists, moderated the session. She introduced her organization, which began in 1972 advocating for Jewish scientists who were barred from immigrating to Israel from the Soviet Union. The Committee's work is much expanded now, advocating for the human rights of scientists, engineers and health professionals around the world. Cook noted that the Committee does not have strong mechanisms for self-evaluation due to complex political factors specific to each case and because their efforts are intertwined with those of other advocacy organizations. She invited each of the panelists to describe their respective organization's work to protect individuals and also to address the questions of effectiveness and evaluation in this type of advocacy.

Lauren Crain, Scholars at Risk, described her organization's work towards the protection of academics and intellectuals of all disciplines. Based at New York University, they serve individuals in their home countries by pressuring governments to respect the rights of scholars. They also help place scholars in academic positions outside their home countries to help protect their safety. The staff at Scholars at Risk are currently assessing trends and patterns in their work in order to identify the most effective approaches.

Jasmine Heiss, Amnesty International, explained that her organization is a large global nonprofit organization with three million members. Amnesty International maintains an urgent action network that writes letters calling on governments or relevant parties to protect the rights of imprisoned individuals. It has an impact monitoring framework to evaluate its efforts and identify the most influential strategies.

Courtney Radsch, Committee to Protect Journalists (CPJ), pointed out that journalism is dangerous; last year was the deadliest year for journalists and many were jailed. The CPJ aims to defend the individual rights of journalists and the broader right to practice journalism. They monitor every case of murder and track the imprisonment of journalists. She pointed out that effective advocacy needs data. CPJ also provides direct emergency assistance in order to get journalists out of harm's way when a threat is imminent. Monitoring effectiveness can be complicated; the removal of a journalist to safety can often mean a loss of journalistic quality and scope. CPJ's work is, therefore, a balancing act, enabling a journalist's valuable work while ensuring adequate safety and rights. CPJ also protects bloggers (who some claim are not journalists) by emphasizing the right to practice journalism, rather than identifying what journalism is strictly by the medium through which it is publicized.

Giovanni Dazzo described Freedom House's human rights defenders assistance program. This program provides financial assistance to support legal and medical fees. Unlike some human rights organizations, Freedom House receives government funding, which provides easier acquisition of capital but involves some institutional constraints. The organization frequently evaluates its own data in order to determine best practices for helping human rights defenders. Dazzo noted that individual human rights defenders must first want assistance in order for Freedom House to have a positive impact.

Concurrent Session: Indicators for Human Rights

Human rights and socio-economic indicators have been critical to the field of global development, helping organizations understand human development levels across countries. **Brian Gran** of Sociologists without Borders gave a brief overview on the importance of human rights indicators and the Coalition's Service to the Human Rights Community working group project to develop indicators for monitoring the "right to science." According to Gran, human rights indicators serve to help hold governments accountable for their human rights abuses. He noted that these indicators must be accessible, understandable, consistent, disaggregable, and impartial. The three types of human rights indicators are structural, process, and outcome indicators. Structural indicators refer to the institutional framework, constitutional and legal provisions, and public policies, process indicators refer to the necessary activities completed to attain specific rights-related objectives, and outcome indicators describe the status of a population's enjoyment of a right.

Nicholas Luisiani, of the Center for Economic and Social Rights, discussed the promises, pitfalls, and precautions of human rights indicators. In order to be comprehensive, human rights indicators should be indicators of both how policies are implemented, as well as the results of those policies. If conducted effectively, indicators can be utilized as ways to: identify groups that are not enjoying a right or not accessing goods or services; describe what nations are doing to better the rights of individuals; assess whether progress is being made on specific rights; and see whether countries are gathering data to monitor human rights.

A significant benefit of human rights indicators includes the ability for organizations to better visualize human rights. With human rights indicators, organizations are able to depict human rights across a period of time and use this to understand whether there is a relationship between socio-economic outcomes and public/private conduct. Additionally, human rights indicators create a standardized unit of measurement to assess human rights in different states and bridge the gaps between policy decision makers and human rights organizations.

Despite their benefits, human rights indicators also have their limitations. Luisiani discussed how the manageability of indicators is a complex problem, as they need to be both selective in what information they include as well as broad as to not exclude important factors. Furthermore, human rights indicators, though they explain *what* is occurring, do not always elaborate on *why* that outcome is occurring. Perhaps the most significant concern is that much of the collection and dissemination of official data remains biased in many countries and it is difficult to corroborate the validity of the data.

During the question and answer session, participants raised concerns about how certain nations are able to collect data on human rights within their borders. Since this requires funding, lesser developed countries could potentially be restricted in their ability to create comprehensive assessments. Audience members also noted that some human rights are not limited to the borders of specific countries, creating difficulty in accounting for these rights. Additionally,

Luisiani addressed how typically, many countries that are capable of conducting assessments are not accountable for their actions, while countries and organizations that are accountable are not always capable, making the acquisition of un-biased, sound data more challenging.

Concurrent Session: Scientific Responsibility, Ethics and Human Rights

Moderator **Mark Frankel**, AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program, introduced the panel. **Jessica Wyndham**, also of the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program, described a project of the Coalition's Ethics and Human Rights working group examining the social responsibilities of scientists and engineers. In order to begin answering the questions of how scientists and engineers view the nature and scope of their responsibilities and to determine whether there are any trends in these perspectives according to demographic factors, the working group developed and disseminated a questionnaire. The questionnaire consisted of several demographic questions (including age, gender, field, sector, source of funding and country of education and career), ten Likert scale questions, and an open-ended question. The questions probed a variety of potential responsibilities, such as considering adverse consequences of your work, explaining your work to the public, reporting misconduct and engaging in public policy.

The survey elicited over 2600 responses. Once the data were cleaned, 2153 responses were usable. Most represented were individuals from the life sciences (36.9%), working in the educational sector (43.7%), receiving government funding (61.8%), male (58.3%), working in North America (65.4%), and over 50 years old (39.7%). The responsibilities rated of greatest importance were "considering adverse consequences of your work," "reporting misconduct," and "minimizing anticipated risks associated with your work." In contrast, the questions that were considered of less importance were "participating in public policy," "taking steps to ensure one's research is used appropriately," and "considering the potential of one's research to contribute to societal well-being." By region, the analysis found a greater emphasis on considering adverse consequences of one's research in Europe, North America and the Pacific, while there was a greater emphasis on contributing to societal well-being in Africa, Arab States, Asia and Latin America.

Robert Albro, co-chair of the Ethics and Human Rights working group, described the results of the open-ended question, which formed the basis of the report's qualitative analysis. The question asked was, "What are other responsibilities of scientists and engineers?" Albro described the process of parsing through the 509 written responses, organizing them by subject matter and searching for correlations across various demographic factors. The qualitative analysis revealed several interesting findings: older participants mentioned a wide variety of responsibilities with greater frequency than their younger counterparts; female scientists and engineers cited education as a social responsibility significantly more than men; and engineers and social scientists more frequently mentioned responsibilities related to societal impacts.

Albro noted the importance of language and how it influences the concerns of scientists and engineers. When we engage on ethical issues, we especially need to think about the levels at which scientists and engineers are responsible for risks associated with their work. Are they only responsible for their individual behavior? For practices in their laboratory? For the broader impacts of their research on society? He also pointed out the importance of examining uneven

trends of ethical concerns across demographics. This can inform what groups to target with stronger ethics educational programs in the future.

Discussant **Hugh Gusterson**, George Mason University, raised several questions to be considered in a future study. In the next phase of the research, how can the group obtain responses from individuals who are not already passionate about the topic? The results may have suggested an inflated concern about social responsibilities due to the nature of those who would respond to such a questionnaire. Additionally, is there a way of examining the differences between survey responses and real-life scenarios, e.g., reporting misconduct? In reality, one may act considerably differently than what one writes in a survey.

One participant questioned whether the open-ended response should come before or after the multiple choice questions. If it comes afterward, participant responses might be colored by the content of the Likert scale questions. Another participant critiqued one of the Likert scale questions, noting the inability to truly predict the outcomes of one's discoveries. It was also noted that the working group should take a look at the codes of ethics/social responsibilities created by various scientific societies. More ideas raised during the discussion included the need to encourage greater international participation in the next survey and to consider adding religion as another demographic factor.

Both Albro and Wyndham emphasized that the scope of the study is not large enough to make any broad claims on the perceived social responsibilities of scientists and engineers; however, the questionnaire will inform the creation of the larger survey in the near future. The next steps for the project are to complete the analysis and disseminate the results. The working group, along with AAAS staff, will then start designing the larger survey based on lessons learned from the questionnaire.

Closing Plenary: Funding Science, Technology and Human Rights

This plenary, moderated by **Romesh Silva**, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, explored opportunities and challenges related to the funding of science and technology impacting human rights.

Michael Kleinmann, Humanity United, described the importance of acquiring reputable data for human rights. Good data is not only essential for accurately assessing conflicts, but also critical for providing useful materials for legal cases and tribunals. He warned the audience against utopian thinking; science and technology can make life significantly easier, but it is ultimately not a panacea. However, the greater extent to which technology can be adapted to specific circumstances, the more useful it will be for practitioners working on the ground.

Liz Steininger described the work of the Open Technology Fund, an organization that funds internet freedom projects. She emphasized the importance of transparency and agility in the human rights field. Private philanthropy is encouraging new approaches and bridging fields.

Liza Dawson described the work of the AIDS Division at NIH's National Institute for Allergy and Infectious Diseases, noting the significant connections between AIDS and human rights. Populations at high risk for contracting the disease, such as homosexual men, migrant workers and sex workers, are often targeted for human rights abuses. In response to this, AIDS researchers are documenting abuses of key populations, designing, testing and implementing interventions, and removing barriers to healthcare. In addition to human rights concerns, protecting vulnerable populations is also important for mitigating the further spread of AIDS/HIV.

Jeffrey Mantz, National Science Foundation's (NSF) Cultural Anthropology Program, explained that NSF funds basic scientific research with human rights aspects. He described one example of a study of trafficking in "conflict minerals" that fit these criteria.

Collaborations between scientists and human rights initiatives will take time to bear fruit. There are significant differences between the science and human rights fields. While scientists may be highly focused on accuracy and methods, for example, the human rights community will try to make use of whatever information is available to affect change. Urgent needs can outweigh methodological qualms. As scientists become more engaged in global issues and human rights practitioners become more scientifically literate, both groups have the opportunity to enhance their work and impact.

Workshop: Contributing to Discussions on Article 15 at the United Nations

In this meeting, Coalition members interested in engaging with the United Nations human rights structures discussed the meaning of the "right to science" as well as different ways that they could advocate for this right.

Jessica Wyndham, AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program, and **Margaret Weigers Vitullo**, American Sociological Association, began by discussing Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and what it means to have the right to enjoy scientific progress. Article 15 of the International Covenant on Social, Economic, and Cultural Rights expects governments to:

1. Recognize the right of everyone to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications
2. Conserve, develop, and diffuse science
3. Respect the freedom indispensable for scientific research, and
4. Recognize the benefits of international contacts and co-operation in the scientific field.

Wyndham discussed three areas in Article 15 that many people find unclear. In its current outline, Article 15 is vague about what the benefits of science are, what fields of study are included in the broad term "science", and who has the right to enjoy the benefits of science. Wyndham and Vitullo discussed the methodology of the Coalition's focus group study (a research study aimed at understanding the scientific community's understanding of Article 15) as well as the conclusions derived from the study. The study included 17 focus groups, where participants in each focus group shared a common disciplinary background. Participants were asked a set of open-ended questions about what they believed were the benefits of their discipline to society, as well as what they believed were the core responsibilities of governments with regards to advancing scientific freedom, among other questions.

This study revealed that the two most common benefits of science recognized by the participants were the applications it has for improving health and the advancement of knowledge. With regards to what fields of study are included in the broad term science, participators concluded that the social sciences are as applicable to Article 15 as the life and physical sciences, as well as engineering. Additionally, when addressing the question about the beneficiaries of the right to science, participators emphasized the need to increase access to science at every level for the lay public as well as scientists, including increasing funding for researchers in addition to increasing access to scientific education.

Risa Kaufman, Human Rights Institute at Columbia Law School, described the mechanisms available for human rights advocacy related to Article 15 in the United Nations, including the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, which is the monitoring body established by the ICESCR. The framework relies on a fairly open process in which a committee of experts reviews and clarifies material. Governments that have ratified the ICESCR must report to this committee on their progress. In this discussion, Coalition members raised concerns about whether countries would not report on their progress, not because of lack of credibility, but

because of their lack of capacity. Kaufman discussed how there are other ways that governments can be held accountable for their adherence to specific treaties. For example, “shadow” reporting allows for outside parties such as civil society organizations to report on the progress made by governments and offer a different perspective.

Coalition members discussed how they could attain increased participation by NGOs, specifically scientific organizations, with contributing to the General Comment for Article 15 and with contributing to shadow reporting. Although increased NGO participation is desirable, attendees discussed the financial limitations of involving these groups in the process, since money would be necessary for NGOs to effectively fulfill their work and travel to the sites of United Nations meetings. Discussion also revolved around how to encourage conversation about Article 15 in spheres beyond NGO’s. Members discussed increasing participation and awareness of Article 15 among academics and educators. Members also recognized that increasing awareness among people at an early age would be beneficial for future United Nations human rights work and suggested including Article 15 in university programs such as the Model United Nations to get students involved and interested in understanding the right to science.

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
Maya Sabatello, Affiliated Individual

Progress since last meeting

Over the last six months the primary activities of the working group have focused on moving forward with our report project focused on more fully defining the extent and implications of "scientific responsibility," particularly as it pertains to Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. This is a joint project with the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program.

During this period we completed the administration of a pilot questionnaire designed to provide basic feedback from scientists about their understanding of what is entailed in "scientific responsibility." Questionnaire respondents – from different disciplines and countries – totaled 2,670, with 2,153 of these able to be used, and with over 500 of these also completing the qualitative section. Together with Jessica Wyndham and Mark Frankel, AAAS intern Josh Ettinger has completed a first analysis of the qualitative Likert-scale section of the survey. Working also with working group co-chairs Rob Albro and Maya Sabatello, Josh has also begun to develop an initial analysis of the qualitative responses. In short, an initial draft of the report is now taking shape.

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

The primary working group goal during this period will be to complete the report on "scientific responsibility," working closely with colleagues at AAAS. To this end, working group co-chairs Rob Albro and Maya Sabatello are actively developing a work plan for completion of the report.

As part of this project, a next step will be using the report as a basis to engage with key stakeholders. Incorporating the results of the pilot survey, the report is intended to be preliminary and to provide the necessary momentum for a more comprehensive project focused on scientists and responsibilities. To this end, and again working closely with AAAS, we plan to: 1. Organize an event to present the report's preliminary findings to colleagues at NSF and perhaps other federal science funding agencies; 2. Begin to develop an NSF proposal to fund a more ambitious survey on this topic.

Ideas Generated

One area of definite interest among working group members is a future project exploring implications for "privacy" of new and emerging "big data" sciences, as these are raised by particular – often digital – methodologies of data collection.

A second area of interest is to take up the relative lack of reference to human rights in the ongoing work of the Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues, despite a

mandate that human rights should be a part of the Commission's work. This work might begin with an assessment of the commission's forthcoming report on neuroscience, which is likely to appear this fall.

Next meeting date:

Co-chairs Maya Sabatello and Rob Albro are scheduled to have a teleconference in the second half of August, on the basis of which we will organize a meeting with the working group as a whole.

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: **Clifford S. Duke**, Affiliated Individual
Margaret Weigers Vitullo, American Sociological Association

Progress since last meeting

The working group has two main areas of activity, with the Article 15 effort completed for the time being. Progress on each of the two main areas of activity are outlined below.

Starter Kit Project:

In the absence of Clinton Anderson and Gabriel Twose, Margaret Vitullo summarized plans for a workshop at the next Coalition meeting (see below).

Webinar Project:

Margaret Vitullo has updated the slide deck in response to previous comments, and Cliff Duke has completed a letter to invite associations to host webinars, incorporating input from the working group and Jessica Wyndham. Alyson Reed (Linguistic Society of America) led development of a timeline for webinar preparation and presentation.

The working group discussed the revised slides, suggesting several additional changes. Building on an idea from David, the group also discussed making a short (3 minute) video that would preview the webinar, to show prospective hosts the subject matter and style. Ed Butterworth has a contact whose students may be able to assist with the video.

Several group members may wish to make additional detailed comments on the slides, so we will make the slide deck available on our Sharepoint site, with input due soon, date to be determined.

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

Starter Kit Project:

A workshop, "Communicating to Your Constituencies about the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition," is scheduled for the January 2015 Coalition meeting. Led by Clinton Anderson and Gabriel Twose, the workshop will teach participants how to link coalition activities to resources within their own organization and target messages about the Coalition's work to their membership.

Webinar Project:

Our goal is to run three pilot webinars this fall for associations represented by working group members – ASA, ESA, and Linguistics. Doug Richardson of AAG has offered to host a fourth

pilot. After the first couple of pilots, the invitation letter will go out to all the other members of the Coalition, with the goal of having new groups beginning to host in the spring of 2015. We also plan to conduct follow-up surveys of webinar participants 3-6 months after each webinar to evaluate impact.

Ideas Generated

Tiffany Carey suggested offering the webinar to student groups. David suggested developing targeted videos that could be posted online, an idea that the group may consider in the longer term.

Next meeting date:

The next meeting will be planned for October. Margaret and Cliff will confer and send the date to the working group members soon.

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**, Sociologists Without Borders
Susan Hinkins, American Statistical Association
Oliver Moles, Capital Area Social Psychological Association

Progress since last meeting

Clinics and Workshops: Two presentations have been organized for this fall at American University Washington College of Law. One will be a luncheon seminar for their students to describe the overall Coalition activities; AAAS staff and others will present this work. The second is an open afternoon workshop on indicators of use to human rights workers, led by Giovanni Dazzo from Freedom House and possibly others.

Indicators Project: The Indicators sub-working group (ISWG) has drafted a report describing the data and the issues around creating indicators based on three data sets selected as exemplars of three types of indicators. Six individuals collaborated in reviewing the information and evaluating the data for the purpose of developing indicators. ISWG attempts to hold monthly telephone conference calls to provide updates on the members' work and to discuss goals and future directions of the Indicators work.

Brian Gran led a general session at the July Coalition meeting on indicators. Through his talk, "Indicating Human Rights: Promise, Pitfalls, and Precautions," Niko Lusiani, Director, Human Rights in Economic Policy of the Center for Economic and Social Rights (CESR), described the various efforts CESR has taken in using indicators to hold governments and nongovernment organizations accountable for human rights implementation. Lusiani offered helpful perspectives and suggestions on the work of ISWG. Audience engagement was high, and their comments will prove helpful as ISWG moves forward.

Text Mining: Bill Mawby has analyzed the annual reports and other documents from about 50 human rights organizations to identify their most common words related to human rights. He has also compared HR organizations that have used the On-Call Scientists to other organizations via logistical regression of their statements. He identified organizations in the latter groups that have similar characteristics that may inform the On-Call opportunities and other services we may provide.

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

Clinics and Workshops: The immediate next steps are to hold the presentations at American University and evaluate the response and interest generated. Additional workshops and clinics will be planned (at this time there is no specific goal regarding number or location).

Several attendees at the July Coalition meeting would like to join this subgroup and participate in developing these workshops. (Kendall, Brown, Schechtman). A teleconference call is scheduled for Monday July 21st. Sue Gunawardena-Vaughan, Theresa Harris and Oliver Moles are taking the lead.

Indicators Project: ISWG will conclude work on its first database of indicators, which focus on knowledge. Currently, ISWG is deliberating on its second database of indicators.

Text Mining: The next step is to determine how to use the information to identify Human Rights Organizations that appear to have characteristics making them likely to benefit from science/technology but that have not used the On-Call Science program. There was a discussion of possible ways to contact such organizations – emails, calls, personal contacts by those who know them – and the resources needed for this. Bill Mawby asked for HR organizations where we have personal contacts. Art Kendall and Sue Gunawardena-Vaughan volunteered to provide some examples. It is hoped that Bill can participate in the January meeting in person.

Ideas Generated

Clinics and Workshops: The University of the District of Columbia was also suggested as a venue for a workshop. Howard University's law school is another group we will explore. It is near UDC and a joint session is possible. Giovanni Dazzo who will participate in the AU workshops this fall also knows other schools and organizations that may be interested (Vaughan). In addition, we may get a videotape of the AU indicators workshop for later use in remote areas and a webinar there is possible. AAAS might be able to use link to these on its own website.

Indicators Project: The following suggestions were made.

- The benefits of science may be seen in access to health care, clean water, and lessening environmental degradation (Schechtman).
- Patents may show who is doing science and where (Kendall).
- The following potential sources of data/information were suggested
    - The XTXS cross-time and cross-systems data sets. David Miller of AIR is the contact (Torney-Purta).
    - Health issues
        - The World Bank issues reports on health issues (Reiser).
        - NIH has international health data.
        - UNESCO and UNICEF record children not getting health care (Kendall).
    - The AAUP has studies here and abroad (Reiser).
    - The CIA publishes a World Fact Book.

Text Mining and Follow up:

Other words were suggested for the text mining analysis, such as impact, outcome, estimates, measures, and program evaluation (Kendall). A tree analysis by type of organization was also suggested (Kendall).

Next meeting date:

Monthly calls are scheduled for the first Monday of the month, unless it is a Federal holiday in which case the second Monday of the month. Our next call is scheduled for Monday, August 4.

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: **Sheryl Luzzadder-Beach**, Association of American Geographers
Sam McFarland, Affiliated Individual

Progress since last meeting

The notes below represent the work of the Education and Information Resources Working Group from January – June 2014.

In truth, the EIR Working Group made little progress during the January – July 2014 time period. On the positive side (as summarized before the July 15 meeting):

1. The updated annotated human rights bibliographies for a number of disciplines (Chemistry, Forensic Anthropology, Geography, Information Science and Technology, Medicine, Physics, Psychiatry/Orthopsychiatry, Psychology, Social Science, Sociology, Statistics) were posted on-line at http://www.aaas.org/page/science-and-human-rights-select-annotated-bibliography. A bibliography on Public Health and human rights, approved at the EIR January meeting, was added during the spring.

   These updates are consistent with the 2012-2014 Plan of Action goals, to "Invite all Coalition members to review and suggest additions/deletions to the current bibliographic database," and to "Continuously augment the Bibliographic Database with more materials on science and human rights . . ." (Plan of Action, p. 27)

2. A link was posted to the teaching module, "A Very Brief Overview of Modern Human Rights," posted on the SENCER website (http://serc.carleton.edu/sencer/backgrounders/overview_of_modern_human-Rights).

   Posting this link is consistent with EIR Objective 2, to "promote a deeper understanding of human rights among students in science, engineering, and health classes."

3. As proposed at the January meeting, a "form" was created for annotated bibliographies that would enable student interns to prepare first drafts. This form was reviewed at the July 15 EIR meeting.

4. At the January meeting, a decision was reached to make revisions in the high school module on science and human rights. Jennifer Bronson has just completed these revisions, which will be distributed to the EIR membership for its review.

Despite the advances, the following goals set in January 2014 are not yet achieved:

1. The decision was reached in January to ask each "curator" of the annotated bibliographies to obtain as many hotlinks for their listings as possible. This has not yet been done, and was delayed (by co-chair Sam McFarland) because of concerns over the appearance of the new website.

2. The annotated bibliography website has bibliographies in sixteen disciplines (e.g., anthropology, education, economics, political science) that have not yet been updated. To date, the EIR Working Group has not found individuals in these disciplines who have agreed to prepare these updates. A module on history and human rights was received for review at the July meeting.

3. While the EIR Working Group now has an agreed-on template for exemplary teaching modules on particular sciences and human rights, we have made no further progress in developing these modules. That will hopefully become a major task of the EIR Working Group after the July meeting.

4. A suggestion was made at the January meeting to locate non-technical articles and artifacts (e.g., art works, films) that could be useful for science and human rights courses. The EIR Working Group has not yet pursued this possibility.

Finally, Liljana Stevceva and Bruce Friesen expressed interest in serving as co-chairs for the next two years (replacing Sam McFarland, whose term is expiring), and both will jointly share co-chair duties for the next two years. Sheryl Beach's term will continue for one more year, yielding three co-chairs for the next year.

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

Because a pre-count of members able to attend the July meeting showed that attendance would be small, the Co-Chairs decided that the meeting would be used to discuss matters on our agenda, make appropriate motions, and submit them to the EIR members for a short period of online comments followed by another short period to receive votes.

Four discussions and motions were made at our meeting:

1. The module for high school students on science and human rights, prepared and revised by Jennifer Bronson, was reviewed. Several suggestions were made for further revisions.
   Motion: Send the requested edits to Jennifer, and once the revised module is received, email the revised module to EIR members for discussion and approval.

2. The annotated bibliography on history and human rights was discussed, and several suggestions were made for revision (including suggestions to fit the common template for annotated bibliographies).
   Motion: Once revisions are received, the annotated bibliography will be submitted to the EIR members for review and vote.

3. The "template" for annotated bibliographies prepared in the spring was reviewed. Suggestions were made regarding the length of the introduction statement, and whether to adopt a common reference style or allow each discipline to use the style common to that discipline (this was favored).
   Motion: Amend the template according to these suggestions and submit to EIR members via email for discussion and vote.

4. "Human Rights 101: A Brief College-Level Overview" was discussed, and two suggestions were made for amendment.

Motion: Once these revisions are made and the revised document ready, submit to EIR members for review and vote.

Next meeting date:

The Co-Chairs held a conference call on 8/11/14 to work on the Next Plan of Action Document due 20 August. Due to the lack of a quorum at the July 2014 Meeting, we will distribute the motions proposed at the July meeting via email for discussion and vote, and schedule a conference call in mid to late September to follow up and discuss progress on active projects.

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: **Ali Arab**, American Statistical Association
Jeffrey H. Toney, Sigma Xi

Progress since last meeting

- During the past six months, the Outreach Committee has continued to hold Monthly conference calls.

- During this period, the first student essay competition took place and two of the total 53 qualified entries were awarded and recognized at the July 2014 Coalition meeting. Essays were judged by a panel of 15 judges. The best essays in the undergraduate and graduate categories were awarded a one-year AAAS membership. The organizing committee also raised $1,140 to partially support travel funds for the winners to attend the July 2014 meeting of the Coalition.

- The organizing committee for the poster competition implemented a crowd funding effort for the first time in order to raise funds for student travel support. This effort although it did not meet its goal of $2,500 was successful given the short period of time it was implemented. The organizing committee raised $1,140, including generous contributions from Kean University (thanks to Jeff Toney) and the Eastern Tennessee section of the ASME (thanks to Joe Carson).

- A project to identify prospective new member organizations is in progress. Once a list of these organizations/societies is finalized, the committee will plan outreach strategies for them.

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

The implementation of the essay competition was discussed and feedback was solicited at the meeting. Also, outreach to non-member organizations (with emphasis on engineering organizations) was discussed. The committee also discussed preparation steps for the student poster competition to be held during the January 2015 meeting.

The following next steps for the committee are

- Further development of student competitions/sessions to be held at the future Coalition meeting (poster competition in January, and essay competition in July),
- Improve fundraising strategies to raise funds to support student travel.
- Outreach to inactive member organizations and prospective new members.
- Improve participation in committee meetings and conference calls by approaching individuals and finding optimal meeting times using tools such as Doodle.

Ideas Generated

Several ideas related to outreach strategies were discussed, including:

- outreach to engineering organizations and in particular umbrella organizations such as the National Academy of Engineers
- identify engineer members of the AAAS and potentially outreach to these members regarding the work of the Coalition in order to build support within the engineering communities.
- improve fundraising strategies to raise funds for student travel.

Next meeting date:

Monthly conference calls will resume in August.

Appendix: Session Evaluations

Opening Plenary: Innovations in Science and Technology for Human Rights

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	5	6	8	4	4.16
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	5	8	6	3	4.05

Comments:

- The DNA and geospatial tech. talks generated a lot of interest and so were the most useful-they served as springboards to dive deeper into what human rights look like in different situations
- I think there was too much back slapping at what a good job presenters had done and not enough critical science. The most fundamental reason there is not money for this is that the small pie can only be cut in a number of ways.
- We got side tracked in the discussion and ended up offering an MA student help on improving her research. The lightening presentation idea is worth exploring more, but the presenters need to answer the question "why is this innovation important for human rights? How can it be used to move the ball forward on advancing human rights?"

Concurrent: Evaluating Effective Tactics for Protecting Colleagues at Risk

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	1	5	6	3	8	3.73
Usefulness of Presentations	0	2	4	4	3	7	3.62

Comments:

- I did not see that there was much focus in this session
- The session seemed to drag on and lacked focus, in my opinion. I think the session also suffered from logistical problems, i.e. trying to squeeze too many people into the room (from my vantage point, I couldn't see all of the panelists even when they spoke).
- There wasn't as much about evaluation as the title led me to expect. So I left for the other session.

Concurrent Session: Teaching Human Rights in Science and Engineering Courses

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	3	3	7	10	4.31
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	3	3	3	12	4.00

Comments:

- As I pointed out our colleagues need to be educated even more than students. Apathy is common and interest in human rights among faculty is minimal.
- Interesting to see how to incorporate human rights into a classroom setting.
- This was my first meeting, so perhaps this was done already; however, it is my experience that human rights courses need to be taught relevant science & engineering as well. I would recommend that as a future session.

Information Session: Introducing the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	0	5	4	12	4.44
Usefulness of Presentations	0	1	3	0	3	11	3.71

Comments:

- I learned a lot of information, and appreciate the ideas of moving forward and mainstreaming human rights

Concurrent Session: Indicators for Human Rights

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	2	6	8	7	4.38
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	3	7	4	6	4.07

Comments:

- The topic was good but the indicators were defined differently by each sub organization.
- Good presentations, visuals and discussion.

Concurrent Session: Scientific Responsibility, Ethics, and Human Rights

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	1	6	5	8	4.33
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	2	4	3	9	4.11

Comments:

- A lot of interesting data was presented, and gave good food for thought as people/organizations move forward.

Plenary Session: Funding Science, Technology, and Human Rights

Answer Options	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	7	6	7	3	4.00
Usefulness of Presentations	0	3	9	1	5	1	3.44

Comments:

- This panel became strangely contentious.
- I am not sure at which section, but a comment was made by a human rights advocate that science should fit into the needs of human rights groups. That is not a viable interaction since we have different but overlapping goals. Oversimplifications of funding probabilities were made and the need for balance among the subsections of the joint group needed to complement, not use, the other. Balance is needed. We are not going to spend the whole science budget on human rights and we shouldn't. I do not think the best associations between scientists and academicians are being established since there needs to be a critical analysis of that interaction.
- I especially liked Michael Kleinman's thoughts- especially his emphasis on not having a "one night stand" mentality and focusing on longer-term commitment to developing relationships with the group of people whose views/ behaviors you hope to change.
- Not what I had expected or hoped for, but still interesting.
- Unfortunately, the NIH speaker did not provide practical information to help those sci/eng and human rights professionals in the audience and the NSF speaker was too basic. With a funding topic, I think this could be more useful with presentations that are less abstract and instead more tightly focused on specific funding mechanisms that are out there and tips on how to maximize the strength of a proposal for those specific funding mechanisms.
- Somewhat simplistic.

Workshop: Contributing to Discussions on Article 15 at the United Nations

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	3	2	8	9	4.38
Usefulness of Presentations	0	1	1	2	7	7	4.36

Comment:

- Presentations were good, but I was already quite familiar with this issue.
- Glad to see this on the agenda.

Working Group and Committee Meetings

	Response Count	Response Percent
Welfare of Scientists	3	12.5%
Ethics and Human Rights	4	16.67%
Service to the STEM Community	4	16.67%
Service to the Human Rights Community	5	20.83%
Education and Information	2	8.33%
I did not attend a working group meeting	6	25%

Rate Working Group Attended

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	5	7	3	6	3.87
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	1	1	5	4	3	6	3.50

Comments:

- I would have to change the entire nature of my science. There is no place for basic researchers, just the subset that are willing to subsume their interests specifically to human rights. You have a community that does not reflect much of the scientific community and more of the activist community and you need both if there will be any success.
- Too few working group members present, no draft agenda for meeting was circulated beforehand; there did not seem to be a meeting agenda; no cell phone speaker-phone capability for working group members to participate by teleconference members
- I had to participate by phone, and this wasn't ideal.

Outreach and Communication Committee Meeting

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Format	0	0	2	1	1	16	3.75
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	1	1	15	4.00

Comments:

- A draft agenda was not circulated beforehand; too few people participated – we could have tried to bridge some in by cell-speaker phone

In your opinion, what would be the most productive way to use working group and committee meetings?

Comments:

- Updates, reminders of deliverables and feedback from members on on-going work.
- Be more critical of what the group does not have, less defensiveness of NGO. As an outsider, I felt it hard to break through the wall between most of science and the committees. They cannot be effective in a self-contained manner. Come up with a balanced approach or several and present these to the group.
- Apply Robert's Rules by: Having the chair prepare and distribute a draft meeting agenda beforehand (at least several days beforehand). Revising agenda according to feedback and approving the agenda at the start of the meeting. AAAS - buy a few cell phone speaker phone adaptors - they are not that expensive and would allow more members of these working groups to

participate. After the meeting, the chair should update the approved agenda to show what was decided/accomplished and distribute it to the members of the working group.

- Have more project execution/implementation
- I would have enjoyed attending the working group meetings; however, this was my first time attending the coalition meeting and it seemed, well, presumptuous to "crash" a working group meeting. Working groups and committees have, in my experience, been more productive when closed or by invitation with clear expectations. This might already be available somewhere, but I am rather new to what the coalition has been doing.
- Come to more of a consensus of how entire community can be engaged!
- I think that having minutes of the session that could be augmented by those who were attending might be helpful (including next steps). I sent the chair a couple of emails about resources that I thought of during the meeting (e.g., the XTXS data sets, which already have both student outcome data in science and data about other potential indicators by country). It appeared that some members thought they had to collect this country data anew, but it is already on line.
- Remaining proactive, and coming up with ideas for the year. Not spending the majority of the time going over vague logistics that can be covered via email or possible in a subcommittee focus group.
- 1) Educate potential new group members 2) Report updates on ongoing projects

Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations

How did you hear about the Coalition meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent (of total number of respondents)
Email from AAAS/Program	20	90.91%
Program Facebook Page	2	9.09%
AAAS/Program Website	0	0%
Word of Mouth	2	9.09%
Other	6	

Other Responses:

- Coalition member
- Email from the ACS
- Invitation to speak
- Council meeting
- Announced at prior meeting
- ESA Student Delegate
- Employer

How would you prefer would you prefer to hear about Coalition events and activities in the future?

	Response Count	Response Percent (of total number of respondents)
Email from AAAS/Program	25	96.15%
Program Facebook Page	2	7.69%
AAAS/Program Website	5	19.23%
Word of Mouth	0	0%

Affiliation:

	Response Count	Response Percent (of total number of respondents)
Professional Society/Association	9	34.62%
University/College	11	42.31%
Government	1	3.85%
Human Rights Organization	2	7.69%
Business/Industry	0	0%
Nonprofit	2	7.69%
Press/Media	0	0%
Self-employed	1	0%

Other Responses:

AAAS DoSER intern

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	2	8%
To learn how I can personally become involved in the Coalition	9	36%
To learn more about science, technology and human rights	18	72%
To learn how my organization can respond more effectively	12	48%
To obtain help in engaging members of my discipline in human rights	12	48%

Other Responses:

- Essay winner

- To speak on a panel
- To help the Education and Information Resources Group develop materials
- Invited to speak
- To help support the work of the Coalition
- To bring my long background in human rights into a specific setting with other interested persons

Overall, how satisfied were you with the meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Very satisfied	14	60.87%
Moderately satisfied	7	30.43%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1	4.35%
Moderately dissatisfied	1	4.35%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%

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

- Networking opportunities.
- Discussing the topics with conference participants.
- The very fact that scientists and human rights advocates are getting together but each group has difficulty communicating in a realistic way with each other.
- Meeting Theresa and Jessica
- The plenary meetings.
- I went to simply sit in and listen to the work that is going on in the realm of ethics and human rights, and so simply learning/ being there was the most valuable.
- Clarity, Openness
- Catalyst for continuing work by my association
- The session on Contributing to Discussions on Article 15 at the U.N.
- For me, the opportunity to meet and speak with new colleagues was most valuable.
- Exchange of differing attitudes!
- Indicators session.

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

- The indicators panel, but only because it was not too relevant to my work.
- The funding meeting which contained both scientific flaws and outright contempt of basic science.
- Too few attendees, no (or only a few other) engineer attendees; did not accomplish some of what I came to do which is get some definite answers from AAAS staff as to what AAAS will/will not do with its current engineer membership to try to get more engineering societies into the Coalition.
- Opening plenary talk
- The session on funding.
- More time to visit with moderators!
- Presentation about Daily Hassles

How can future meetings be improved?

- No concrete suggestions. I thought it was excellent in all respects.
- A group that cannot be questioned from the outside is too insular. Finding ways of communicating how THEIR work can contribute to human rights is essential.
- Have draft agendas for the various committee/WG meetings circulated a few days beforehand Obtain speakerphone/cell phone adaptors for use in the committee/WG meetings so out-of-town members can participate. And amaze me by contacting the other volunteer membership organizations to which I belong to express appreciation for my giving the SHR Coalition an extraordinary amount of personal time and personal $ to attend the recent meeting. If you want to know who to contact at which organization, just ask me
- Provide travel awards for students
- More action-oriented content
- I believe that the current structure is working well.
- The lunch break seemed to be very quick, given half of it was concurrent with sessions. Yet it wasn't made clear when sessions were starting. Given that morning sessions often run a few minutes late, it takes time to get through the lunch line, and new/old colleagues like to chat while getting their lunch, it is easy to not know what time it is and miss a session (especially when juggling all of your personal belongings as well). Having an organizer clearly alert everyone that Session X is starting in Room Y would be useful. Alternatively, having a place for people to eat and chat would be useful. Also, making it clear where/when people might be able to leave belongings in a room during the meeting would make it easier to have free hands to get through the lunch lines more efficiently.
- Provide a more balanced input from all types of scientific endeavors!

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

- An overview (printed or presented) of all members/affiliates.
- The translation of science into the practice of human rights
- Same topics; more sophisticated and problem solving, accepting that the problems present are difficult. Continual critique and questioning of the purpose of the mission.
- "Get real" about how engineering profession enables human rights violations and is AWOL, overall, in human rights advocacy.
- More science
- Integrating information on human rights into science education.
- Automation and article 15
- The current U.S. policy climate for human rights advocacy - opportunities for impact
- I appreciate hearing about how scientists see the connection between their work/research and human rights.
- Educating scientists about human rights. More inclusive session on how we can help without distorting our work to meet the needs of human rights advocates!
- If there is a session about "big data" include some of these educational indicators projects such as XTXS. I will be in touch with someone to see if this group might be interested in co-sponsoring the release of a National Academy of Sciences report on Building Infrastructure for Collaboration in the Behavioral and Social Sciences. This will be available in the fall.

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

- Invaluable. It has expanded our networks and allowed us an important reach into aspects of the science diplomacy community we would not otherwise have.
- To ensure that the science used by human rights advocates is rigorously analyzed.
- Voluntary membership organizations and their staffs have blinders on about valuable info their members/supporters would be glad to share - if only asked - such as what other voluntary membership organizations they belong to. In 2014, with our hyper-individualistic, too-likely civilization dooming lifestyles, the relatively few people who join any voluntary membership

organization - and actually donate time to it - likely belong to several, if not many, voluntary membership organizations (including faith communities). But each of these organizations ignores this and the possible synergy, making all of them less relevant and less effective - and who has time to belong to anything but relevant voluntary membership organizations?

- I am still searching for my place!