



ADVANCING SCIENCE, SERVING SOCIETY

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

Meeting Report July 14-15, 2011

[View Meeting Agenda](#)

Thursday Plenary: Criminal Justice – Forensics, DNA, and Human Rights _____	3
Opening Plenary: Evaluating the U.S. Human Rights Record: The Universal Periodic Review _____	4
Sessions	
Article 12 (ICESCR): The Right of Everyone to the Enjoyment of the Highest Attainable Standard of Physical and Mental Health _____	7
STEM Education: Diversity, Human Rights and New Curricula _____	9
Workshops	
The Right to Benefit from Science: Engaging Your Association in the UN Process _____	12
Engaging Your Discipline in the UPR Process _____	14
Business Meetings	
Planning the 2012 Coalition Meeting _____	15
Membership and Outreach _____	17
New Members _____	18
Working Group Reports	
I. Welfare of Scientists _____	19
II. Science, Ethics and Human Rights _____	20
III. Service to the STEM Community _____	23
IV. Service to the Human Rights Community _____	27
V. Education and Information Resources _____	29
Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Steering Committee _____	31
Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Members _____	32
Appendix: Session Evaluations _____	33

The [AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition](#) is a network of scientific and engineering membership organizations that recognize a role for science, scientists and engineers in efforts to realize human rights. The aim of the Coalition is to facilitate communication and partnerships on human rights within and across the scientific and engineering community, and between the scientific and engineering, and human rights communities. Launched in January 2009, the Coalition is currently comprised of 46 professional associations and scholarly societies and 63 affiliated individuals.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition thanks the

American Statistical Association
Kean University, College of Natural, Applied and Health Sciences
and
Sigma Xi

for their sponsorship of the meeting

Criminal Justice – Forensics, DNA, and Human Rights

The Coalition meeting began on the evening of July 14, 2011 with a screening of the documentary film *After Innocence*, followed by a panel moderated by **Mark Frankel** ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)). *After Innocence* details the lives of eight individuals in the United States who were wrongly convicted and later exonerated. The film highlights the work of the [Innocence Project](#), a national public policy and litigation organization that supports post-conviction claims of innocence, including through the application of DNA testing and other scientific methods.

Panelists **Joe Cecil** ([Federal Judicial Center Division of Research](#)), **Sarah Chu** ([Innocence Project](#)), and **Kenneth Melson** ([Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives](#)) identified several key human rights issues addressed by the film including: the right to compensation, the right to have one's criminal record expunged following exoneration (not automatically granted), and a lack of state-funded programs to facilitate reintegration into society. Currently, approximately 20 states provide some sort of compensation to those who have been wrongfully convicted and released. However, in most cases exonerees are not eligible for such services as health care and job assistance, services that are offered to parolees. Another concern is the enormous backlog of cases pending DNA analysis and the inadequate number of laboratories available to conduct such reviews, leading to extensive delays. The result is that many people who are incarcerated are unable to challenge their conviction in circumstances where the individual maintains their innocence.

Another challenge, as highlighted by Chu, is that state laws regarding incarceration, exoneration, access to records, and compensation are incredibly varied. Each state adopts unique regulations on these issues, regulations that are often quite distinct across states. Chu recommended that the Federal Government take a bigger role in governing how the states share information with one another, compensation for wrongly convicted persons, and other related issues. Chu also noted that while DNA testing is the most well-known and reliable method of new forensic research, ballistics, fingerprints and other methods exist for investigating guilt and could be pursued in cases where DNA evidence is unavailable for examination.

Frankel posed a number of questions to the panel. The first question concerned the responsibility of scientists participating in the judicial process. Chu suggested that scientists should be more vocal when they see "bad" or less reliable evidence being used, and called on research scientists and academics to be more involved in examining the technology and providing guidelines on appropriate methods of analysis for judicial proceedings. Cecil added that DNA forensics grew up from law enforcement, not from within a research culture. This has limited the continued development of the field, as academia is the source of expert knowledge and reliable scientific development. He noted that while this represented a major problem in the past, the culture is beginning to change as more academics become involved. He also expressed his view that there is a public service role for scientists in the development of improved methods.

Another question posed to the panel related to the knowledge that judges need to possess in order to effectively utilize forensic evidence in cases. Cecil pointed out that the Federal Judicial Center is starting to conduct training, on precisely this topic and that new reference materials are being

created for judges. Chu added that judges are gatekeepers in the cases, but the problems start much earlier than in the court room. Forensic evidence gathering and analysis, she pointed out, occur well before such evidence reaches a courtroom. Chu also noted that the failure of defense attorneys to challenge forensic evidence in court indicates a lack of knowledge and understanding on their part of forensic evidence, its applications and limitations.

Turning to [Article 27](#) of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights which recognizes the right of everyone to share in the benefits of scientific advancement, Frankel asked the panel to discuss what this right means in the context of forensic evidence. Cecil responded that evidence must meet minimum standards of reliability. He also noted that the burden should not be solely upon the defense to question the veracity of forensic evidence, but that judges also shared responsibility for probing the applicability of forensic evidence in cases. Melson added that the judicial process should meet the highest possible level of quality assurance, starting at the laboratory level, including certification of labs and researchers, all the way through to the presentation of evidence in court.

Finally, Frankel referenced a statistic presented in the film, the fact that 70 percent of wrongful convictions are based on eyewitness testimony. Cecil said that a key way to reduce the likelihood of wrongful convictions based on eyewitness testimony was to remove bias. To achieve this he recommended reforms in the line-up process and the need for jurors to be appropriately cautioned about the testimony provided by eyewitnesses. Melson emphasized the need for corroboration of eyewitness testimony which, he said, should not be relied on as the sole basis for a conviction.

Evaluating the U.S. Human Rights Record: The Universal Periodic Review

In 2006, the United Nations General Assembly established the [Universal Periodic Review](#) (UPR) process as a means of systematically evaluating the current human rights records of United Nations Member States. Every four years, sixteen nations are slated for review and are required to submit a concise report to the Human Rights Council in Geneva summarizing the status of human rights in their country. On August 20, 2010, the United States submitted its first UPR Report. The process of developing the report included a year of government-focused assessment as well as consultations with non-governmental human rights organizations across the country.

In this session, moderated by **Jessica Wyndham** ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)), **Susanne Nossel** ([State Department, Bureau of International Organization Affairs](#)) described the fundamental strengths and weaknesses of the UPR process. According to Nossel, there are three primary strengths: (1) universality, (2) periodicity, and (3) the process of review. Originally, the UPR process emerged as a way to correct the United Nation's tendency to focus on the human rights records of certain nations while ignoring the status of human rights in others. When the Human Rights Council required its Member States to submit a report for review, all 192 countries agreed to participate, including nations infamous for human rights violations such as Burma, Iran, and North Korea. The fact that governments are required to periodically assess their countries' human rights records further strengthens UN efforts to support and redress human rights in the long term. The method of review is another strong element of the established UPR process because it incorporates the recommendations of a

country's civil society, compels governments to assess their own policies, and includes an element of international peer critique.

These strengths notwithstanding, Nossel also acknowledged two fundamental weaknesses of the UPR process: the potential for political pandering during the Human Rights Council review as well as the superficial nature of the reports submitted by states. Country representatives in the Human Rights Council cannot always be candid in their reviews, particularly when they have associations or allegiances with countries that are undergoing review. For example, before the Arab Spring and the crackdown on the Libyan government, many countries with allegiances to Libya in the Council applauded Muammar al-Gaddafi's human rights record despite evidence of the Libyan leader's demonstrated responsibility for political violence and repression. Moreover, governments are limited to 20 pages when drafting reports, meaning the vast majority of the human rights issues discussed can only be addressed superficially. This restriction was proved particularly challenging for the United States, Nossel explained, because the government was genuinely committed to listening to and incorporating in its report the concerns expressed by a wide spectrum of civil society. This engagement with the public will need to continue as the United States attempts to adopt some of the 228 recommendations made by the Council.

While Nossel spoke from the perspective of the US government, **Theresa Harris** ([World Organization for Human Rights USA](#)) gave an account of her experience with the UPR process from the perspective of civil society. According to Harris, the UPR process spurred a wide diversity of human rights organizations with both broad and specific human rights concerns to come together and communicate their views on the US human rights record. Grassroots organizations, national and international non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and law schools contributed their perspectives and concerns at three different occasions: government-hosted consultations, NGO-led meetings, and during the adoption hearing that follows the review of the US UPR Report. During these consultations hosted by the US government, human rights organizations expressed their points of view on issues that included civil rights, corporate accountability, the death penalty, disability rights, education, foreign policy, housing and homelessness, LGBT issues, freedom of speech, migrant labor rights, reproductive rights, racial profiling, and more.

Harris commended the US government for sincerely listening to the concerns expressed in these dialogues, pointing out that many problems outlined by human rights organizations were incorporated into the final UPR Report submitted by the US. Indeed, she described how this conversation between government and civil society allowed the human rights network to promote accountability, encourage compliance with human rights standards and advance internal consideration of human rights issues at all levels of government. In addition to educating the government on a broad spectrum of human rights concerns, the consultations with civil society broadened the public's awareness of human rights issues and promoted public engagement with grassroots organizations.

While Harris commended the US government for engaging civil society during the UPR process, she pointed out that entry points created for civil society involvement can be manipulated by ill-intentioned governments. For example, some countries have organized NGOs with government-approved agendas and have placed those NGOs at the forefront of their civil society efforts. This

problem becomes particularly evident following the review of a country's human rights record and during the adoption hearing when the reviewed government chooses to accept or reject the recommendations made by the Human Rights Council. At that point, ten NGOs have two minutes each to speak and respond to the comments made by reviewing nations in the UN. When these NGOs have been contracted or informed by the government under review, the process is no longer a sincere effort to redress real human rights concerns. Harris emphasized that this problem of politicization will need to be addressed by the Human Rights Council for the UPR to have, and be seen to have, a genuine impact on the realization of human rights internationally. [View PowerPoint.](#)

Although the STEM community was not involved in the process leading to the US's involvement in the UPR, both Nossel and Harris identified areas in which scientists and engineers might contribute their expertise in future. Nossel focused on issues related to healthcare, environmental justice, and criminal justice. She observed that racial and socioeconomic disparities in healthcare, particularly access to healthcare for minorities and immigrants, as well as reproductive rights were all of central concern for both the Human Rights Council and civil society. Accordingly, the US government should consider incorporating the perspectives of scientists, physicians, and engineers in understanding where gaps in the healthcare system exist and how to redress them.

The overlap of environmental issues and human rights creates additional opportunities for the STEM community to get involved, particularly since much of the southeastern coast of the United States is still reeling from the 2010 B.P. oil spill as well as Hurricane Katrina in 2005. Nossel emphasized that scientists should be involved both in understanding how to redress these identified concerns for human rights and also in communicating human rights concerns to the US government for future UPR review processes. Indeed, Nossel explained, civil society's consultations with the government may represent an ideal opportunity for the STEM community to participate and make its voice heard.

Harris echoed Nossel's comments, emphasizing that the human rights community needs empirical evidence to have a greater impact on policy and government. If scientists can conduct statistical and qualitative analyses to understand trends in social discrimination or the impacts of climate change, NGOs and other human rights organizations will have more leverage when demanding the US government to act. By applying the rigorous methodology of science to human rights issues, the STEM community can give human rights organizations the tools to advocate more effectively for changes in programs, policies and laws. Both speakers agreed that while science played no formal role in the United States' first UPR process, the STEM community would be welcome as an integral participant in following-up on the most recent UPR process and preparing for the next in 2015.

During the question and answer session that concluded the opening plenary, Nossel and Harris further addressed how the STEM community should become involved. One participant emphasized how areas where quantitative or empirical analyses would be useful should be identified for scientists to step forward. What is clearly missing, the audience member argued, is quantification in human rights discussions. However, to ensure earnest and widespread participation by the STEM community, there also needs to be a sense of obligation within the

scientific and engineering communities themselves. Perhaps, the audience member observed, in our codes of ethics, scientists should recognize the responsibility to come forward and contribute to human rights globally.

Another participant identified the lack of publicity surrounding the UPR process as a fundamental weakness in the system. Washington, D.C. was just named a “Human Rights City,” she said, and yet few people in the audience had probably become aware of this. Harris agreed and added that the limited media coverage of the UPR meant there was a great deal of misinformation communicated to the public. Nossel added that the UPR process needs informed journalists to actively follow the events and dialogues that transpire.

Finally, one participant asked how the United States planned to respond to the recommendations made during the review. Nossel identified tangible changes to policy that occurred during the process of assessing human rights in the country. She cited President Obama’s decision to sign the [U.N. Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#) in 2010 as well as his repeal of Don’t Ask Don’t Tell that same year. It will take time, Nossel explained, but these two major events are the first steps in a long process of redressing and bolstering protections for human rights in the United States.

Article 12 (ICESCR): The Right of Everyone to the Enjoyment of the Highest Attainable Standard of Physical and Mental Health

This session focused on Article 12 of the [International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#) that recognizes the right of everyone “to the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of physical and mental health.” **Paula Skedsvold** ([Federation of Associations in Brain and Behavioral Sciences](#)), who facilitated the session, remarked that a number of human rights instruments, in addition to the Covenant, recognize and elucidate on the meaning of the right to health. She noted that the purpose of the day’s session was to demonstrate the practical activities that organizations have undertaken to address the human right to health, as well as to highlight the role that science has to play with respect to that right.

Aram Schvey’s ([Center for Reproductive Rights](#)) presentation focused on reproductive rights, specifically how science can be used to support those rights. Too often, he remarked, advocates for reproductive rights have no background in the sciences, yet many of the ongoing debates involving reproductive rights directly involve science (i.e., abortion and contraception). Schvey organized his presentation around a series of questions; What are reproductive rights?; Are they human rights?; How does America stack up?; and, What is the role of science in protecting human rights?

One of the most widely accepted definitions of reproductive rights comes from the [1994 International Conference on Population and Development](#), which defines reproductive rights as those that “rest on the recognition of the basic right of all couples and individuals to decide freely and responsibly the number, spacing and timing of their children and to have the information and means to do so, and the right to attain the highest standard of sexual and reproductive health.” Schvey remarked that the acknowledgement of reproductive rights as human rights has been integral to the ability of women to participate equally in society.

While reproductive rights are explicitly articulated in [Article 14 of the African Women’s Rights Protocol](#), the [Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women \(Article 16\)](#), and the [Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities \(Article 25\)](#), and implicitly referred to elsewhere, there are numerous other human rights that can impact reproductive rights. Examples include the right to health, the right to life, the right to be free from discrimination, the right to decide the number and spacing of children, the right to consent to marriage and to equality in marriage, the right not to be subject to torture or other cruel, inhumane or degrading treatment or punishment, the right to be free from sexual violence, the right to privacy, the right to education and information, and the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress.

To demonstrate how the United States “stacks up,” Schvey presented a case study on contraception. Although he noted that 99% of sexually active women in the United States have used contraception, there are significant racial disparities when it comes to access to contraceptives, sexual education, rates of unintended pregnancy, and rates of abortion. Science has a critical role to play when it comes to reproductive rights and health more generally. There are numerous venues for science to be involved in reproductive rights issues including in current debates over whether or not contraception should be covered by healthcare, pharmacists should be able to refuse to fill prescriptions for birth control or Plan B, and whether hospitals should be able to refuse potentially lifesaving treatments for pregnant mothers. [View PowerPoint.](#)

Andres Pumariega ([American Orthopsychiatric Association](#)) discussed the human rights challenge of mental health disparities in the United States. Health disparity is defined by Carter-Pokras & Baquet as a “chain of events signified by environment, access to, utilization of, and quality of care or health status; particular health outcome that deserves scrutiny.” Pumariega emphasized that the US population is becoming increasingly diverse; it is projected that by year 2050 there will be no majority ethnic group. The health disparities that are experienced by these diverse populations have ethical implications because of health rationing, human rights repercussions specifically associated with issues of equity, and can negatively impact economic development.

A report commissioned by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) on racial and ethnic disparities in healthcare found disparities among Medicare beneficiaries between Caucasians and African Americans. Some potential reasons for the disparities include financing and structure of care in the health system, personal preferences among different populations, poor patient adherence, biological differences, cultural and linguistic barriers, and issues of access, stereotyping and uncertainty at the clinical level. Pumariega noted that diverse populations have the highest burden of disease and associated morbidity. Disparities faced, in particular, by diverse youth include misdiagnosis, increasing rates of psychopathology, and lack of access to mental health services. In order to combat these, Pumariega remarked, it is critical that youth be given adequate access to treatment facilities, that there is a thorough assessment of diverse cultural environments as they impact mental health, family involvement in the treatment process, and access to psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy. [View PowerPoint.](#)

During the question and answer session the speakers were asked about the most productive way for scientists to become advocates for science-based human rights. All three speakers suggested that scientists author joint publications and reports, conduct outreach among politicians, and that they work to keep the public informed of the issues and their work by holding presentations. It was noted that it is important to hold people accountable for what is said publicly.

Another participant asked if reproductive rights were discussed during the US Universal Periodic Review process. Schvey responded that reproductive rights were mentioned, but not extensively discussed. Reproductive rights were brought up in the context of the “[Helms Amendment](#),” which prohibits US foreign assistance funding to be used to pay for abortion as a method of family planning. Of particular interest was how the amendment would impact countries that had high instances of rape during times of crisis.

Finally, the speakers were asked what steps their organizations were taking to better inform the US public about the right to health. Pumariega remarked that the mental health organizations with which he works have not undertaken significant public campaigns, but that their focus lies more on the information available on their websites and in the distribution of brochures/handouts. Schvey noted that his is not a membership organization, so the focus is more on advocacy and litigation.

STEM Education: Diversity, Human Rights and New Curricula

This session focused on strategies to integrate a human rights perspective into STEM education. Through consideration of the human right to education, policymakers can approach educational issues with clear standards and goals in mind. Moreover, addressing social issues in STEM curricula fosters a community of scientists whose work goes beyond purely academic science, but also engages the community and benefits it through science. Incorporating a human rights framework into science education can benefit students, educators, and society at large.

Felice Levine ([American Educational Research Association](#)) opened the session by noting that education is at the heart of the role and responsibility of the Coalition. Education, she remarked, is the first context outside of the family where children are exposed to a social institution with rules, rights, and responsibilities. STEM education in particular introduces children to a method of inquiry that is “excellent in quality, diverse, and inclusive.” Despite the importance of the institution of education, there are disparities in distribution and opportunity for education that are based on suspect characteristics. Taking a human rights approach to education, she argued, will help better address these issues.

Liz Sullivan ([National Economic & Social Rights Initiative \(NESRI\)](#)) addressed the importance of approaching education as a fundamental human right. In her role at NESRI, she partners with local communities to frame crises in the nation’s school systems as human rights issues. Framing educational issues as such brings the weight of human rights law and the standards of human rights indicators to facilitate and measure progress. Whereas national and local standards lack adequate protections for the right to education, various human rights instruments recognize and provide a firm basis for addressing education. These instruments include the [Universal Declaration of Human Rights](#), the [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#), and the [International](#)

[Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#). However, even if governments make a commitment to a treaty, she acknowledged, they often fail to fulfill their obligations. Moreover, the United States has neither signed nor ratified several of these human rights instruments, further impeding progress.

NESRI seeks the fulfillment of five standards for the human right to education, Sullivan explained. First, students need *quality education*. Schools must provide good teachers, they must tailor curricula to issues relevant to students, and they must make attempts to keep children in school by reducing the number of expulsions and suspensions. Second, students must be able to reach their *full potential*. Education should prepare students for active lives in society by developing critical thinking skills, expanding the scope of quality STEM and arts education, and teaching to resolve conflicts non-violently. Third, there must be *dignity* in education. Schools must create an environment of tolerance and respect. A school in which students play an active role in their education ensures an environment of mutual self-respect. Fourth, schools must provide *freedom from discrimination and guarantee equality*. Schools should be diverse institutions where even unintentionally discriminatory outcomes, such as the achievement gap, are not tolerated. Fifth, education entails a *right to participation*. Schools must create the space for participation by the local community and parents must be guaranteed the right to participate in their children's education.

While NESRI works on grassroots initiatives for the human right to education, Sullivan concluded by discussing the top-down approaches that also address education. Treaty-monitoring bodies of the UN as well as independent experts such as the [Special Rapporteur on Education](#) address education issues under the auspices of the United Nations. Other UN bodies, such as the [Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination](#), have made recommendations to the US on their progress with regard to the human right to education. These recommendations include reductions in the achievement gap, limits on the number of suspensions and expulsions, and elimination of racial disparities in education. Together with grassroots movements, these initiatives all work to achieve the human right to education in the United States. [View PowerPoint](#).

Shirley Malcom ([AAAS Education and Human Resources](#)) opened by suggesting that the legacy of slavery and racial segregation continues to leave its mark on educational disparity in the United States. This legacy endures because there is a clear relationship between parental education and student achievement. To combat these disparities, the availability of technical and professional education must be based on merit, not socioeconomic considerations. Differential access to facilities in K-12 education, including to quality instruction and teachers, means that the legacy of separate and unequal endures even today.

Current standards to measure educational progress, such as [No Child Left Behind](#), only answer trivial questions with regard to achievement. Moreover, even if these measures indicate progress, they do not address the fact that there is still inequality; the gap nonetheless remains. Similarly, at the undergraduate level access to education remains a socioeconomic issue. Even at these higher levels there exist differential outcomes on the basis of race. Educational disparities in STEM education have real consequences in society, Malcom argued. STEM education relates to personal empowerment; it gives individuals the opportunity to think critically about crucial

decisions not just in the classroom, but in everyday life. STEM education is closely related to employment opportunities and the ability to participate in government and society. Furthermore, there are educational and societal benefits to diversity in STEM education. The lack of women in STEM fields potentially precludes important research areas, such as the differential presentation of diseases in men and women. The sex bias in STEM means that important research areas with potentially critical impacts on society are being ignored. [View PowerPoint.](#)

The final speaker, **Karen Oates** ([Worcester Polytechnic Institute](#)) began by examining the role of scientists and students in society. If access to STEM education can provide the resources for a good life, what are the responsibilities of those who might expand STEM to a broader demographic? Answering this question involves bringing together science and civic engagement in such a way that presents science as a civil responsibility. This responsibility falls heavily on educators, who – beyond lecturing – must *engage* their students. They must consider the content of their curricula which should no longer just focus on the science itself, but must facilitate use of STEM knowledge for policy and civic engagement. Students should be able to apply their STEM education to social issues that really matter to them; they should be able to understand how STEM education can ultimately accelerate the progress of democracy.

The question remains, how does an educator bring civic responsibility into, say, an epidemiology course? Oates noted that, in particular, minority students are interested in being involved with the community. The task for educators thus becomes how to let students become involved in an issue relevant to STEM that really resonates with them. Educators can achieve this by incorporating modules into curricula that matter to the students. Furthermore, students should pursue advocacy and service projects to apply their STEM knowledge to community issues. Indeed, the new goal of science should not be to make it an exclusive club like it once was, but to make it accessible, with a diverse range of resources for students with different interests, needs, and skills. Once we start thinking about science as an inroad for civic engagement, Oates argued, it becomes much more than just a purely academic pursuit. Once this occurs, the impacts of science grow; it becomes a channel through which to address the most critical problems in society. [View PowerPoint.](#)

During the question and answer session one member of the audience asked if students contribute to curricula when they are asked to pick out topics that are particularly relevant to them. Oates remarked that when students are asked to pick social topics for consideration in a science course, they actually do not choose issues much different from that which would normally be on the curriculum. Instead, it is the context in which they wish to learn about an issue that changes. For example, instead of teaching a normal course on cell biology, students wanted to learn cell biology in the context of cancer. Students receive the same knowledge as they would in a normal class, but also walk away with specific knowledge relevant to cancer.

Another participant questioned how one addresses the particular STEM education needs of special populations who are not always included in statistics (the LGBT community, Native Americans, and disabled persons)? Malcom noted that the small population size of these demographic groups makes it difficult to consider their particular needs in science education. Especially with regard to students with disabilities, each of whom presents learning difficulties in a unique way, it is a challenge to tailor education to their specific needs. In the LGBT

community, discrimination can often be subtle. But despite these challenges, educators cannot pretend that these populations do not exist or that their perspective may not lead to valuable scientific insight. Ultimately, scientists ignore differences at their own peril.

The final question concerned the role to be played by professional societies. Sullivan recommended that K-12 teachers get training beyond the scope of the curriculum. They must be skilled in managing the classroom culture and facilitating dialogue which spurs interest in education. Malcom stated that each society must do a 'self-study'. They must make sure that policies reflect the values of the institution and that these policies reflect a diverse array of perspectives. A good way to make everyone more aware of civic engagement issues is by implementing disability programs. Oates responded with the idea that scientists have a professional responsibility to teachers, a responsibility which professional societies should be thinking about. By considering the needs of teachers in the context of a classroom environment, scientists can better address the most effective educational practices.

The Right to Benefit from Science: Engaging Your Association in the UN Process

Jessica Wyndham ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)), workshop facilitator, remarked that [Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights](#) is the focus of the Coalition's Joint Initiative and is, therefore, a focus of all Coalition activities. She noted that the US has signed, but not ratified the Covenant and as a result is not legally bound by its terms. Furthermore, Wyndham remarked, because of the amorphous language of the right its meaning is not clear and, therefore, it is not being applied in practice. In an effort to address this challenge, in 2007 UNESCO began a process to define the right. The process resulted in the [Venice Statement](#) though few scientists were involved in the process. In order to add a scientific interpretation and perspective, the Coalition is seeking input from the STEM community which will then be presented to the UN.

In April 2010, the AAAS Board of Directors issued a [statement](#) on Article 15 and the importance of involving the STEM community in the UN process. One of the Coalition working groups has developed a focus group process to define the right across various science and engineering disciplines. The information resulting from the focus groups will be collated and presented to the UN at the end of this year. [View PowerPoint](#).

Margaret Vitullo ([American Sociological Association](#)) introduced the focus group process and the associated protocol. The focus group approach is used in many types of research including marketing research. This method gets the interviewer to be less of a focus, and allows participants to draw information from each other. The format improves the ability to talk about complex ideas, community norms, in part because the emphasis is on the group as a whole, not on the individuals. The goal of holding the groups in the current format is to get a sense of what the community thinks. This is particularly important for Article 15 because the language of the right is difficult to understand in isolation.

Vitullo outlined the structure of the protocol for the focus group: the focus group is intended to take two hours, a group of approximately 12 participants plus two facilitators is optimal. During the course of the focus group participants are asked 10 questions, discussion about which is recorded. The protocol provides a full script for the meeting, which is recorded and transcribed for qualitative analysis. To date, three focus groups have been held, one each with the American Psychological Association, the Acoustical Society of America, and the American Astronomical Society.

The workshop facilitators then led the participants in a ‘mini’ focus group in which three participants discussed and address one of the protocol questions. Issues raised with regard to Article 15 included: the politicization of science generally, and politicization that impacts funding of specific paths of research; the inadequacy of general scientific knowledge among the public as a result of poor K-12 STEM education; lack of scientific literacy leading to the inability of the public to digest scientific information and participate in dialogues regarding science-related policies; regulatory and enforcement schemes that restrict travel among scientists; the deliberate government manipulation of scientifically rigorous data; and government persecution of scientists.

Clinton Anderson ([American Psychological Association](#)) went through the tools needed to host an Article 15 focus group. These include:

- Template invitation for recruiting participants
- Demographic form to be completed by each participant
- PowerPoint presentation on Article 15 and the focus group process
- Q/A sheets for writing responses to each question

These materials are available to association representatives who wish to host their own Article 15 focus group. Additional facilities and staff required include: a seminar room and powerpoint, two facilitators, and an audio recorder. Anderson noted that the Coalition had sought advice and concluded that IRB review of the focus group process was not necessary.

Possible alternatives to this format would be to offer an online questionnaire to the members, or to hold a conference call or webinar after members have had time to process and brainstorm ideas in response to the questions. Anderson concluded by outlining the reasons for holding an Article 15 focus group. They include: ensuring your discipline's perspective is known to the UN, protecting scientists and advancing science, and encouraging people in your discipline to think about the relationship between science and human rights.

All Coalition members and members of scientific associations not yet part of the Coalition are invited to contact Jessica Wyndham to learn more about hosting a focus group for your discipline on the subject of the right to “enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications.”

Engaging Your Discipline in the UPR Process

The workshop focused on the various access or entry points for engaging in the Universal Periodic Review (UPR) process. **Theresa Harris** ([World Organization for Human Rights USA](#)), first asked participants to list their substantive goals and their organizational goals. Substantive goals included: have an impact, engage in public service, and leverage expertise. Organizational goals included: leverage expertise, engage membership in human rights work, and breakdown language barriers or negative perceptions of human rights work. Harris went on to explain the basic relationship between science and human rights. In the context of human rights advocacy, the goal is to collect documentation or evidence about human rights abuses, activities that provide an excellent entry point for scientists. Harris went on to explain the process of the UPR to the group. She also explained the value of using the UN and the UPR to advocate for specific US domestic policies, by framing the conversation as foreign policy issue.

Next, Harris identified three specific entry points for scientists and their organizations to engage in the UPR process:

- (1) Organizations should go through the final Human Rights Council recommendations agreed to by the US and consider which might benefit from the scientific input or analysis. She suggested writing a letter to the corresponding government department or agency to identify how a particular expertise or field might be of relevance to the implementation of the specific recommendation, potentially identifying relevant experts and/or offering technical assistance. Harris suggested copying the State Department on any such letter.
- (2) Organizations or individual scientists could become engaged in preparing the midterm report by offering technical assistance to the State Department. Such assistance could take the form of analyzing what studies already exist, i.e. what data we already possess, and/or the data that needed to be collected in order to report accurately on progress made in the interim period between now and the next UPR.
- (3) Finally, UN [treaty bodies](#) receive periodic reports from states concerning their compliance with human rights treaties. These treaty bodies include the [Human Rights Committee \(CCPR\)](#), [Committee against Torture \(CAT\)](#), [Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination \(CERD\)](#), and the [Committee on the Rights of the Child \(CRC\)](#). When the US government files a report to one of these bodies, civil society has an opportunity to respond and supplement the information provided by the government. This process represents another way to offer suggestions and guidance to the State Department, as well as call attention to areas in which the US needs to improve its human rights record.

Planning the January 2012 Coalition Meeting

Rob Albro ([American Anthropological Association](#)) facilitated a conversation about the upcoming January 2012 Coalition meeting that will focus on indigenous populations, human rights, science and technology. What follow are several relevant points of reference for further review in thinking about potential speakers to invite and panel topics:

1. The [2007 UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples](#): A watershed convention in the making since 1993, this lays out a variety of topical areas (e. g. territorial rights, heritage rights) as they related to human rights, and also connects these issues to development and to science in different ways.
2. The [United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues](#): Historically the most important international body promoting transnational indigenous advocacy. In addition to the Declaration itself (above), the Forum has worked on a wide range of issues of potential relevance, including development, cultural property and intellectual property rights.
3. The [1990 U.S. Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act](#): This is the most important piece of new legislation shaping the relationship between indigenous peoples and the government in the U.S., and lays out a set of procedures for cooperation between native peoples and federal agencies, as well as private institutions, with direct impact upon the practice of science (e. g. the ownership, management, presentation of archives and collections; the limits of research made clear by such cases as Kennewick Man; scientific responsibilities to indigenous communities, and more).

A panel session could be organized around one or all of these points of reference. In addition, each is a valuable resource in helping to inform us about key issues and topics while we plan our eventual speaker and panel lineup. Second, what follow are some more specific ideas for possible panels:

1. Indigenous Voices in Scientific Debate (e. g. climate change): The paralysis that characterizes much international efforts of cooperation around climate change and global warming (e.g. the lack of movement post-[Kyoto Accord](#)) is well-documented. But indigenous peoples both have distinct concerns and perspectives about such issues (e. g. a concern for the integrity of land and of territory; the notion of human beings as part of nature rather than as manipulators of nature; sustainable ecology with a spiritual component; alternatives to “progress” such as “right living” (buen vivir), and more). In addition, international alternatives to the normal multilateral process, and framed in indigenous terms, have begun to challenge the working assumptions of debates about climate change, such as Bolivia’s hosting of the [World People’s Conference on Climate Change and the Rights of Mother Earth](#) in 2010. A panel could address how indigenous peoples are taking part in such scientifically-informed policy debates and how indigenous frames for thinking about such transboundary and international issues might alter the debate.

2. Indigenous approaches to science and to human rights: Nowadays it is no longer the case that indigenous peoples represent themselves simply as “indigenous.” In recent decades we have seen more “indigenous scientists” and indigenous human rights professionals. Building upon contacts among indigenous advocacy and policy organizations in the D.C.-metro area, we might consider convening a panel composed of indigenous scientists and/or human rights professionals to ask them to discuss what is involved in such projects as “indigenous science,” or an indigenous take on human rights, and how this offers a different perspective on the question of the universality of science and/or human rights. What is distinctive about indigenous scientific practice(s)? What sorts of inspirations, responsibilities, topics, and obligations do such individuals recognize and to what communities? How is this similar/distinct from the practice of non-indigenous science or human rights? What possibilities for collaboration exist among indigenous peoples and science and/or among indigenous and non-indigenous scientists? Thinking about such a possible panel, places to start might include the [Indian Law Resource Center](#) and the [Native American Rights Fund](#) and [First Peoples Worldwide](#), all in the D.C.-metro area, as well as [Indian Country Today](#). One other key resource to keep in mind, going forward, is: The [American Indian Science and Engineering Society](#).

3. Another possibility raised would be to promote an indigenous perspective on implications of [Article 15](#) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), with particular attention given to how to measure indicators of progress in this domain, given the emphasis upon the rights explained in Article 15 as a universal entitlement. What does such a “universal entitlement” mean for groups of people, such as native peoples, for whom cultural distinctiveness is a basic form of identity and legal recognition? How might native peoples interpret the right to scientific progress? One interesting way to think about this issue is to bring it together with discussions focused on the status of “indigenous technical knowledge,” as this is part of the work of international development and where different sorts of authoritative accounts of knowledge – including scientific knowledge – suggest different models for the pursuit, circulation, and availability of it. This, further, has well-recognized implications for such international issues as the intellectual property rights of pharmaceutical companies and research on genetically modified organisms, among others.

Note: Alyson Reed ([Linguistic Society of America](#)), was present at the business meeting and indicated that she would be willing to assist in any planning activities.

Membership and Outreach

David Proctor (Membership and Outreach Committee) facilitated the conversation, which focused on the role of the Coalition (whether it should be activist or resource provider) and the audience the Coalition wants to reach. In an effort to guide the work of the Coalition, participants discussed developing an online survey aimed at scientific and engineering societies. The survey results would help identify what societies know about human rights work and how they perceive their role.

Next, the conversation centered on increasing the Coalition membership. Participants identified four main questions which need answers: 1) Who is the Coalition aiming to engage? 2) How does the Coalition best reach out to those groups? 3) How does the Coalition pique their interest? and 4) What can the Coalition offer those groups as incentives or reasons to join? The group discussed how the Coalition should deal with umbrella organizations such as [CESSE](#) and [FABBS](#). These organizations could serve as a great way to get in touch with smaller membership organizations. They could also be invited to become members of the Coalition themselves.

The conversation turned to a discussion of the strategies for engaging new organizations and members in the Coalition. Participants spoke about the [online starter kit](#), as well as suggested adding an introductory form letter about what the Coalition is and does, and what benefit it might have to organizations if they choose to get involved. An evaluation of the current starter kit was suggested, and seemed to be agreed upon by those present. Moving forward, it was suggested that AAAS should aim to at least double the Coalition membership, and work to attract diverse disciplines as well as minority science and engineering societies. Some concrete suggestions were made for moving forward, these included a member benefit document, which could help current members to recruit new organizations and individual members, and a document on the proper relationship of scientific societies to politics or human rights movements.

Finally, a strategy was discussed and identified for talking with individual potential members. Two approaches were suggested: approaching particular scientists with the framework of leveraging their particular expertise to identify, quantify or evaluate human rights abuses, since scientists can identify with the role of ‘expert’ well already; and approaching scientists and asking them to engage to protect their counterparts worldwide from being the victims of human rights abuses.

New Members

This meeting focused on steps that new members of the Coalition can take to increase their organization's participation in Coalition activities. The discussion introduced new members to the composition of the Coalition, including a description of its five working groups. Also discussed were new members' ideas for the Coalition, which included a discussion about how to expand the membership of the Coalition to include students.

Jessica Wyndham ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)), started the discussion by acknowledging that, while many people and professional organizations are interested in the Coalition, they often do not know how they can participate. A crucial first step to getting involved was joining the Coalition, following which scientific societies themselves can pursue human rights initiatives independent of the Coalition or with the support of the Coalition.

The discussion turned to what the Coalition can do to expand its outreach to students and university campuses. Despite the challenges of organizing students, the membership and outreach committee has been particularly keen to reach out to students. One participant noted that science students want to volunteer their time pursuing interesting projects that are relevant to society. They do not just want to pursue science as a strictly academic enterprise, but want to use science to serve society. As such, the prospects for student engagement with the Coalition are strong.

At the end, new members were given the opportunity to present their ideas for Coalition projects. Potential ideas included poster competitions examining the intersection of particular fields and human rights and the development of programs to integrate human rights education more broadly into specific academic fields. Ultimately, Wyndham remarked, the Coalition is member driven, and therefore requires the input of members to direct its course of action and ensure it has impact.

I. Welfare of Scientists

Chair: Brad Miller ([American Chemical Society](#))

The Welfare of Scientists working group is devoted to the protection and defense of scientists and engineers under threat and will work to increase the effectiveness of scientific and engineering organizations in defending the human rights of colleagues under threat.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the July 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since last meeting

The working group has begun developing a Guide to facilitate communication and action by organizations defending the human rights of scientists and detailing the means by which human rights of scientists are restricted. In addition, to date, 11 members have joined the ACS Network, an interactive web platform hosted by ACS that allows members to post alerts and communicate with others about the abuse of human rights of scientists. In total, 32 postings have been made, some of which have been viewed by over 100 people. The list is open to Coalition and non-Coalition members alike, and reaches the wider community of users on the ACS site.

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

At the Coalition Meeting, working group members received a presentation on a draft welfare of scientists Primer and provided input on its refinement and elaboration. Next steps include to expand the membership of the Welfare of Scientists Network and complete the welfare of scientists primer. Dissemination of the primer to a wide audience will involve providing it to all Coalition members and affiliates, promoting it through the AAAS Science and Human Rights listserv and newsletter, and encouraging working group members to disseminate it among their networks.

Ideas Generated

Working group members suggested providing more examples and expanding the primer's international character.

Next meeting date:

Working group members will interact virtually on the ACS Network.

II. Science Ethics and Human Rights

Co-Chairs: Rob Albro ([American Anthropological Association](#))
Doug Richardson ([Association of American Geographers](#))

The Science 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 research protections.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the July 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since last meeting

The Working Group has continued to work toward completion of its white paper landscape document, entitled “Integrating Science, Ethics and Human Rights: A Way Forward.” Since January, this white paper has gone through extensive further review, editing and revision by AAAS staff, experts and leadership, as well as working group co-chairs, with additional attention to perceived uses of science by the professional human rights community and to relevance for the Article 15 joint initiative. In addition, several more cases have been written and/or solicited, including by working group member David Schrader on “The American Medical Association and Public Health Emergencies” and by Jerome Kruse on visual sociology, public spaces and privacy (forthcoming).

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

Immediate next steps for the working group involve completion of the white paper, in the effort to make it publicly available. Steps include:

1. Final editing (if any, as needed);
2. Sending the document out for review and comment from a list of independent experts, established in conjunction with the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program.

Further steps with respect to the white paper include the following additional activities:

3. Planning and carrying out an organized public event to bring attention to the white paper document: We are aiming for an event of between 2-3 hours, to be convened at the AAAS and financed using Oak Foundation funds, which will bring together the following stakeholders in a round table discussion format: human rights professionals, professional ethicists, science policy experts concerned with ethics and/or human rights. The purpose would be at once to draw attention to the contents of the white paper and to use it to create a practitioner, policy, academic forum to discuss the relationships between professional scientific and engineering associations in the US and the discourse and

practice of human rights. In addition, the forum would be a basis to begin to conceive of a next such white paper, going forward (see below for details);

4. We also plan to share the white paper with the ethics committees of member and/or of affiliated associations for comments and feedback.

5. Continuing to solicit and to collect cases to build up the case archive which currently stands at six cases. We hope eventually to produce an archive of up to three dozen cases or so, illustrating the range of variation of how ethics and human rights are part of the practice of the (physical, biological and social) sciences as well as engineering. We anticipate the process of case collection will be ongoing for several years. At the same time, we aim to use the ongoing work with focus groups (see: Service to the STEM Community) as opportunities to solicit new cases, with particular focus on professional associations which do not have an obvious connection to human rights (e. g. astronomy, acoustics);

6. Producing the case archive as a stand-alone digital archive and resource of ethical frontiers across the sciences and engineering, available online as part of the Coalition website hosted by the AAAS;

7. Working with the Service to the STEM Community Working Group, we also plan to use the collected cases as a basis for customizing the materials of the Coalition Starter Kit. In other words, priority will be given to collection of cases from disciplines among professional scientific and engineering associations so far unrepresented by the Coalition. These cases, in turn, will be made part of the starter kit materials, as these are made available to different associations.

Ideas Generated

During our working group discussion, significant attention was given to the content of the current white paper, using it as a way to think about next steps. A key observation is that this document deals extensively with implications for sciences with a regular concern for “human subjects” protection. This is a focus of attention that tends to spotlight the social sciences. Given this, the question was raised: What about sciences – specifically physical sciences – for which a straightforward connection to human rights might be less obvious? George Middendorf (Howard University) offered the example of the ecological sciences. It is time to move to this next set of consideration: exploring the human rights dimensions of the impacts of non-social scientific disciplinary practice of different sorts, while moving past a major concern for bioethics (e. g. the relation between ecology, environmental justice, and human rights). Case studies can be used to continue to develop this. Concretely, this would involve a second white paper comparable to the first.

A second set of ideas were clustered around what to do with the digital case archive. In this regard, most of the discussion focused on their value as curricular and teaching tools. If properly framed online, and made available for easy download, the cases can be used as part of K-12 (and collegiate) teaching as the basis for stand-alone classroom exercises. The cases can be framed with appropriate provocative questions re ethics/human rights.

A third idea was to engage with NSF as it goes about completing the developments of its “broader impacts” assessment. The Coalition, and particularly the working group, is in a strong position to help NSF think constructively about these broader impacts, including: the movement beyond bioethics and promoting awareness of the connectivity between ethics and human rights (rather than selling “human rights” directly). In this regard, we are considering reaching out to NSF at the policy level to organize a symposium for NSF staff (based on our white paper). The short goal would be to introduce these issues among NSF staff and decision-makers. The longer goal would be to move toward embedding human rights into the ethics component of science through the grant application process. Once we reach out to NSF, we would seek funding to organize such a workshop. Beyond NSF as the pilot case, we could consider similar possibilities re NIH, DOE, NRC, and other relevant science policy institutions.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

Helping to organize the public event for the initial presentation of “Integrating Science, Ethics and Human Rights: A Way Forward” at the AAAS.

Next meeting date:

We have tentatively scheduled our next meeting for the first week of September, to take place once the white paper process is completed.

III. Service to the STEM Community

Co-Chairs: Clinton Anderson ([American Psychological Association](#))
Margaret Wiegers Vitullo ([American Sociological Association](#))

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.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the July 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since last meeting

The Service to the STEM Community Working Group's 2010-2011 action plan included four priority projects:

- (1) a basic information resource on human rights for scientific associations;
- (2) a survey of the needs and interests of scientific societies for workshops and presentations on human rights;
- (3) presentations and workshops for scientific societies based on the needs and interests expressed in the survey responses;
- (4) activities to engage scientific associations, their governance, and their special interest groups in identifying the link between Article 15 and their discipline in order to contribute to defining Article 15.

The group decided in mid-2010 to drop the survey project; progress on the basic information resource, presentations at meetings, and the Article 15 initiative projects is reported in the following.

Basic Information Packet (Starter Kit)

Helping Your Scientific Society Promote Human Rights received the approval of the Science and Human Rights Coalition Steering Committee and was published on the AAAS website in March 2011 at

<http://shr.aas.org/coalition/AreasofActivity/ServtotheScComm/StarterKitInteractive.html>.

Information about the availability of the starter kit was distributed at the coalition meetings, featured in the AAAS Science and Human Rights newsletter, and included in a communication sent to all AAAS affiliates about the AAAS statement on Article 15 and the plan for focus groups.

Presentations at Meetings

Jen Makrides developed a model presentation in Power Point for use in making presentations about the Coalition and Gavin Baker worked on a speaker list as a resource for Coalition members wanting to propose presentations at their organizations' meetings. Working Group member Clinton Anderson participated in the Career Workshop "Scientists Working for Human Rights: Approaches to Effective Engagement" that took place at the AAAS meeting in February

2011, which was chaired by Jessica Wyndham. A summary of the meeting is posted on the Working Group website [<http://shr.aaas.org/coalition/AreasofActivity/ServtotheScComm/SSCEvents.html>]. Jerry Baker, (Sigma Xi), Clifford Duke (Ecological Society of America), and Alyson Reed (Linguistic Society of America) proposed presentations on human rights to their respective associations' annual meetings. Jerry also proposed programs to AAAS and to the Council of Engineering and Scientific Society Executives. Constance Thompson (American Society of Civil Engineers) arranged a ASCE-sponsored webinar on civil engineering and human rights.

Article 15 Initiative Project

As our contribution to the Coalition's Joint Initiative [http://shr.aaas.org/coalition/AreasofActivity/Joint_Initiative.html], the Service to the STEM Community Working Group aims to increase awareness of and engagement in Article 15 among the scientific and engineering community. Our method for achieving that aim is to develop tools for Coalition members, their representatives, and others to use within their own disciplines and organizations to engage their members and organizations in learning about and interpreting the meaning of the right. Scientists had not had much knowledge of this right nor been much involved in interpreting it until the Coalition initiated the Article 15 initiative.

Focus groups. The first tool that we have developed is a focus group protocol to be used with a purposive sample of scientific disciplines and engineering societies. We piloted the protocol in March with a group from the American Psychological Association, which was not very successful in generating substantive answers. Consequently, we revised the protocol to reduce the number of questions in order to get people thinking more deeply about the topic. We used the revised protocol in May with groups from the American Astronomical Society (AAS) and the Acoustical Society of America (ASA). The protocol is now set and will be used going forward. There are plans for focus groups with the Linguistic Society of America, the American Statistical Association, the Ecological Society of America, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, the American Historical Association, the American Society for Tropical Medicine and Hygiene, and the American Academy of Forensic Sciences.

Questionnaire. The second tool is a questionnaire version of the Article 15 questions, which should be ready for dissemination by the Coalition in a month.

Other Article 15 Advocacy. Gavin Baker, an individual scientist member of the Working Group, made recommendations to the National Science Foundation to include Article 15 in its criteria for evaluating funding proposals.

General Progress of the Working Group

The Working Group had productive quarterly meetings in March (nine members in attendance) and June (six members in attendance). Our current membership is 21. The Working Group decided to propose to the Council that the Coalition adopt 'STEM' in place of 'Science', which was approved, and so the Working Group will change its name to Service to the STEM Community Working Group.

The members of the working group have been active within their own organizations on human rights issues. The American Sociological Association and the Ecological Society of America

wrote a joint letter to the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights supporting a hearing on global warming and the right to water. The American Psychological Association launched two web pages on human rights, one within the “Psychology Topics” section of the organization’s website and one within the “Advocacy Issues” section. The Linguistic Society of America launched a blog related to Article 15. Individual scientist member David Proctor has engaged in outreach to the American Chemical Society and the National Institutes of Health training office.

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

Starter Kit Dissemination

We discussed continued dissemination of *Helping Your Scientific Society Promote Human Rights*. We thought it was time to try to evaluate the starter kit and consider how it should be modified, based on some assessment of how effective people think it is, and to evaluate our process of dissemination, about which we do not have any information. We will return to this issue in the September meeting. The primary purpose of the starter kit is to get leaders in scientific and engineering organizations to take action on human rights. It will be most useful as a dynamic “living” document that allows periodic updates. For example, as we develop materials (e.g., generic or exemplary member newsletter articles, simple sample agenda item templates for associations’ committees and boards), these items can be added.

Presentations and Workshops

We will review the status of presentations during the September meeting, since several will have taken place by then.

Article 15 Initiative Project

The series of focus groups sponsored by scientific organizations will continue. We are planning to have the first two focus groups transcribed in order to use them for developing the data analysis that we will use on the transcripts for all the focus groups. Margaret Vitullo will take the lead on the qualitative data analysis. A new member, Ed Butterworth, also volunteered to help. We plan to synthesize the results of our efforts with other contributions from other Coalition working groups into a report in late 2011 to the United Nations Committee that monitors states’ compliance with the ICESCR and to other relevant stakeholders. The aim is to synthesize the data we obtain from focus groups and from questionnaires into a report that will recommend that the UN Committee on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights develop a *General Comment* on the right. General Comments are the mechanisms through which the Committee elucidates the meaning of a right. Such a decision by the Committee would typically involve holding a *Day of General Discussion* on the right in order to advance their development of a General Comment. We are hoping to deliver a report to the Committee at its 47th Session, November 14 - December 2, 2011. There are some important questions:

- whether we can obtain, analyze, and report on the data in time for the meeting;
- whether the results of the focus groups and questionnaires will be substantial enough to persuade the Committee that a General Comment and a day of general discussion are warranted;
- whether the sample will be too small and too limited to the United States.

We may need to frame our presentation to them as an interim report on a data collection and reporting process that we will complete next year.

We developed the focus group protocol for use with participants from a single discipline, but working group members have suggested opportunities for doing focus groups in multi-disciplinary contexts. The decision of the group was to consider multi-disciplinary focus groups with organizations, such as Sigma Xi, in which multidisciplinary groups were necessary to the nature of the organization. We will not seek groups beyond those represented in the working group membership, but we acknowledged that the data obtained in the two kinds of focus groups will present a challenge, while also acknowledging that some populations of interest, for example, students and business communities, may not be accessed through single disciplines and may produce important data.

Ideas Generated

We discussed whether and how to give the focus group sponsors access to their own focus group data. One suggestion was to encourage them to share the results with the participants to get their comments, build some consensual validation, and use it as an opportunity for building awareness of and interest in human rights among association members.

We discussed outreach to multidisciplinary groups.

We discussed the webinar sponsored by ASCE as a model for an additional tool we could develop and offer to scientific and engineering associations. ASCE representative Constance Thompson agreed to share the webinar contents with the group as a first step to considering how to make it into a template that others might use. We decided that we would try to set it up to be reviewed before the next meeting, so we could discuss it then.

We reflected on the focus groups' success as a method of reaching out and considered whether the success was due to the content/topic or the structure (i.e., self-contained, clear). There was no consensus that it was one or the other. Both seemed to have contributed to its success. Having Jessica Wyndham available to travel was also an important advantage.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

Constance Thompson has offered to host an email group for the Working Group on the ASCE servers and an intern could help us get that set up.

Next meeting date:

The Working Group scheduled its next Quarterly Meeting for Wednesday, September 7, 12:30-2:00.

IV. Service to the Human Rights Community

Co-Chairs: **Brian Gran** ([American Sociological Association](#))
Susan Hinkins ([American Statistical Association](#))
Amanda Sozer (Individual Scientist)

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

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the July 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since last meeting

Connect Human Rights Organizations with “On Call” Scientists: A conference call was held to develop a plan to have a Workshop in the New York City area. Last year a Clinic was held in Washington, D.C. A Clinic is an opportunity for one Human Rights Organization (HRO) to meet with a scientific panel to discuss the HROs projects and explore specific ways that science and technology might be of assistance to this HRO. A Workshop, in contrast, would consist of a presentation to a number of HROs, as described in the next section.

Article 15 Indicators: preparation of draft Green Paper on Article 15 indicators.

Guidelines for Scientists Working with Human Rights Organizations: The team has almost finished a draft, ready for review by scientific “volunteers” at Physicians for Human Rights.

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

Connect Human Rights Organizations with “On-Call” Scientists

- a. Host a workshop in the New York City area (National Economic and Social Rights Initiative). This would consist of a presentation to representatives from a number of Human Rights Organizations, describing “On-Call” Scientists in general and with specific examples of the types of projects and types of help provided by On-Call Scientists to human rights organizations. Proposed format: One-hour presentation and one hour of questions and discussion. Ideally, presentations would be by HRO representatives who have benefited from “On-Call” Scientists.
- b. Develop UN contacts, specifically draft letter to Dr. Jeffery Huffines.
- c. Investigate possibility of participating in the 2012 meeting of International Human Rights Funders Group.
- d. Develop a process for identifying HROs that could benefit from the assistance of “On-Call” Scientists and develop templates for contacting HROs. The goal would be to expand the number of workshops and to host them in a variety of locations so that there could be a Workshop/or Clinic approximately every two months.
- e. Increase engagement of other Working Group members in this activity.

Article 15 indicators

- a. Distribution and discussion of Green Paper
- b. Increase engagement of other Working Group members regarding Article 15 indicators.
- c. Review of the Green Paper by experts and Coalition colleagues.

Guidelines for Scientists Working with Human Rights Organizations

The plan is to have the final draft ready for Steering Committee review by the end of 2011, with the possibility for completing the project by the January Coalition meeting. This involves the following steps:

- a. Present to Physicians for Human Rights' scientific volunteers for feedback and input
- b. Incorporate any suggestions
- c. Working Group Review
- d. Steering Committee Review

Next meeting date:

Workshop for HROs: Susan, Patricia and Ollie have scheduled a conference call for August 31, 2011. We may use this as a planning session and then schedule another call to invite others to participate.

After holding a teleconference with Jessica, we will hold a teleconference with WG members to discuss current work and to set up goals for the WG. We hope to schedule both teleconferences this August.

Additional Comments

We discussed how to reach out to other scientific and human rights communities. We desire to receive input on this issue.

V. Education and Information Resources

Co-Chairs: **Judith Blau** ([Sociologists Without Borders](#))
Amy Crumpton (Individual Scientist)
Jeff Toney ([Sigma Xi](#))

The Education and Information Resources working group is devoted to identifying, compiling and developing resources, and to creating opportunities for developing a productive and collaborative relationship between the scientific and human rights communities.

For a description of ongoing and proposed working group projects, visit the group's [webpage](#).

Report from the July 2011 Working Group Meeting

Progress since last meeting

Human Rights Modules for Science Curricula

Goal: To develop flexible human rights modules for incorporation into university-level science curricula.

Action: Phase I: Research and develop modules to introduce human rights into science curricula at the undergraduate and graduate levels.
Phase II: Pilot the modules in a cross-section of classrooms and solicit feedback from professors.
Phase III: Introduce Coalition members to the modules via a workshop, if funding is available, and solicit feedback. The first workshop is anticipated to take place in Summer 2012. After feedback has been incorporated, the module will be available online via the Coalition website.
Phase IV: Update the modules and develop additional modules as necessary.

Output: Modules will be made available online and feedback will be solicited via a web-based survey. If funding can be secured, the group will offer short-course(s) introducing the module(s) to Coalition members and other interested individuals.

Since July, 2010, the Education and Information Resources working group has initiated a project to develop flexible Science and Human Rights Modules to integrate human rights into science curricula. The Modules are envisioned to consist of: background reading in human rights, and in science and human rights; a brief case study to which students will apply human rights knowledge and discipline-specific scientific training; and a series of questions and resources to support the lesson. Toward this end, the group has assembled and met with an advisory group composed of science and human rights educators and solicited partner-professors with whom to develop the modules. Because of the diverse requirements on professors across the science disciplines, the Modules will be developed as a flexible resource that can fill one lecture period or be extended to a longer unit.

Achievements:

- Convened a meeting of the Modules Advisory Group

- Based on Advisory Group input, working with 7 professor-partners to develop case studies for pilot modules
- Modules are being developed in these disciplines – information sciences, physical geography, physics, psychology, sociology, and cultural studies (Latin America focus)

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

- Seek professor-partners in biology and chemistry
- Finalize reading content and case studies for the pilot modules
- Pilot modules in classrooms Fall 2011-Spring 2012
- Develop evaluation survey and solicit feedback from professors and students
- Continue to partner with professors to develop a wide selection of modules for a broad spectrum of science disciplines (Phase I)
- Continue to pilot and revise modules based on feedback (Phase II)
- Plan and Design training workshop for dissemination of the modules
- Publicize modules via the website (Phase III)

Joint Initiative (Article 15)

Outputs: A multimedia online training module to educate and raise awareness among scientists and human right practitioners of the existence, significance and potential applications of Article 15.

Ideas Generated

Professor Black-Parker gave a stunning presentation that pulled together the right to access technology and the right to access the internet, which the General Assembly has affirmed. She used Wikileaks as an example. Prof. Black discussed the possibility of developing an additional module for Information Science, in collaboration with one of her colleagues. We discussed the possibility of using the Wikileaks case study as thesis topics for graduate students at her institution. For example, students could explore “satellite” websites with similar missions to that of Wikileaks.

There are too few sociologists to discuss what a “human rights city” or “human rights society” would look like. (I have used the term, “decent society” in my own writings, but these are essentially the same thing.) The point is that rights are not only individual, but have to do with collectivities, communities, and groups. This is an interesting topic because we don’t understand the empirical indicators.

Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Steering Committee (2011)

- **Rob Albro**
American Anthropological Association
robert.albro@verizon.net
Co-Chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group
- **Clinton Anderson**
American Psychological Association
canderson@apa.org
Co-chair, Service to the STEM Community Working Group
- **Susan Hinkins**
American Statistical Association
HINKINS-SUSAN@norc.org
Co-chair, Service to the Human Rights Community Working Group
- **David J. Proctor**
djproctor@gmail.com
Chair, Outreach Committee
- **Douglas Richardson**
Association of American Geographers
drichardson@aag.org
Chair, Membership Committee
Co-chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group
- **Jeffrey Toney**
Sigma Xi
jetoney@kean.edu
Co-Chair, Education and Information Resources Working Group
- **Jessica Wyndham**
AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program
jwyndham@aaas.org
Coalition Coordinator

Appendix: AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Members

Updated: July 7, 2011

Members

American Anthropological Association
American Educational Research Association
American Historical Association
American Industrial Hygiene Association
American Institute of Biological Sciences
American Orthopsychiatric Association
American Philosophical 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
Ecological Society of America
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 the Psychological Study of Social Issues
Society for Research in Child Development
Sociologists Without Borders

Affiliated Organizations

Acoustical Society of America
American Academy of Forensic Sciences
American Astronautical Society
American Astronomical Society
American Society for Tropical Medicine and Hygiene
American Geological Institute
American Occupational Therapy Foundation
American Society of Agronomy
Association of Earth Science Editors
Committee of Concerned Scientists
Crop Science 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 63 Affiliated Scientists.

Appendix: Session Evaluations

Criminal Justice – Forensics and Human Rights

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	2	2	3	4.14
Choice of Presenters	-	-	2	3	2	4.00
Quality of Presentations	-	-	1	5	1	4.00
Session Format	-	1	1	4	1	3.71
Overall usefulness	-	-	2	4	1	3.86

Attendance: 51 Evaluations: 7

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Ramifications of DNA in courts”

“The movie, which clearly illustrates the fallibility of the criminal justice system. This is such a worthwhile cause for the Coalition. I shudder to think how many people were wrongly executed in this country.”

“I think the moderator did a better job than I have seen in a long while. He reworked my question into something much more profound and important to the panel.”

“The documentary, which was very moving. I also like the panel discussion that followed the film.”

“I liked the use of documentary film as a way of presenting information about the real world impact of forensic science for those who have benefitted from it.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Relate the discussion more to DVD shown”

“The film was a little long and drawn out, but I understand they had serious stories to tell – and it would be unfair to short change one – I would expect it is important to them that this group hear his story.”

“I didn’t find all of the respondents were engaging in constructive dialogue.”

Evaluating the US Human Rights Record: The Universal Periodic Review

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	5	14	4.65
Choice of Presenters	-	-	2	5	13	4.55
Quality of Presentations	-	-	2	8	9	3.37
Session Format	-	1	2	9	8	4.32
Overall usefulness	-	-	3	7	10	4.35

Attendance: 51 Evaluations: 21

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Exposed to a totally new concept and process”

“Honest assessment of pros and cons of what happened”

“Excellent overview of the UPR process but it displayed a discouraging disconnect with science quantification”

“Very interesting topic to learn about the UPR; on the other hand, science and science diplomacy in the Middle East may have been a bigger draw”

“Quality of state department official’s presentation; question and answer session”

“Each presenter used presentation format in which she was most comfortable; very engaging. I appreciated the government (state department) and civil society perspectives”

“This session provided a really detailed view into the UPR process and how civil society organizations got involved.”

“Learning something new about HR process, negotiations”

“Good perspectives of presenters, civil and federal government”

“Presenters gave very clear and interesting information”

“Surprisingly candid. Great match. Balanced”

“I like the topic and to get a good, concise report from both the US government and NGO perspective at once. I also like how this topic is a natural progression from discussions at the January meeting.”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Background material would be useful”

“I think a fact sheet handout would have helped”

“Less prepared to address where process goes from here; what the follow-up to implementing recommendations stands; and role of science in the process”

“Provide list of resources mentioned in presentations”

“More info on effect of non-signatory of US on HR treaties”

“The session was a bit long – which is necessary given the subject matter.”

“I know they’re super busy, but short reports from speakers would be appreciated”

“Have the session in a room where food is allowed. Food was available, but I couldn’t eat and participate in the session at the same time.”

Article 12 (ICESCR): The Right of Everyone to the Enjoyment of the Highest Attainable Standard of Physical and Mental Health

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	2	8	4.80
Choice of Presenters	1	-	2	3	4	3.90
Quality of Presentations	-	1	2	4	3	3.90
Session Format	-	-	5	2	2	3.67
Overall usefulness	-	1	2	4	2	3.78

Attendance: 26

Evaluations: 11

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Speakers quite good”

“The first speaker on reproductive rights was very good. Content – informative. The second speaker was not clear in his presentation and I didn’t understand his main point.”

“Presenters were well-prepared, knowledgeable and interesting. One was a little too detailed (slides had too much info).”

“This was a fantastic session; knowledgeable presenters who were able to speak to the right to health in the context of the US”

“Good slides with explicit quotations from documents and empirical data.”

“Presentations were excellent”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“More time for discussion”

“Note cards for Q&A may allow for more questions to be answered. The session was not what I thought it would be based on the description”

“N/A – excellent”

“Presenters did not address the overall question about why health care is so poor for most people in US. Why don’t Americans live as long as other people?”

“Better integration between/among panelists.”

STEM Education: Diversity, Human Rights and New Curricula

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	4	4	4.33
Choice of Presenters	1	-	2	2	4	3.89
Quality of Presentations	1	-	1	5	3	3.90
Session Format	-	-	4	3	1	3.63
Overall usefulness	-	-	3	4	3	4.00

Attendance: 30

Evaluations: 9

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Interestingly diverse set of topics”

“The broad perspectives”

“The speakers were excellent and the topic was very interesting”

“I thought the topic itself was of foremost importance. I am glad that the topic was covered and I think it should be covered again.”

“Great Discussion”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Should provide copies of all presentations”

“The room isn’t ideal and there wasn’t enough seating for everyone”

“I thought two presenters were great and one was less so. I would suggest that you pick session presenters on the basis of the ideas they promote”

“24 point type on the PowerPoint’s – these were bad; lack of understanding of what A/V is about. 2 of the 3 presenters did not focus.”

“Too much info to fit time”

“Greater pragmatic focus on how scholarly association representatives can make a difference – too much was an abstraction, albeit interesting.”

Engaging Your Discipline in the UPR Process

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	1	1	3	2	3.86
Choice of Presenters	-	1	1	3	3	4.00
Quality of Presentations	-	2	-	4	1	3.57
Session Format	-	1	1	3	3	4.00
Overall usefulness	-	2	-	5	1	3.63

Attendance: 14

Evaluations: 8

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Input from attendees plus expertise of presenters”

“The tailored approach the session facilitator took in relating the topic to the interest of participants.”

“Facilitator did a great job”

“It was a topic I knew little about and I learned a lot”

“There was ample opportunity for discussion and commentary”

“Open discussion”

“Speaker very knowledgeable”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Not much, only that the presenters be briefed more on the work of the coalition and its goals”

“The session was slow to start and given everyone’s different background, the conversation should have started on a common vein. It was unclear to me how the objective could be met.”

“Should have been more clear in schedule that it was a discussion and not a presentation”

“There was a disconnect between the audience’s understanding and the content of the presentation. There was little specific information or guidelines for scientific discipline societies to engage in the UPR process. It felt like a more in depth discussion of the opening plenary.”

“Could focus more on concrete example of advocacy for HR”

“A short presentation in the beginning would have helped – a way to advance goals; how the review process can be utilized; where the interventions and benefits can be; didn’t know enough to think of ideas for society”

**The Right to Benefit from Science:
Engaging Your Association in the UN Process**

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	7	6	4.36
Choice of Presenters	-	-	2	5	7	4.36
Quality of Presentations	-	-	3	5	5	4.15
Session Format	-	2	5	1	6	3.79
Overall usefulness	-	1	4	6	3	3.79

Attendance: 28 Evaluations: 14

Q: What did you like best about this session?

- “Interactive discussion”
- “How the mini focus groups incorporated many disciplines”
- “Great way to be familiarized with focus groups”
- “Discussion, but thought session would go further than focus groups”
- “Very educational and helpful”
- “Interesting topic, charismatic and expert speakers”
- “Interactive nature”
- “Practical example”
- “Illustrative”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

- “No good answer – problem too hard”
- “I would like a bit more detail about the UN process”
- “Better room for a workshop. Also, need better sound (may automatically improve in a different room)”

Membership and Outreach

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	3	4	4.38
Choice of Presenters	-	-	1	4	3	4.25
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	4	2	4.33
Session Format	-	-	1	4	3	4.25
Overall usefulness	-	-	1	4	3	4.25

Attendance: 9

Evaluations: 8

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Group discussion format was beneficial”

“Open discussion”

“Interactive nature”

“Dynamic conversation”

“How to articulate better why associations should join the coalition”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“More structure. Did not come away with specifically stated ideas or directions”

“Member benefits – increasing recognition of HR content in each professional society”

New Members: How Can You Participate in the Coalition?

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	1	3	4.75
Choice of Presenters	-	-	1	-	3	4.50
Quality of Presentations	-	-	1	-	3	4.50
Session Format	-	-	1	-	3	4.50
Overall usefulness	-	-	1	-	3	4.50

Attendance: 4

Evaluations: 4

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Helpful intro”

“The excitement on behalf of AAAS to work with students”

Working Group: Welfare of Scientists

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	1	5	4.83
Choice of Presenters	-	-	-	1	5	4.83
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	-	6	5.00
Session Format	-	-	-	2	4	4.67
Overall usefulness	-	-	-	1	5	4.83

Evaluations: 6

Q: What did you like best about this session?

- “Great primer presentation and follow up discussion”
- “Representations, discussion”
- “Beautiful presentation, great conversation”
- “The presentation will be hugely useful”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

- “Making representation available”
- “No complaints”

Working Group: Science Ethics and Human Rights

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	1	-	3	4.50
Choice of Presenters	-	-	1	-	3	4.50
Quality of Presentations	-	-	1	-	3	4.50
Session Format	-	-	1	1	2	4.25
Overall usefulness	-	-	1	-	3	4.50

Evaluations: 4

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Good conversation of next steps”

“Wonderful discussion!”

“Lively discussions, lots of new ideas”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Need group members to get more involved: there is a lot to be done!”

“Contact NIST for membership”

“More participation”

Working Group: Service to the STEM Community

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	1	1	4.50
Choice of Presenters	-	-	-	1	1	4.50
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	1	1	4.50
Session Format	-	-	-	1	1	4.50
Overall usefulness	-	-	1	-	1	4.00

Evaluations: 2

Working Group: Service to the Human Rights Community

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	3	-	4.00
Choice of Presenters	-	-	-	2	2	4.50
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	2	2	4.50
Session Format	-	-	-	3	1	4.25
Overall usefulness	-	-	-	3	1	4.25

Evaluations: 4

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Open discussion and involvement”
 “Range of projects”
 “Moving forward”

Q: How can future sessions be improved?

“Earlier in the day: palpable exhaustion”

General Meeting Evaluation

Attendance: 103

Evaluations: 27

How did you hear about the Coalition meeting?	
Email from AAAS/Program	19
Program Facebook Page	1
AAAS/Program Website	1
SHR Newsletter	-
Listserv	4
Word of Mouth	7
Other	8

Affiliation	
Professional Society/Association	19
University/College	3
Government	1
Human Rights Organization	4
Business/industry	-
Nonprofit	5
Press/Media	1
Self-employed	0
Other	1

What was your main reason(s) for attending (check all that apply)	
To learn how my scientific organization can become involved in the Coalition	12
To learn how I can personally become involved in the Coalition	9
To learn more about science and human rights	21
To learn how my organization can respond more effectively	14
To obtain help in engaging members of my discipline in human rights	16
Other	8

Overall, how satisfied were you with the meeting?	
Very satisfied	23
Moderately satisfied	8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	1
Moderately dissatisfied	1
Very dissatisfied	1

Did the meeting help you decide on whether to join the Coalition?	
Definitely more likely to join now	5
Somewhat more likely to join now	3
Had no influence on decision	2
More likely will <u>not</u> join	1
Not sure	0
Not applicable	23

What was the most useful aspect of the meeting for you?

“The STEM diversity session”

“Determining how to engage our membership”

“Hearing what the other associations are doing within the Coalition”

“It's difficult to select just one aspect as all were useful. I particularly enjoyed hearing the speakers who had been involved in the US HR Review.”

“Meeting scientists involved with human rights”

“Discussions in sessions.”

“The Council meeting discussion around the future of the group and the discussion surrounding STEM Diversity.”

“Meeting Council members and hearing about the work of the working groups.”

“Realizing the networking opportunity across discipline to apply means as well as to confirm validity of topics”

“The breakout sessions were both great.”

“Getting to meet people I would not have otherwise met, who have shared interests; learning more about the goals of scientific associations for advancing human rights and how we can work together”

“The Friday night panel.”

“Networking and learning about the UPR”

“STEM discussion was very useful Evaluation of US Human Rights record: The Universal Periodic Review very useful Article 15”

“Learn about the Innocence Project”

“11:30 session on STEM Education, However, this was also the least valuable session. Multiple presenters deserve independent evaluation.”

“Understanding the broader, more fundamental issues at the heart of the Coalition. I also enjoy seeing which associations are represented at events such as this; getting a sense of who is involved is always helpful in thinking about future projects”

“The meeting of the committee on the welfare of scientists”

“The parallel sessions and workshops.”

“The ability to contribute to the future direction of the Coalition and network with other like minded scientists.”

“Contacts with event organizers”

What was the least useful aspect of the meeting for you?

“Connecting my discipline to the UPR process”

“The Thursday evening program”

“I found the entire meeting to be useful”

“The health presentations on Friday morning.”

“Perhaps wrap-up time because the participation dwindled”

“Too much on what each of the societies are doing... a general overview was all we needed.”

“Despite the great film and interesting discussion, there seemed to be little impact following the film screening. Perhaps a second discussion of the issue on the second day of the meeting would help?”

“It was difficult to find the agenda of the meeting ahead of time.”

“I wish there had been more concrete discussions of specific issues where science and human rights overlap. I felt that a lot of discussions were logistical, dealing with how to get scientists involved etc. These are certainly important issues to discuss, however I feel that these topics should be discussed in conjunction with specific examples of the successful interaction of the STEM community with the human rights community. Also, I felt that there were few members from human rights organizations. How can we get these people more involved?”

“The plenary”

“While the session topics were interesting and the sessions themselves informative, they were not particularly relevant to my discipline and my own work.”

“The time that was taken in processing questions and asking each individual how they responded to specific issues.”

“Absolutely have to have agenda for meeting at the time of the invitation. I only got it the first day, would have changed my travel plans had I had it sooner.”

Please suggest topics you would like to see covered at future meetings.

“The perspective of ethnic groups and faith as it related to Article 15”

“Approaches used to get members involved in the Coalition’s efforts”

“Set a panel of representatives of different societies who will explain how they are culling greater HR awareness and involvement on the part of their association.”

“Delving deeper on engaging US entities on this discussion...specifically focused on US based initiatives”

“Scholars oppressed around the world.”

“How are campuses implementing some of the ideas we spoke out in the break out. What national group can our campus align with?”

“Religious freedom.”

“Indigenous rights, the right to access to water, welfare of scientists”

“International Scientific Cooperation: immigration, visa, funding of Schools, Workshops in developing countries. American Universities opening campus in "developing wealthy countries", good for science and free-expression? good for Human Rights?”

“Importance of science in human rights topics related to gender based violence and sexual based violence. I am against death penalty and I am very concerned with issues related to the lethal injection.”

“Anything relevant to educational rights by presenters knowledgeable in the topic area (beyond their classroom STEM work).”

“How to get the human rights community connected with scientists-specific examples of where the overlap of science and human rights worked. Why did these situations work? Brainstorming future overlaps of science and human rights”

“I think indigenous rights is a great topic.”

“Helping the scientists in some of the "hard sciences" like mathematics and physics see the connection between their work and human rights. Seeing how human rights abuses affect the scientific community and international scientific collaborations more broadly.”

“More about the natural and physical sciences contributing to advancing human rights activities”

“I would like to see action steps to influence scientific response to specific human rights issues”