AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

Meeting Report

July 23-24, 2009

Special Event

The second meeting of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition began on the evening of July 23 with an event to honor science and human rights pioneer, [Richard Pierre Claude](). A scholar, educator, and writer, Claude believes that the education of young scientists and health professionals must be bound by a social contract that safeguards their freedom to travel, associate, and communicate freely, but that in return they do no harm and direct their talents toward caring for all human beings and the earth we inhabit. Claude developed this thesis in his award-winning book *Science in the Service of Human Rights*. A Professor Emeritus of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland, College Park, Claude is founding editor of *Human Rights Quarterly*. Seven colleagues and friends who worked with Claude, were mentored by him, and were inspired by him presented tributes.

In his remarks, Claude called on the scientists to "give back to society, including by heeding the ethics of their respective professions which both demand freedom and acknowledge social responsibility." He emphasized the "differential pace between achievements in implementing human rights and advancements in science and technology" and advocated for a multi-disciplinary and interdisciplinary approach to all areas of human rights. With a particular emphasis on the value for human rights education for all, Claude reflected on the interest shown in his experimental course, *Science and Human Rights*, by students from a wide variety of discipline – engineering, pre-med, computer science, and physics majors. In conclusion, he congratulated the Coalition for taking real steps to address human rights.

Opening Plenary: Business Meeting

Mona Younis (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) welcomed meeting attendees to the second meeting of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition. She described the impressive growth in participation and membership in the Coalition since the first planning meeting in June 2007. Initially involving representatives of ten scientific organizations, over the course of the following year and a half and five more planning meetings, participants grew to include nearly 20 scientific organizations. Working together, these organizations laid the foundations for the Coalition that was launched officially in January 2009. Since the launch, membership in the Coalition has grown to 26 Member Organizations, 15 Affiliated Organizations, and 36 Affiliated Scientists, and many more scientific organizations are processing requests to join through their governing bodies.

Younis noted that, "The response has been tremendously encouraging. With ambitious plans for moving forward, a highly participatory approach is the only guarantee that the Coalition will not become a 'talking shop.'" To ensure its success, the Coalition has the benefit of a highly committed Coalition Council, which will provide leadership and guidance, and an outstanding Steering Committee that will ensure the implementation of the Council's policies and decisions.

Younis concluded by introducing and thanking the Steering Committee and Jessica Wyndham (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) who becomes Acting Coordinator upon Mona's departure from AAAS at the end of July.

Paula Skedsvold (Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences) outlined the function of the Coalition Council, and presented the key decisions that had been taken the previous day at the Council's first meeting. Composed of two representatives of members organizations, the Council sets policy and priorities for the Coalition. It considers new initiatives and any changes to the structure of the Coalition. Skedsvold explained that the purpose of the first meeting was to orient members as to the mission and goals, and organizational structure of the Coalition; to agree on the operating principles, and rules and procedures that would guide the Council in its work; and to take stock of progress in the five area of activity working groups, the joint initiative, and the Plan of Action (2009-2011).

The Council considered several questions of particular importance to its operation, including how best to open a dialogue with the human rights community, and agreed that the Service to the Human Rights Community working group was well placed to do this. The Council also discussed mechanisms for ensuring respect for the autonomy of member organizations in the event that some members wished to issue public statements or when resource materials or reports were published. The Council agreed that any statements would be made in the name of the organizations that endorsed them, and not in the name of the Coalition. On the procedure for publishing resources, the Steering Committee will create a committee or subcommittee to draft guidance on this question to be presented to the Council before the next meeting in 2010. A full account of the Council meeting deliberations is available in the [Council Meeting Report](#).

Doug Richardson (Association of American Geographers) presented the meeting objectives, noting that the Coalition meets twice a year and that each meeting is an opportunity to interact and move the Coalition forward in several ways. The Coalition meetings also are a place to learn and expand our understanding of science and human rights issues. These meetings also enable us to:

1. Hear from leaders in the field – both the human rights community and members of the scientific community – that recognize the importance of human rights;
2. Learn from each other about how we are bringing human rights to our organizations and members;
3. Obtain training that is of value to our efforts to take human rights to members of our disciplines and our associations; and,
4. Generate new ideas and identify new opportunities.

He emphasized that Coalition meetings also provide a venue for taking stock of progress in the Coalition's working groups and Joint Initiative. Because action is central to the Coalition's mission and objectives, the bi-annual meetings provide working groups the opportunity to meet and assess what has been accomplished, introduce the areas of activity to new members, and make plans for the next six months.

With a view to activities that would take place in the next six month, Richardson highlighted the session that would take place to discuss the Joint Initiative, a plan of action for which would be finalized by the end of the year. He also encouraged all participants to use the opportunity presented by the final session to provide input on a draft agenda for the January 2010 meeting.

Finally, attendees were encouraged to complete session evaluation forms for each of the sessions, and an evaluation form for the overall meeting. Reporting on the session evaluations is in keeping with the Coalition's commitment to transparency.

Sessions, Training and Workshop

The program included a combination of sessions and workshops. These varied not only in content, but in objectives.

One session, titled **"Ethical Dilemmas in Science Practice: Human Rights Perspectives,"** featured a panel of three human rights practitioners. Leslie Harris of the Center for Democracy and Technology discussed emerging challenges to the right to privacy posed by new internet technologies. Len Rubenstein of Physicians for Human Rights examined the limitations of ethical debates about interrogations conducted at the U.S. detention center at Guantanamo Bay, when disconnected from human rights concerns. Finally, Eric Rosenthal of Mental Disability Rights International reflected on the human rights debate among mental health professionals regarding the use of electroshock therapy.

Another session, titled **"Human Rights and the Mobility of Scientists: Acting on Visa Restrictions,"** addressed the challenges posed by government visa restrictions on the free exchange of ideas and movement of scientists across international borders. Participants heard from Sophie Cook of the Committee of Concerned Scientists, Kathie Bailey-Mathae of the National Academies, and Brad Miller of the American Chemical Society. The panelists discussed the international standards and guidelines applicable to scientists' right to travel: the scientific community's role in influencing policy developments in this area, and practical steps that can be taken to facilitate the participation of scientists from abroad in US scientific meetings.

In addition to these informational sessions, participants were given the opportunity to take part in a **"Human Rights 101"** training session designed to give participants an understanding of the key human rights concepts and principles necessary for robust engagement in human rights. Margaret Huang of Rights Working Group conducted the training in which participants discussed the meaning of human rights, the background to the international human rights standards, and how human rights are enforced. Through a practical exercise, participants also learned of the indivisibility and interdependence of human rights.

In another workshop, Clinton Anderson (American Psychological Association) facilitated a session entitled **"Getting Your Association Involved: A Workshop on Clarifying Commitment and Building Capacity"** which was designed to identify the measures necessary to build the capacity of scientific associations to incorporate human rights into their activities. Based on the findings of an informal survey conducted during the launch, scientific organizations have a greater commitment to human rights work, than the capacity to carry it out. The suggestions made in this workshop will inform the activities of the Coalition's Service to the Scientific Community working group by shedding light on and helping prioritize capacity-building needs of scientific organizations.

Areas of Activity: Working Group Meetings

In keeping with the Coalition's commitment to action and measurable outcomes, Coalition members and affiliates are required to contribute to one of five working groups which meet four times a year, including during the two semi-annual Coalition meetings. The working groups' reports on their meetings follow.

I. Welfare of Scientists Working Group

This working group is devoted to the protection and defense of scientists under threat and will work to increase the effectiveness of scientific organizations in defending the human rights of scientists.

Co-chairs: **Michele Irwin** (American Physical Society)
               Brad Miller (American Chemical Society)
               Sinead O'Gorman (Scholars at Risk Network)

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Overview of Working Group
3. Progress on priorities since the launch
4. Coalition Joint Initiative: Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights
5. Table of Contents for Resource Guide
6. Discussion of Possible Additional Initiatives/Projects for Working Group
7. Next Steps

Priorities for 2009 adopted at the Launch (January 2009)

The working group will compile a resource guide for establishing and maintaining a scientific freedom and human rights element in one's association/society. The guide will be composed of a series of articles that will be solicited throughout the year. Some possible topics include:

- "Best practices" of how to respond to situations in which a scientist has been persecuted/Taxonomy of a response
- Freedom of mobility and travel. Visa related issues. How do these issues influence the scientific community and scientific exchange?
- What are the needs of a persecuted scientist or scientist at risk?
- Have persecuted scientists write about how it helped to have their colleagues/associations defend them. What helped, specifically? What hurt? What could be done differently or improved upon? And why?
- Articles by individual scientists demonstrating how their involvement in a case was beneficial.

The working group will also organize a one day training session with Scholars at Risk. The training session will prepare scientific associations to better respond to violations of the human rights of scientists.

Progress on priorities since the Launch (January 2009)

Training: Scholars at Risk will conduct a training session on the [Best Practices for Defending the Human Rights of Scientists](#) on January 21, 2010 at AAAS Headquarters in Washington, DC. The session will prepare scientific societies and associations to respond to alleged human rights violations against scientists.

Best practices: The working group has developed the following structure for a resource guide to assist scientific organizations in responding to situations of persecuted scientists: (1) censorship; (2) research interference; (3) restrictions on dissemination of findings (e.g., patent and copyright violations) (4) mobility (e.g., visas); (5) personal welfare; and (6) government interference (e.g., requests for information that is not in the public domain). Each section would include the following: (i) descriptions of cases; (ii) response options; (iii) best practices: document, outreach alliance, ways to frame activities; (iv) resources: early warning signs; (v) pro-active (education) versus reactive actions.

Key decisions regarding next steps:

- Organize a conference call concerning ways in which the working group can incorporate Article 15 into its work;
- Meet soon (likely by conference call) to discuss further the content of the guide.

Key questions:

No questions or issues were raised.

What has been working well:

- narrowing the focus of activities.

What has not been working well:

- coordination across working groups.

New working group members:

Diaa A. Ahmed, Individual Scientist

II. Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group

This working group is devoted to fostering appreciation among scientists and scientific associations of the relevance of human rights to ethical standards, the conduct of science, and human research protections.

Co-chairs: **Rob Albro**, American Anthropological Association
Paula Skedsvold, Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences

Meeting Agenda

1. Announcements
2. Introductions and Member Interests
3. Review of Working Group Purpose and Priorities
4. Working Group Discussion
   - Which human rights and ethics documents should guide our work?
   - What is missing from our own scientific societies' ethics codes?
5. Joint Initiative
   - How does Article 15 of the ICESCR relate to science ethics?
   - Working Group Activity in the Fall
6. Preparation for Report Back

Priorities for 2009 adopted at the Launch (January 2009)

1. Develop a human rights framework for science ethics, based on national, international and human rights precedents, which encompasses the full diversity of science practice and beginning with Article 15.

2. Develop tools for scientific associations that more effectively frame their Codes of Ethics as informed by human rights and as an active part of scientific practice.

3. Encourage network-building with international science organizations and with international human rights centers.

4. Work with funders of scientific research (including foundations) to incorporate a more robust human rights-based ethics process into the grants application phase.

5. Work with scientific associations to develop a human rights-based model for ethics pedagogy and curriculum-building.

The working group will focus initially on developing a human rights framework for science ethics which draws upon human rights instruments, as well as other relevant international or national standards. In doing so, the working group will involve scientists from across scientific disciplines, and examine both the diversity of science practice and scientists' responsibilities at every stage of the scientific process. The working group will also examine how science ethics might inform and give shape to Article 15 of the ICESCR.

Progress on priorities since the Launch (January 2009)

Ethics codes: A Coalition intern assembled and reviewed the ethics codes of scientific societies to highlight those that refer to human rights principles. Eight scientific associations make explicit reference to human rights in their ethics statements. The summary is available through the Working Group.

However, to adequately identify *those principles that are applicable across the sciences*, international ethical standards and human rights instruments for the conduct of science need to be compared with the ethical statements of science associations in the U.S., in order to establish a baseline for moving forward, and as a way to identify where human rights principles best apply.   The international documents include not only the human rights instruments composing the "International Bill of Rights," but also particular ethics standards such as the Declaration of Helsinki (1964), the Belmont Report (1979), and subsequent UNESCO efforts to create additional human rights instruments in the field of science ethics, such as the Universal Declaration of Bioethics and Human Rights (2003), among others. The Working Group has started the process of comparing international human rights documents with ethics statements of science associations in the U.S.

Key decisions regarding next steps:

- Rather than beginning with the question "How do we introduce human rights into science ethics?," we first have to ask the question: "What are the basic challenges when engaging science ethics in human rights terms?"
- Produce a "landscape document," which will bring together at once discussion of relevant international standards and domestic codes of ethics, and engage in a comparison of these. This will be used as a basis to begin to examine constructive ways in which human rights language and concepts might best be incorporated into science ethics statements in the U.S.
- Compile "cases" that foreground ethical dilemmas for the purpose of illustrating the kinds of challenges we anticipate for the introduction of human rights language into ethics, highlighting ethically challenging issues, such as interrogation, field work, and the problem of internet open access. The goal of such a discussion will be to establish: "Do we at present have common ground from which to begin?"

Key questions:

- What are the issues/hurdles in bringing human rights principles/language into ethics codes? When is this appropriate or not appropriate?
- If the Belmont Report is the foundation stone of the "Common Rule," which is in turn composed of a host of additional statements, how should we compare these as a whole to ethics statements of scientific societies? In short, at which level should we be pursuing a common standard?
- Can we identify overarching values in science?
- How should we navigate the uneven topographic landscape of aspirational, educational, and sanctioning models for codes of ethics across scientific associations?
- Given the "cultural struggles" over human rights, will we face significant difficulties in equating ethical claims with human rights claims?
- Given that efforts to establish a universal code of ethics for science in the past have always failed, and that there is no single standard by which one can assess research integrity, how should we proceed with the introduction of human rights?
- How does open access relate to Article 15?
- How does the dissemination/communication of science relate to Article 15?

What has been working well:

- the development of a virtual Google workspace, as a user-friendly and centralized point of reference for the management of our shared group work
- posting shared documents online for use by all group members
- using and uploading sample cases and analyses to illustrate group objectives

What has not been working well:

- keeping adequate track of the comings and goings of specific group members
- incorporating individual group members' interests to develop group goals "by committee"
- keeping individual members engaged in finding particular ways for them to contribute to established group priorities

New working group members:

Linda Billings, Individual Scientist
John Gardenier, Individual Scientist
Rex Honey, Individual Scientist

III. Service to the Scientific Community Working Group

This working group is devoted to building the commitment and capacity of scientific 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
Lee Herring, American Sociological Association

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions and Member Reports on their own associations' Human Rights activities
2. Announcement of Working Group Workshop (on Clarifying Commitment and Building Capacity)
3. Article 15 – workshop during fall meeting – What is our Working Group role?
4. Review general comments on "Starter Kit" (finalize comments by 8/10/09)
5. Review 3 Next Steps (2008) and 5 Priorities (2009)
6. Decide which task to tackle next
7. Self evaluation: What is working well and what is not working well for you and your association in this Working Group?

Priorities for 2009 adopted at the Launch (January 2009)

Among suggestions made for working group activities were: development of a directory or database of human rights organizations; compilation of a bibliography on science and human rights; analysis of the organizational location of human rights efforts in scientific associations; survey of scientific associations regarding their human rights resources; distribution of a basic PowerPoint/one-pager on the Coalition; encouragement of appropriate university structures to support faculty and student discussion on human rights; development of a training manual; creation of a roster of trainers; and identification of university human rights centers with which to potentially partner in bringing human rights to science faculties and curricula.

The priorities for 2009 are to:

1. Develop a "Starter Packet" for potential and new members, which will serve to support associations' self-assessment and clarification of commitment to human rights activities.
2. Help scientists apply their disciplinary perspective to human rights;
3. Compile a list of annual meetings for 2010 and propose trainings or presentations at those meetings;
4. Compile syllabi of science courses that incorporate human rights; and
5. Conduct a literature search and compile a bibliography.

Progress on priorities since the Launch (January 2009)

Starter Packet: A draft "Starter Packet" has been developed. Comments and suggestions are being sought from working group members and the other working group co-chairs, with the aim of finalizing revisions by September 30.

Applying science to human rights: Members from scientific organizations have been encouraged to communicate with their membership using material from the AAAS

Science and Human Rights Program newsletter. Members should also contribute to the newsletter to increase awareness of their work, as scientific organizations, to advance human rights.

Annual meetings: This item is considered superfluous at this time.

Syllabi: A AAAS summer intern is compiling a list of relevant syllabi in higher education that relate to human rights and science.

Bibliography: Given that another working group is already compiling a bibliography and can devote adequate resources to the effort, this task is no longer warranted.

Key decisions regarding next steps:

- Complete the revisions of the Starter Packet by Fall 2009;
- Continue cultivating a sense of the importance and direct relevance of human rights to the pursuit of science and to humans' access to its benefits, including by boosting membership of the working group;
- Help scientific organizations consider and decipher how their discipline's unique methods and approaches can contribute to human rights work by, in part, developing a guide that answers some of the most commonly cited reasons for scientific associations to not get involved in promoting human rights (e.g., fear that human rights advocacy could jeopardize non-profit status, human rights is too close to politics);
- Urge scientific organizations to use the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program's electronic newsletter to disseminate stories about our individual organizations' human rights activities and use the newsletter's content to better inform our own associations' members of human rights issues and their relevance to the integrity of science itself.

Key questions:

- How does 501(c)(3) IRS status relate to scientific organizations' participation in human rights advocacy efforts?

What has been working well:

- quarterly in-person meetings work well, attracting sufficient participants (as a percentage of our Working Group's total membership)
- members are responsive to requests to get engaged in tasks

What has not been working well:

- communication among Working Groups is not well developed and has resulted in some duplication of effort

New working group members:

Morgan Taylor, American Public Health Association
Rieko Yajima, Individual Scientist

IV. Service to the Human Rights Community Working Group

This working group is devoted to bridging the scientific and human rights communities with the aim of encouraging and facilitating the greater engagement of scientists in efforts to advance human rights.

> **Chair:** **Susan Hinkins**, American Statistical Association

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions and Agenda
2. Review Goals and Plan of Action
3. Develop dialogue between Human Rights Community and Scientific Associations
4. Facilitate "Partnership" between human rights organization and scientific association
5. Joint Initiative - Article 15: The Human Right to Benefit from Scientific Progress
6. Other ideas
7. Organization: team leaders and communication
8. Next steps

Priorities for 2009 adopted at the Launch (January 2009)

The priority of the working group is to focus on "communication," specifically reaching out to the human rights community about the value of bringing science to human rights work. To this end, the working group will:

1. Write and publish 3-4 articles addressing the role of scientists in human rights work, and inviting debate on the science needs of the human rights community. The working group will aim to publish such articles in periodicals and newsletters with broad human rights readership (e.g., Human Rights Quarterly) and will identify sympathetic human rights advocates to be co-author.
2. Develop a presentation for face-to-face and online delivery that informs human rights organizations of the Coalition and elicits their feedback about their scientific needs.
3. Identify opportunities for presenting at two national human rights meetings and one meeting at the DC office of a human rights group that already works with scientists (e.g., Amnesty International).

Long-term goals:

1. Develop a mechanism through which human rights organizations can participate in and provide input for the working group
2. Garner input from the program/evaluation community
3. Create guidelines for the involvement of scientists with the human rights community. These might address: uncertain field work challenges, communication with the local community, funding, etc.
4. Outreach to human rights funding organizations as another possible way to publicize the availability of scientific tools. An example that could be ripe for this is scientific methods for program evaluation.

Progress on priorities since the Launch (January 2009)

Discussions since January raised concerns that we were premature in our plans to communicate with human rights groups either directly or via articles. At this meeting we revised our "first steps" as described below.

Key decisions regarding next steps:

- Establish a web portal for the work group as a means of improving communication (Doug Samuelson);
- Begin documenting how scientific associations provide services to the human rights community, starting with associations represented by working group members (Luisa Safiotti to lead; Doug Samuelson, Jill McLeigh, and Luisa will create a template by mid-September);
- Open a dialogue with human rights organizations concerning their science and technology needs, starting with existing connections of working group members (Susan Hinkins, Luisa Safiotti, and Brian Estes will brainstorm how to make initial approaches and what information we would like to obtain.) We hope to have these "interviews" completed by the January meeting;
- Mary Gray volunteered to make a short presentation at the AAAS Affiliates meeting at the February 2010 AAAS;
- Amanda Sozer will lead an effort to begin to define "guidelines" for scientists. The purpose is to provide scientists with information regarding what they might expect in working with non-scientists in the human rights area. She will put together a plan for moving forward with the guidelines so that the committee can discuss the plan during the January meeting. Doug Ubelaker has also volunteered for this project;
- Address Article 15 in the Fall via email.

Key questions:

- What is the basis for not allowing university human rights centers to join the Coalition?

- Ambiguity exists regarding tasks appropriate for this working group as compared to the Service to Scientific Community working group.

What has been working well:

- building on existing resources within the working group.

What has not been working well:

- taking on too much, too soon;
- communication via email and conference calls.

New working group members:

Spencer Ward, Individual Scientist
Doug Samuelson, Individual Scientist

V. Education and Information Resources Working Group

This working group is devoted to producing a variety of accessible information materials for the promotion and support of collaboration between scientists and human rights practitioners.

> **Co-chairs:** **Judith Blau**, Sociologists Without Borders
> **Amy Crumpton**, Affiliated Scientist
> **Jeffrey Toney**, Sigma Xi

Meeting Agenda

1. Introductions
2. Annotated Bibliography: presentation and discussion of draft, next steps
3. Case Studies: discussion of drafts, next steps
4. Syllabi
5. Education materials: courses, syllabi, translational document
6. Article 15 - Joint Initiative: developing a plan of action

Priorities for 2009 adopted at the Launch (January 2009)

The key commitment of the working group for 2009 is to create a portal or website presence that might allow for building a database that connects bibliographic information, contact information for experts, and case studies through a well-structured search mechanism of topics and geographic regions.

In support of this primary commitment, the working group will:

1. Develop a series of case studies that describe ongoing collaborations between science and human rights organization (John King and Hank Kaplowitz will take the lead on this).
2. Compile a bibliography on science and human rights. Such a bibliography should be representational, not necessarily all inclusive (Julie Mertus and Amy Crumpton agreed to work on this)
3. Conduct a needs assessment by surveying the Coalition members, AAAS affiliates, and human rights organizations to see what they would find most useful in terms of information resources.
4. Identify ways of reaching scholarly associations or broader groups of experts in a variety of fields. (Robert Kreiser offered to announce the existence and efforts of the Coalition at the next meeting of the American Council of Learned Societies).
5. Identify appropriate specific topic areas according to which information in the portal can be structured, thereby helping clarify the broader effect that science and human rights in concert can have on social and environmental justice issues.
6. Gather ideas and materials to use in building teaching curricula.
7. Compile a list of meeting activities within U.S. and abroad that coalition members may not be aware of, particularly workshops, conferences, webinars, etc.

The working group will be mindful of gathering information resources from around the world to reflect the international nature of science and human rights.

Progress on priorities since the Launch (January 2009)

1. *Case studies*: Eight case studies have been developed, each demonstrating a working relationship between a scientist(s) and a human rights organization. Examples from physics and engineering, in particular, are still required. Several working group members offered to contribute cases. The drafts will be shared with all other working group co-chairs, with the aim of putting the case studies online by early October.

2. *Bibliography*: The group has drafted an annotated bibliography on science and human rights which was circulated to the working group members. In addition, the working group, with the help of SHRP interns and working group members, is developing an online searchable bibliography (using 'Zotero'), including case studies, literature from associations, codes of ethics, syllabi, and literature on Article 15. The aim is to put the searchable bibliography online by early October.

3. *Needs assessment*: The group will survey the Coalition members, AAAS affiliates, and human rights organizations to find out their information needs after alerting them to the materials already gathered.

4. *Outreach*: The group will find out what the Coalition working groups on Service to the Scientific Community and Service to the Human Rights Community are doing with respect to outreach. At minimum, this group might be the appropriate body to keep a rolling calendar of upcoming relevant meetings.

5. *Identify topic areas*: This issue is developing in an organic fashion as we gather citations and create key words for use in the Zotero database.

6. *Syllabi and teaching materials*: The Coalition intern has gathered examples of syllabi which will be listed online and included in the Zotero bibliographic database. Working group members suggested developing sample teaching modules that could be integrated as a session or two into a class.

Key decisions regarding next steps:

- Gather further input from working group members who volunteered to contribute citations and case studies;
- Gather further input from co-chairs/members of other working groups on the draft case studies and annotated bibliography;
- Finalize and disseminate the case studies and bibliography – both annotated and database – by early October.

Key questions:

- What kind of support will be needed for the Coalition members to use Zotero effectively?
- How should we regularly update case studies and bibliography?
- Should there be an inter-working group task force on case studies to coordinate the needs of various working groups and set criteria for what the Coalition means by a "case study"?

What has been working well:

- communication among the three co-chairs;
- an all-hands working group conference call on May (14 participants);
- members volunteering to gather material.

What has not been working well:

- eliciting responses and work from entire working group membership and not just a core few.
- communication with other working group co-chairs to ensure against overlapping or duplicating efforts.

New working group members:

Lars Bromley, Association of American Geographers
Lisa Jennings, American Society of Civil Engineers
Sam McFarland, International Society of Political Psychology

Areas of Activity: Working Group Reports-back

The working groups reported back in plenary on their meetings. First, each working group described the "Progress" the working group had made since the launch in January and their "Plans" for the next six months. Each working group was also asked to share with Coalition members what they tried and worked well ("Try it!") and what they tried that did not work well ("Avoid it!"). The reports were entered onto a PowerPoint slide on the spot. Below are the slides for the following five working groups:

I.   Welfare of Scientists
II. Science Ethics and Human Rights
III. Service to the Scientific Community
IV. Service to the Human Rights Community
V.   Education and Information Resources

Science and Human Rights Coalition — AAAS

Progress

I.   Developed table of contents for resource guide, to be used by associations when faced with threats to the welfare of scientists; have planned training session for January

II. Discussed how best to proceed; completed inventory of ethics codes of scientific associations to identify those with explicit mention of human rights

III. Drafted "Starter Packet" for scientific associations that includes Human Rights 101 for scientists

IV. Developed plan with specific people committed to concrete actions with concrete deadlines

V.   Began to develop annotated bibliography and electronic database (Zotero); to collect case studies of partnerships between scientists and human rights practitioners; to compile relevant course syllabi

Science and Human Rights Coalition

AAAS

Plans

I. Hold training session on January 21, 2010 to prepare associations to respond to threats to the welfare of scientists

II. Produce a landscape document of codes of ethics; include case studies of controversial or compelling instances; identify potential contributions of human rights-informed scientific practice to the realization of human rights goals

III. Review/revise "Starter Packet" draft document; help scientific societies highlight current efforts relevant to human rights and reframe through a human rights lens; develop talking points against not getting involved in human rights; recruit more scientific societies by leveraging their internationally focused members

IV. Develop web portal to include history, plans, current activities; will establish venues for communication within and outside working group; create a dialogue with human rights organizations

V. Further work and dissemination of bibliography, case studies, and database

---

Science and Human Rights Coalition

AAAS

Try It!

I. Narrow your focus; concentrate brainpower!; coordinate efforts with other working groups

II. Narrow down plans to achievable activities/objectives

III. Encourage working group members to be aware of human rights-oriented activities within their organizations; face-to-face meetings (quarterly); between-meeting homework for members; online work space

IV. Build on existing resources, on experience of working group members

V. Establish specific milestones, assessments to measure progress; coordinate with other working groups; conference calls

Joint Initiative: Article 15 - Our Work Together

Jessica Wyndham (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) began her presentation by noting the almost complete absence of scientists from a UNESCO-led process to conceptualize Article 15, the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications. "Article 15 lies at the nexus of science and human rights, and the realization of this right cannot be achieved without the scientific community," Wyndham said. Adding that the right has direct relevance for each of the area of activity working groups, and on that basis was chosen as the focus of the joint initiative, the Coalition program unites the full membership around shared objectives.

Through this Joint Initiative, the Coalition aims to: increase knowledge among scientific organizations of the existence, significance and potential application of this right; engage scientific organizations in efforts to help realize this right; and leverage this human right to accomplish the objectives of the areas of activity. As laid out in the Plan of Action (2009-2011), the goal in 2011 is for the working groups to present their work on Article 15 to the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights as a means of supporting the Office's role in monitoring and advising governments in the realization of Article 15.

Planning Meeting for January 2010 Meeting

The next meeting of the Coalition will take place on January 21-22, 2010 at AAAS Headquarters in Washington, DC. **Clinton Anderson** (American Psychological

Association) chaired this session which provided participants with the opportunity to discuss the draft program for the meeting. Anderson announced that Scholars at Risk, in partnership with the working group on the Welfare of Scientists, will be presenting a training on January 21 entitled "Best Practices for Defending the Human Rights of Scientists." The following day the Coalition will meet for the full day. Proposed session topics include: "Ethical Dilemmas in Science Practice; Scientists' Perspectives," "In Their Own Voices: Hearing from victims of human rights violations," "Human Rights 101 for Scientists: [with specific focus to be determined]," and "Scientific Associations Serving Humanity: Associations with volunteer programs."

Suggestions:

- Combine the next meeting with another special event honoring an important individual in the field of science and human rights;
- Consider virtual participation in forthcoming meetings of the Coalition.

Appendix 1: Meeting Program

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

23-24 July 2009
Washington, DC

Thursday, July 23

5:00pm **Registration**

5:30 **Opening Plenary** *Auditorium*

A Special Event to Honor Dr. Richard Pierre Claude

Richard Pierre Claude has dedicated his career to integrating human rights with the practice of science. Indeed, through his career, mentoring, and scholarship, Dr. Claude has inspired and enabled scientists to take up the important work of human rights. Himself inspired by Albert Einstein and others, Dr. Claude believes that the education of young scientists and health professionals must be bound by a social contract that safeguards their freedom to travel, associate, and communicate freely, but asks in return that they do no harm and direct their talents toward caring for all human beings and the earth we inhabit. Dr. Claude developed this thesis in his award-winning book, *Science in the Service of Human Rights*. A Professor Emeritus of Government and Politics at the University of Maryland, College Park, Dr. Claude is a founding editor of *Human Rights Quarterly*, published by John Hopkins Press and now in its 27th year.

Welcome: **Mona Younis**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

Introductions: **Susan Hinkins**, American Statistical Association

Tributes: **"Science in the Service of Human Rights: A Conversation"**
Elena Nightingale, Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences
Eric Stover, Human Rights Center, University of California, Berkeley

Bert Lockwood, Urban Morgan Institute for Human Rights

Richard Alan White, author of *Breaking Silence: The Case That Changed the Face of Human Rights*

Ellen Dorsey, Wallace Global Fund

Allen Keller, NYU School of Medicine and Bellevue/NYU Program for Survivors of Torture

Howard Schneider, Washington Post

Remarks: **Richard Pierre Claude**, honoree

6:30 - **Reception** *2nd Floor Reception*
7:30

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition thanks the

Association of American Geographers

and the

American Sociological Association

for their sponsorship of the reception

20

Friday, July 24

8:30am   **Plenary**   *Auditorium*

Welcome
Mona Younis, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

Coalition Council Report
Paula Skedsvold, Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences

Meeting Objectives
Douglas Richardson, Association of American Geographers

9:15   **Sessions (concurrent)**

"Ethical Dilemmas in Science Practice: Human Rights Perspectives"   *Revelle*

This session will bring together leading human rights defenders to share their perspectives on science and technology, and the conduct of science. Each will speak from their specific area of human rights expertise about the challenges and/or potential threats to human rights of particular scientific practices, uses of technologies, and/or research approaches.

Facilitator: **Rob Albro,** American Anthropological Association

Presenters: **Leslie Harris,** Center for Democracy and Technology
Eric Rosenthal, Mental Disability Rights International
Len Rubenstein, Physicians for Human Rights

"Human Rights 101 for Scientists"   *Abelson/Haskins*

What are human rights and who is responsible for protecting them? How do science and human rights intersect and what can scientists do to contribute to the realization of human rights? These and other questions will be answered in this session that is designed to provide a basic understanding of human rights law, the human rights system, and where science and scientists are needed.

Trainer: **Margaret Huang,** Rights Working Group

10:45   Break

11:15   **Areas of Activity: Working Group Meetings (concurrent)**

In keeping with the Coalition's commitment to action and measurable outcomes, Coalition members and affiliates are required to contribute to one of five working groups. Through these meetings, working groups will take stock of progress made and, together with new and potential members, will continue work toward their objectives for 2009.

Welfare of Scientists   *Auditorium*
This working group is devoted to the protection and defense of scientists under threat and will work to increase the effectiveness of scientific organizations in defending the human rights of scientists.

Co-chairs: **Michele Irwin,** American Physical Society
Brad Miller, American Chemical Society

Science Ethics and Human Rights   *Abelson*

This working group is devoted to fostering appreciation among scientists and scientific associations of the relevance of human rights to ethical standards, the conduct of science, and human research protections.

Co-chairs: **Rob Albro,** American Anthropological Association
                 Paula Skedsvold, Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences

Service to the Scientific Community   *Haskins*
This working group is devoted to building the commitment and capacity of scientific 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
                 Lee Herring, American Sociological Association

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

Chair: **Susan Hinkins,** American Statistical Association

Education and Information Resources   *Room 207*
This working group is devoted to producing a variety of accessible information materials for the promotion and support of collaboration between scientists and human rights practitioners.

Co-chairs: **Judith Blau,** Sociologists Without Borders
                 Amy Crumpton, Affiliated Scientist
                 Jeffrey Toney, Sigma Xi

12:45   Lunch

1:30   **Areas of Activity: Working Group Reports-back**   *Auditorium*

Areas of Activity working groups will report on the progress made and the decisions taken toward meeting their objectives. Working group co-chairs also will share their insights: *What to try* and *What to avoid*.

Facilitator: **Mona Younis,** AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

2:00   **Joint Initiative: Article 15 - Our Work Together**   *Auditorium*

Through its joint initiative the Coalition is committed to harnessing the vital voice of scientific associations in the elucidation and promotion of the right to the benefits of scientific progress (Article 15, ICESCR). This session will introduce the aims of the initiative, and how we will accomplish them. It will also include a report on the outcomes of a UNESCO meeting on Article 15, held on July 16-17, in which AAAS Science and Human Rights Program staff participated.

Presenter: **Jessica Wyndham,** AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

3:00   Break

3:15   **Sessions (concurrent)**

"Getting Your Association Involved: A Workshop on Clarifying Commitment and Building Capacity"   *Abelson/Haskins*

According to an informal survey conducted during the Coalition launch, the commitment of scientific associations to addressing human rights is greater than their capacity. The objective of this session is to assist scientific association members and their staff to build their organization's capacity to engage in human rights activities. Session participants will work in small groups with experienced facilitators and will each receive a "tool box" to assist in following up from the workshop.

Organizer: **Clinton Anderson,** American Psychological Association

"Human Rights and the Mobility of Scientists: Acting on Visa Restrictions"   *Revelle*

Governments have a responsibility to respect the right of scientists to develop international scientific contacts and to cooperate across international borders. So says Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. What is more, the free transnational exchange of scientists and engineers is essential to the research enterprise. This session will provide S&T societies with information they can use to inform and educate international meeting attendees in navigating the US Visa application process, and ideas and best practices for engaging policy makers on scientific mobility

Facilitator: **Brad Miller,** American Chemical Society

Presenters: **Sophie Cook,** Committee of Concerned Scientists
Kathie Bailey Mathae, National Academies
Rob Quinn, Scholars at Risk Network

4:45   Break

5:00   **Planning Meeting for January 2010 Meeting**   *Auditorium*

The Steering Committee will present a recommendation for a program for the January meeting of the Coalition and will invite input and suggestions.

Facilitator: **Clinton Anderson,** American Psychological Association

5:30   **Meeting Adjourns**

Appendix 2: Member and Affiliated Organizations

Member Organizations

American Anthropological Association
American Educational Research Association
American Historical Association
American Industrial Hygiene Association
American Orthopsychiatric Association
American Physical Society
American Political Science Association
American Psychological Association
American Public Health Association
American Society of Civil Engineers
American Sociological Association
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
Capital Area Social Psychological Association
Consortium of Social Science Associations
Council on Undergraduate Research
Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences
Linguistic Society of America
Midwestern Psychological Association
National Association for Biomedical Research
National Council of Teachers of Mathematics
Psychologists for Social Responsibility
Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Society
Society for the Advancement of Chicanos/Latinos and Native Americans in Science
Society for Research in Child Development
Sociologists Without Borders

Affiliated Organizations

Acoustical Society of America
American Association of Forensic Sciences
American Astronautical Society
American Geological Institute
American Occupational Therapy Foundation
American Philosophical Association
American Society of Agronomy
Association of Earth Science Editors
Crop Science Society of America
Ecological Society of America
Fulbright Academy of Science & Technology
Geological Society of America
International Studies Association
Objectif Sciences International
Soil Science Society of America

Affiliated Scientists

The Coalition currently has 36 Affiliated Scientists.

Appendix 3: Steering Committee

- **Rob Albro** (American Anthropological Association), robert.albro@verizon.net
  Chair, Outreach and Communication

- **Clinton Anderson** (American Psychological Association), canderson@apa.org,
  Co-chair, Service to the Scientific Community

- **Susan Hinkins** (American Statistical Association), HINKINS-SUSAN@norc.org
  Co-chair, Service to the Human Rights Community

- **Douglas Richardson** (Association of American Geographers), drichardson@aag.org
  Chair, Membership

- **Paula Skedsvold** (Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences),
  pskedsvold@fbpcs.org, Co-chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights (until August 24,
  2009)

- **Jeffrey Toney** (Sigma Xi), Co-chair, Education and Information Resources,
  jetoney@kean.edu, (as of August 26, 2009)

- **Jessica Wyndham,** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program),
  jwyndham@aaas.org, Acting Coordinator (as of August 1, 2009)

- **Mona Younis** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program), myounis@aaas.org
  Coordinator (until July 31, 2009)

Session: Ethical Dilemmas in Science Practice:
Human Rights Perspective

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	9	15	25	4.56
Choice of Presenters	-	1	-	9	15	25	4.52
Quality of Presentations	-	1	3	5	16	25	4.44
Session Format	-	-	5	9	11	25	4.24
Overall Usefulness	-	2	4	7	12	25	4.16

Attendance: 36   Evaluations: 25

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

"Case studies aspect; speakers"

"Provided fodder for my work with other scientists"

"Great discussion following excellent presentations"

"Interesting, thoughtful speakers"

"It must be continued in next Coalition meeting"

"Presenters had pertinent experience, presented many different ideas, views, proposals very well"

"All 3 presenters had great insights – best session at a conference in several years!"

"Q/A period was great – as always, it would be great to have more time"

"3 nice examples, but too much detail"

"Compelling case studies"

"The presentation on Gitmo"

"Breadth of topics addressed and relevance to our work. Very high level of presenters' expertise"

"Raised a series of issues that a professional association must consider if it is a guardian of a profession's ethical code!"

"Examples of situations"

Q: How could this session be improved?

"Less presentation time"

"Limit speakers to 10 minutes and more time for discussion"

"More structure for questions"

Workshop: Human Rights 101 for Scientists

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the Information	-	-	2	6	8	16	4.38
Quality of Presentation	-	-	3	4	9	16	4.38
Usefulness of Materials	-	-	6	5	5	16	3.94
Workshop Format	-	-	4	7	4	15	4.00
Overall Usefulness	-	-	2	6	8	16	4.38
Interest in More Workshops on topic	-	-	1	7	6	14	4.36

Attendance: 25   Evaluations: 16

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this workshop?

"Great Intro to the topic – speaker was very knowledgeable"

"Presenter is very enthusiastic and open to questions"

"Presenter is extremely knowledgeable on subject of human rights, and explains basic concepts very effectively. Excellent facilitation and encouragement of group discussion"

"Basic knowledge", "Exercise", "Lots of clear info"

"The presenter!"

"Meeting others who participated"

"Her thorough command of this topic. Her ability and rapport with the audience to address their concerns, moments of challenge"

"Very good, clear overview of human rights"

Q: How can future workshops be improved?

"Exercise on prioritizing human rights not as useful here - would rather have the time devoted to how human rights and science intersect and how HR affects the work of scientists"

"Having powerpoint as handout would be useful"

"Focus information on the audience"

"More time for exercise in small groups"

"Would've been helpful to have copies of her slide presentation available"

"At times it seemed the issues are simpler than they are – The speaker at one point denied that there are conflicts among rights – an odd interpretation"

"Deeper discussion of international law directly relevant to most scientists' functional activities, i.e. intellectual property, freedom of expression—censorship by employer (gov.), work-for-hire copyright. So much of discussion lacks purposeful directive focus for future action by coalition"

Joint Initiative: Article 15: Our Work Together

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the Information	-	1	6	4	9	20	4.05
Quality of Presentation	1	-	4	4	11	20	4.20
Presentation Format	-	-	8	2	10	20	4.10
Usefulness of Materials	-	1	4	4	9	18	4.17

Attendance: 51   Evaluations: 20

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

"It started on time"

"Article 15 overview"

"Superb up-to-date information [that] most scientists, absent legal training, require"

"Focus"

"Jessica is a thoughtful and terrific speaker."

"Excellent presentation; direct answers to many questions"

"Discussion following slides"

"Article 15 presentation"

"Enlightening"

"Level and flow of information – just right amount of time"

Q: How could this session be improved?

"Live transcription was distracting, discussions should be more focused"

"More meetings"

"More focus on concrete actions and specifics"

"What can we do concretely with our organizations?"

"Not much happened. What were we supposed to accomplish?"

Session: Human Rights and the Mobility of Scientists: Acting on Visa Restrictions

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	3	5	9	4.44
Choice of Presenters	-	-	3	2	4	9	4.11
Quality of Presentations	-	-	4	-	5	9	4.11
Session Format	-	-	2	2	5	9	4.33
Overall Usefulness	-	-	2	2	5	9	4.33

Attendance: 22   Evaluations: 9

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

"Given base examples"

"Guest speakers were excellent"

"Practical solutions! Bravo!"

"Hearing about the different perspectives"

Q: How could this session be improved?

"One speaker spoke too softly making it difficult to hear. Provide whatever is necessary to correct such problems"

 "Covering the entire spectrum of visa/residency requirements that [concern] foreign nationals rather than the narrow focus on short term visits"

Session: Getting Your Association Involved:
A Workshop on Clarifying Commitment and Building Capacity

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	-	1	2	4	-	7	3.43
Usefulness of materials	-	2	2	3	-	7	3.14
Workshop format	-	2	-	4	1	7	3.57
Overall Usefulness	-	1	2	4		7	3.43
Interest in more workshops on topic	-	1	-	4	2	7	4.00

Attendance: 22   Evaluations: 10

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

"501c3 discussion"

"The 3 tier discussion: assets, barriers, solutions- these were just 'action' light"

"Hearing what other organizations are doing, challenges they're facing, and solutions they've got in place"

"Lots of comments/interaction from audience"

Q: How could this session be improved?

"Inclusion of non-litigation HR monitoring organizations, e.g., HRW, Amnesty International"

"Focus more on the prevention side, or rather what organizations can do. We have gotten our organization interested, but now we don't know what we can do to further HR issues which our membership is interested addressing"

Area of Activity: Welfare of Scientists

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	1	1	2	3	7	4.00
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	1	-	2	4	7	4.29
Use of Meeting Time	-	-	1	2	4	7	4.43
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-		2	5	7	4.71
Likelihood of joining the working group	1	-	-	2	3	6	4.00

Attendance: 12   **Evaluations: 8**

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

"Well organized"

"Diversity of input"

"Openness"

"Information about upcoming trainings"

"Preliminary outlining of handbook 'Resource Guide' on human rights"

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

"Very general HR discussion…the actions available to follow seem ill-defined/nebulous. Societies have wrestled with the same issues for years…little progress. Lots of policy statements, education, etc. Very little substantial action visible to scientists at risk"

"Communication"

"Present much more specific agenda items – committees don't write or develop agendas – they respond to specific recommendations"

Area of Activity: Science Ethics and Human Rights

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	1	2	2	2	7	3.71
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	1	1	3	2	7	3.86
Use of Meeting Time	-	1	1	4	1	7	3.71
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	1	1	4	6	4.50
Likelihood of joining the working group	1	-	-	1	2	4	3.75

Attendance: 17   Evaluations: 7

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

"Real openness to all ideas and viewpoints"

"Great discussion"

"The final resolution of two topics to pursue"

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

"Make some decisions as a group and get on with the work"

"We need to make some clear decisions about where we're going"

Area of Activity: Service to the Scientific Community

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	1	2	1	2	6	3.67
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	-	2	2	2	6	4.00
Use of Meeting Time	-	1	-	2	3	6	4.17
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	-	1	5	6	4.83
Likelihood of joining the working group	-	-	-	2	-	2	4.00

Attendance: 10   Evaluations: 6

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

"Synthesis/Summary of brainstorm session, time devoted to 'tackle what's next,' thoughtful discussion on priorities #1 and #3"

"Small group discussion opportunities, clarifying role of [working group] and where to go from here (especially hearing feedback from new groups)"

"Hearing from new members"

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

"More time working on what to tackle next"

"More structure and specifics"

Area of Activity: Service to the Human Rights Community

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	2	1	3	1	7	3.43
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	3	2	2	-	7	2.86
Use of Meeting Time	-	3	1	3	-	7	3.00
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	1	3	3	7	4.29
Likelihood of joining the working group	-	-	-	-	1	1	5.00

Attendance: 13   Evaluations: 7

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the meeting?

"Meeting the other members"

"Good people, and Susan kept it almost organized!"

"Concrete proposals and persons to carry them out"

"A lot was surfaced, dialogued about"

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

"I think there's an underestimation of what the group can accomplish. If you sign up for a working group, you should expect to do work. No one should leave without homework"

"These things are like herding cats at best. There's not much you can do to make them less painful but somehow many of them end up working"

"Better agenda"

"Bit more coordination of meeting"

Areas of Activity: Education and Information Resources

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Clarity of Meeting Objectives	-	-	-	1	6	7	4.86
Usefulness of Agenda Items	-	-	-	1	6	7	4.86
Use of Meeting Time	-	-	-	-	7	7	5.00
Opportunity to Contribute	-	-	-	-	7	7	5.00
Likelihood of joining the working group	-	-	1	-	5	6	4.67

Attendance: 7   **Evaluations: 7**

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

"New ideas, strategies for developing educations materials"

"Focused and productive!"

"Good generation of ideas"

"Level of enthusiasm amongst members and willingness to serve"

"Fantastic to meet my co-committee members!"

"Focused group"

Q: How could this session be improved?

"Coffee in the room!"

"Keep it going!"