



# **AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition**

## **Launch Report**

**January 14-16, 2009**

<b>Contents:</b>	<b>Pages</b>
The Coalition is Launched!	1
Opening Plenary	1
Introducing the Coalition	2
Sessions, Areas of Activity, Trainings	4
Reports of Areas of Activity Working Groups	
I.    Welfare of Scientists	6
II.   Science Ethics and Human Rights	8
III.  Service to the Scientific Community	10
IV.  Service to the Human Rights Community	12
V.   Education and Information Resources	14
Draft Plan of Action (2009-2011)	15
Closing Remarks	17
Appendices:	
1. Launch Program	18
2. Participating Scientific Associations	22
3. Founding Steering Committee	23
4. Session Evaluations	24

## **The Coalition is Launched!**

After more than a year of deliberations and preparation by representatives of over 20 scientific membership organizations and many individual scientists, the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition was launched on January 14, 2009. The Coalition is a network of scientific associations, professional societies, and academies of science that recognizes a role for science and scientists in efforts to realize human rights. Held at AAAS headquarters in Washington DC, the launch of the Coalition was attended by representatives of 50 scientific organizations and over 100 individual scientists. Over the course of three days, participants heard from colleagues and human rights practitioners about why such a coalition is needed, what it is committed to accomplishing, and how they can both benefit from and contribute to the five areas of activity and joint initiative to which the Coalition is committed. Participants also contributed valuable input and suggestions through sessions, working group meetings, Q+A, and evaluations.

The following report provides an overview of the launch program and accomplishments at this, the first official meeting of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition. The report also contains commitments by the five areas of activity working groups, as well as outcomes of the session evaluations.

## **Opening Plenary: Wednesday, January 14, 2009, 6:00-7:30 pm**

Alan Leshner, Chief Executive Officer of AAAS, welcomed everyone to what he called this “momentous event.” Referring to the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition as an “ambitious endeavor,” Leshner hailed this initiative as an opportunity to collectively identify “some of the best strategies we can mobilize in order to use the power of scientists and the power of the scientific community in the service of human rights.” “I can’t think of an issue that is more important,” he said, and challenged the Launch participants to produce “some action ideas of what we might do both individually and cooperatively” to realize the goals of the Coalition.

Following Dr. Leshner were three distinguished speakers. First, reading a speech from [Mercedes Doretti](#) of the Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team, was Raymond Pettit. Reflecting on her own work in exhuming and identifying the bodies of victims of mass atrocities, and that of other scientists engaged in human rights work, Doretti said that “science and scientists provide not only support, but also legitimacy, and credibility to the human rights movement.” Doretti acknowledged that working in this field means operating “outside of the protection of academia, research or governmental institutions, [which] has often been a deterrent for scientists to get involved in the human rights field.” Yet, Doretti saw unique value in this work: “scientists involved in human rights investigations,” she said, “are, in a way, returning to the principle that every crime has to be investigated, regardless of motive. And this is a fundamental piece in the return to the rule of law.”

The following speaker, [Sidney Verba](#), focused on the importance of scientists bringing their voice to human rights concerns. Verba, Professor Emeritus and Research Professor of government at Harvard University, regaled the audience with the story of a march through Harvard Yard that he had witnessed in support of wage reform. “One group I particularly remember,” he said, “[was] carrying banners that read, ‘String Theorists for a Living Wage.’”

[T]hose scientists were exercising their civic right to take a stand on the wage issue, using their scientific prestige to argue a human rights position.” Verba went on to observe that “[w]hen scientists and scientific societies challenge human rights abuses, they defend the victims of such abuse as well as their own interests in furthering scientific progress.” He cautioned, however, against ignoring the “unanticipated side effects” of scientific progress: “[W]e must also be mindful of issues such as who will benefit ... and can the technology be exploited for destructive purposes?”

The final speaker in the opening plenary was [Mary Robinson](#), former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and former President of Ireland. She noted that “A vehicle that will increase collaboration between the scientific and human rights communities and bring human rights to scientists and the conduct of science is particularly forward-looking. It is no exaggeration to say that everyone stands to benefit from such a project.” Speaking as a human rights practitioner, Robinson identified, as a challenge to be overcome, the need for her peers to be “more comfortable with and knowledgeable about how science and technology can further enhance our work.” She emphasized that in the “monumental task” of ensuring human rights obligations are met, “each community’s unique contributions are needed.” She added, “[a]rguably no single community enjoys as diverse an array of expertise and specialized knowledge as the scientific community possesses collectively.” Addressing the audience of scientists, she added, “I urge you to add to the contributions you make to human rights, your voices, as a matter of conscience and responsibility that transcend any one discipline and any one country.” Robinson, who chaired the committee that presented Dublin’s successful bid to become the European City of Science in 2012, challenged the Coalition to meet in Dublin in three years to take stock of progress made and challenges ahead.

#### **Introducing the Coalition: Thursday, January 15, 2009, 9:45-11:00 am**

[Peter Agre](#), Nobel Laureate in Chemistry and President-elect of AAAS, opened the proceedings of the first full day of the Coalition launch. Speaking from his experience as former Chair of the Committee on Human Rights of the National Academies, Agre spoke of the urgency and need for greater engagement by scientists in efforts to make human rights a reality for all. He noted that “the role of scientists in human rights issues has produced positive outcomes in extremely dire situations.” Having outlined three specific cases in which the Committee on Human Rights had intervened to protect scientists whose human rights were under threat, Agre said that “working privately and behind the scenes, the [Committee] has contributed to the release of more than 600 persecuted scientists, engineers, and health professionals over the past four decades.”

Agre was followed by [Mona Younis](#), Director of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program. Younis explained the impetus of the Coalition as harnessing the “knowledge and skills, and time and voices” of scientists for efforts to realize human rights. She described the Coalition’s development over the preceding year-and-a-half, specifically its mission and goals, as well as six program areas. Describing the Coalition as “ambitious,” she noted that “We are committed to deepening and expanding scientific associations’ current work on human rights, moving into new areas of human rights work, and creating opportunities to identify yet other areas we cannot possibly imagine today.” Emphasizing the importance of engaging scientists with “creative ideas, clear commitment, and readiness to work,” Younis then described the Coalition

membership categories and organizational structure. Finally, reflecting the collaborative nature of the Coalition's development and the value of its multi-disciplinary reach, Younis introduced the members of the inaugural Coalition Steering Committee who represent diverse scientific associations that had been actively engaged in building the foundations of the Coalition.

Following Younis was [Doug Richardson](#), Executive Director of the Association of American Geographers, who spoke to the connection between scientific associations and human rights and why scientific associations should join the Coalition. He began by explaining how he overcame his initial skepticism about being a part of the Coalition to ultimately not only embrace it, but urge others to join. Richardson acknowledged the “often conflicting perspectives, goals, missions, and personalities” found across scientific organizations. Yet, he said, “the power of the human rights issue brings people together and transcends a lot of these, the sorts of things that can drag down a coalition.” For Richardson, there were several compelling reasons for an association to decide to be a part of the Coalition: the opportunity to collaborate across scientific disciplines, “pooling our expertise and our scientific resources;” to collaborate with the human rights community from whom “we have a great deal to learn;” and to learn from one another about how to “find viable, meaningful solutions” to human rights challenges. Richardson also noted the link between the goals of the Coalition, the mission of most scientific associations, and the professional and personal motivations of many scientists “to bring science to the benefit of society and human kind.”

#### **Questions/Comments:**

- *Membership:* The initiative is very American at the moment. This is not a criticism of AAAS, which is largely based in the US. However, given that science transcends all boundaries and human rights are universal, the strength of this initiative would be boosted by taking it beyond the US. Two suggestions: 1) that the Coalition consider how it might spread into other countries; and 2) scientific associations, on their own, may not have time to focus on human rights, so consideration should be given to opening up membership to human rights organizations. Human rights centers could be a catalyst to get scientific associations to become involved.
- *Human rights:* In addition to the International Bill of Rights, the Coalition is grounded in all relevant human rights instruments, including the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.
- *Building support infrastructure:* Many of the attendees are past the age of 40. The work of the Coalition is not going to be accomplished in their life-times. An underlying theme of all the working groups should be keeping an eye on building better infrastructure to future generations to carry on this work.
- *Students:* The Coalition should keep in mind high school students and identify ways to keep these youngest scientists involved in human rights issues. This is a group that is science-interested and science-intense, and human rights issues have not been brought to their attention.

- *Mutual benefits to scientists and human rights practitioners:* One of the reasons why the Coalition is compelling is that human rights tracks unevenly across the discourse and practice of science. One of the ways we need to think about this is to direct resources and energies to identifying for scientists the human rights implications of their work. Similarly, science can lend a lot to the efforts of human rights professionals, particularly with regard to the long-neglected economic, social and cultural rights. The benefits of this engagement work in both directions: a mutual aid society.

*Note: Suggestions will be taken to the Coalition Council in July*

### **Sessions, Areas of Activity, and Trainings: Thursday, January 15, 11:00-5:00 pm**

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

#### **Sessions (concurrent)**

---

Participants had the opportunity to hear from three different perspectives about what science and scientists can contribute to human rights, and why engagement across the communities is so important.

One session, titled “**Science-based Solutions to Human Rights Challenges,**” featured four scientists who have worked on human rights projects, each of which yielded important outcomes and lessons. Jana Asher, a statistician and representative of the Washington Statistical Society, described her work with residents in Sierra Leone to develop appropriate survey techniques. Chris Beyrer, a medical epidemiologist at the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, described the important human rights work carried out on health in Zimbabwe. Yvonne Milewski, a forensic pathologist with the New York medical examiner’s office, described her work with Physicians for Human Rights on the exhumation of mass graves in Bosnia. And Lars Bromley, a geographer with the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, described the work he has done using satellite imagery to document human rights violations in Darfur and elsewhere.

While one session highlighted the role of scientists in contributing to human rights work, another session addressed the activities of scientific associations engaged in human rights activities.

“**Scientific Associations Engaged in Human Rights**” featured the work of three scientific associations’ human rights committees, the different roles and contributions they each make, and their experience in setting up and sustaining human rights programs. Rachel Franklin described the Association of American Geographers’ work applying geospatial technology and conducting fieldwork, activities carried out through the Ethics, Justice, and Human Rights Specialty Group. Bradley Miller spoke about the American Chemical Society’s decades-long work on the defense of colleagues under threat, conducted by the Subcommittee on Scientific Freedom and Human Rights of the Committee on International Activities. Gary Shapiro described the American Statistical Association’s human rights work carried out by the Committee on Scientific Freedom and Human Rights, and the Volunteerism Special Interest Group (SIG), including the

development and management of the newly-formed “Statistics Without Borders,” a sub-group of SIG.

Finally, the session titled “**Hearing from the Human Rights Community**” gave participants the opportunity to hear directly from human rights practitioners about how science and scientists can and have contributed to their work. Participants heard from John Bradshaw, Physicians for Human Rights, who spoke about the challenges of documenting genocide; Theresa Harris, World Organization for Human Rights USA, who addressed state and corporate interference in the use of communication technologies; and Matthew Smith, EarthRights International, who focused on environmental rights.

#### **Areas of Activity** (concurrent)

---

One of the objectives of the Coalition launch was to present the work completed between June 2007 and December 2008. This includes the work carried out by the Coalition’s five working groups, each of which is devoted to a distinct area of activity: Welfare of Scientists; Science Ethics and Human Rights; Service to the Scientific Community; Service to the Human Rights Community; and Education and Information Resources. A summary of the presentations can be found in the next section of this report: “Areas of Activity Working Group Reports.”

#### **Training Workshops** (concurrent)

---

The Coalition is committed to equipping members with the information and tools their associations will need to enable robust engagement in human rights. To begin that work, three training workshops were held as part of the Launch program.

Jessica Wyndham (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) conducted a workshop on “**Article 15: The Human Right to the Benefits of Scientific Progress**” to provide participants with a basic understanding of this human right, its content, and potential applications. The workshop is the first of several that will provide tools for incorporating this right into the activities of scientific associations.

Julie Mertus (International Studies Association) held an introductory workshop on “**Human Rights and the Conduct of Science**” to increase participants' knowledge of the international human rights framework and its implications for the practice of science.

Robert Quinn and Sinead O’Gorman (Scholars at Risk) led a training workshop on “**Best-practices in Defending the Human Rights of Scientists.**” Based on a much more extensive training that Scholars at Risk provides, the workshop introduced scientific associations to effective mechanisms and approaches for responding to alleged violations of the human rights of scientists.

## Reports of Areas of Activity Working Groups

Over the course of the launch, participants had the opportunity to hear from each of the working groups about their rationale, objectives, and activities, both planned and/or carried out. The working groups also met on the final day of the launch with new and potential members to identify priority activities, among them a project that will be completed in 2009.

### Welfare of Scientists Working Group

---

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

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

### Area of Activity Presentation

Michele Irwin provided an overview of the working group’s objectives and the activities in 2008. The presentation included a summary of the results from a survey that was sent to several fellow associations and societies concerning how they learn about individual scientists who are at risk and the types of action they take on behalf of those scientists. Of 19 associations contacted, 15 responded. A significant majority (86.7%) reported that they learn about cases of persecuted scientists from organization members and human rights organizations, and in 73.3% of the cases, directly from the scientists themselves. Letter writing campaigns are the principal form of action taken on behalf of persecuted scientists and most respondents (85.7%) considered their actions effective.

Irwin explained the importance of associations becoming involved in this activity and offered examples of what societies and associations can specifically do, including share information about events, activities, programs, teaching and fellowship positions that would benefit scientists at risk, or draft action and information “alerts” on cases of persecuted scientists.

After the presentation, the co-chairs invited the participants to share their experiences, for example, to address the ways their associations have been asked to intervene on behalf of persecuted scientists and to identify what, if anything, has hampered or helped their involvement. This discussion revealed that:

- Most participants in the room had some experience in the area of action alerts/letter-writing campaigns on behalf of threatened scientists. Few had actually drafted letters; most had been asked to forward letters or to make phone calls.
- Several participants had some familiarity with issues surrounding the mobility of scientists—in particular the question of visas for travel to international conferences or visas for research fellowships.

### **Key questions:**

- How can you best convince your organization of the importance of being part of this initiative? What are the benefits to societies/associations of taking action on behalf of scientists?
- How can the Coalition best work together on these issues? The Working Group could, for example, make efforts to publicize the work of The National Academies' International Visitors Office (IVO) in its efforts to promote mobility of scientists and freedom of travel.
- How can you know if you are getting the correct information about a particular individual's situation?

### **Helpful suggestions**

- It was noted that depending on *where* a human rights violation occurs, the appropriate way to respond may vary greatly, i.e., there is not a set of "best practices" that can be applied in all contexts and in all countries/regions. The working group might wish to work on the question of: "what works best where?"

### **Priorities for 2009**

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

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

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

### **New working group members:**

Heibat Baghi (individual scientist)

Juan Gallardo (American Physical Society)

David Mustra (National Association for Biomedical Research)

Sarah Willcox (IIE Scholar Rescue Fund)

## **Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group**

---

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

Co-chairs: **Rob Albro** (American Anthropological Association)  
**Paula Skedsvold** (Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences)

### **Area of Activity Presentation**

The working group co-chairs focused on placing science and human rights in their historical context to use as a starting point for a discussion about the current state of ethical standards in the sciences, as well as gaps in education and science practice. Human rights and the ethics of science share a common history as responses to World War II atrocities. Concerns about human rights broadly and their relationship to the conduct of science led to the development of international human rights standards which governments are obligated to uphold and, in parallel, international and national statements of ethical principles that guide research. Scientific and professional societies also developed their own guides for professional conduct in the form of discipline-specific ethics standards, ranging from enforceable codes to guidelines that rely on moral persuasion. Yet ethics training is generally not well integrated into the professional development of scientists and that which does exist is not well-connected to a human rights framework.

### **Key Questions**

- What is happening at a global level on this issue? Can we sketch the landscape?
- Can we identify a set of common principles that integrate science ethics and human rights? How would these be used?
- What sort of ethical guidelines, as informed by human rights, do we want? How would we educate scientists about the guidelines and provide practical guidance?
- How do we foster a culture of ethical behavior that is grounded in human rights? How do we redefine science ethics so that it is grounded in human rights?
- Should we encourage societies to examine their ethics codes and connect them to the UDHR (external focus vs. internal focus)?
- Can we look broadly at research ethics (e.g., conflicts of interest, how funding affects research, data access and ownership, and human research protections)?
- How does this link to Article 15 of the ICESCR, and does linking to it provide a motivation for scientists and scientific societies to become involved?
- Might the Office of Research Integrity publications be useful in our work?
- Should we examine why codes of ethics are detached from practice? What tools can be used to link the two? How can this be taught?
- Ethics codes involve interactions with other scientists, clients, the public, and research participants. What are we interested in capturing in our work?

## **Helpful Suggestions**

The wide-ranging discussion captured different and important aspects of the relation between science ethics and human rights. From this discussion, central themes emerged that will lay the groundwork for the working group's activities. These themes included the need to:

- Connect to what is happening at a global level with respect to science ethics and human rights
- Emphasize the connection between science and human rights in both ethical guidelines and practice
- Consider the circumstances of particular disciplines and compare across disciplines for commonalities and differences with respect to ethics
- Identify ethical principles informed by human rights that cross disciplinary boundaries and all aspects of the scientific process

## **Priorities for 2009**

1. Develop a human rights framework for science ethics, based on national, international and human rights precedents encompassing the full diversity of science practice and beginning with Article 15.
2. Develop tools for scientific associations that more effectively frame their Codes of Ethics as informed by human rights and as an active part of scientific practice.
3. Encourage network-building with international science organizations and with international human rights centers.
4. Work with funders of scientific research (including foundations) to incorporate a more robust human rights-based ethics process into the grants application phase.
5. Work with scientific associations to develop a human rights-based model for ethics pedagogy and curriculum-building.

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

## **New working group members:**

Colleen Cordes (Psychologists for Social Responsibility)  
Jacquelyn Goldberg (individual scientist)  
Deborah Popowski (individual scientist)  
Douglas Richardson (Association of American Geographers)  
Gretchen Schafft (individual scientist)  
David Schrader (American Philosophical Association)

## **Service to the Scientific Community Working Group**

---

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

Co-chairs: **Clinton Anderson** (American Psychological Association)  
**Jessica Wyndham** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program)

### **Area of Activity Presentation**

Clinton Anderson introduced the session. Jessica Wyndham gave an overview of the working group's objectives, emphasizing (1) increased awareness among scientific associations of human rights issues, (2) greater capacity to address human rights issues, and (3) greater engagement in human rights activities. Wyndham presented proposed working group activities, including help for scientific associations in setting up human rights committees, and exploring options for bringing science to human rights. She also presented potential activities the working group could pursue as part of the Joint Initiative, including the development of materials to introduce Article 15 to scientific organizations, and identification of discipline-specific barriers to realizing Article 15.

Lee Herring (American Sociological Association), a member of the working group, presented the results of a survey of AAAS's 262 affiliates conducted by the group in December 2008. Among the 24 associations that responded, 15 indicated that they address human rights; 12 of which tackle concerns arising both within and outside the United States. With regard to programs, these associations' primary human rights activities are the adoption of policy resolutions or position statements (11) and education within the discipline (11).

Participants then broke out into groups in which they were asked to assess their organization's commitment and capacity to: advocate for human rights; respond to human rights challenges; and make discipline-specific contributions, using a scale of 1-5, 1 = no commitment or capacity, 5 = full commitment or capacity. The groups then considered what was needed to increase their organizations' commitment and capacity. The results follow (numbers in parentheses are standard deviations):

	Commitment	Capacity
Advocate for Human Rights	3.1 (1.3)	2.9 (1.3)
Respond to Human Rights Challenges	3.2 (1.1)	2.5 (1.2)
Make Discipline-Specific Contribution	3.6 (1.3)	3.4 (1.5)

### **Key questions**

- How to create a technical/advocacy skill base within scientific associations to address human rights
- How to link the goals and activities of the working group to the mission of scientific associations

## **Helpful suggestions**

- There is a basic need for raising awareness among scientific associations and scientists about human rights, including through courses (e.g., short online course), informational materials, and discipline-specific curricula
- To clarify how the “values” of the scientific community relate to human rights, discussion fora involving representatives of both communities could be created
- Scientific associations need to be shown the link between specific human rights challenges and their capacities and the capacities of their members.

## **Priorities for 2009**

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

The priorities for 2009 are to:

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

## **New working group members:**

Kelly Cohen (Optical Society of America)  
Clifford Duke (Ecological Society of America)  
Rachel Franklin (Association of American Geographers)  
Jacquelyn Goldberg (individual scientist)  
Jordann Loehr (individual scientist)  
Carlos Sluzki (individual scientist)

## **Service to the Human Rights Community Working Group**

---

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

Co-chairs: **Susan Hinkins** (American Statistical Association)  
**Hormuzd Katki** (Washington Statistical Society)

### **Area of Activity Presentation**

Brian Estes, American Anthropological Association and member of the working group, presented an overview of the group's goals and proposed plan of action. Hormuzd Katki described the first activity of the working group: "Science Serving Human Rights," an event held in October, 2008 at AAAS headquarters in Washington, DC. The event consisted of interviews with three teams of scientists and human rights activists that had worked together on specific human rights issues, and revealed the value and challenges of engaging scientists in human rights work.

Hormuzd Katki outlined valuable lessons learned from the event, principally that: human rights data analysis will rarely achieve commonly-accepted standards for scientific publication; scientific independence, integrity and objectivity are valued and respected by the human rights community; human rights emergencies can give rise to apparent conflicts with scientific norms; and, similarly, universal ethics need to be reconciled with national human rights obligations. A handout was provided with 1-page descriptions of four examples of partnerships between scientists and the human rights community.

Finally, Susan Hinkins explained the need for the working group to develop a plan of action, which should include a project that contributes to the Coalition's Joint Initiative.

### **Key questions**

- How can we educate and prepare scientists for the challenges of human rights field work and data analysis?
- How do we begin a dialogue with members of the human rights community to find out how volunteer scientists might address their needs?
- How do we set up structures to allow human rights advocates to consult or collaborate with scientists?

### **Helpful suggestions**

- Consider submitting articles to the UNDP and Amnesty International newsletters, as well as alternative magazines aimed at scientists like SEED.
- Scientists should not assume that we know what is needed by the human rights community or even that science can necessarily be useful. Rather we want to learn from this community how we might make a useful contribution

- The usefulness of scientific methods in the evaluation of programs was suggested as a topic that would be of interest to the human rights community in general.

### **Priorities for 2009**

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

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

### **Long-term goals**

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

### **New working group members:**

Jana Asher (Washington Statistical Society)  
 Erika Barr (individual scientist)  
 Chris Beyrer (individual scientist)  
 Michael P. Cohen (American Statistical Association)  
 Kim Durniak (American Academy of Arts and Sciences)  
 Julia Flores (Instituto de Investigaciones Juridicas, UNAM, Mexico)  
 Hal Gaines (individual scientist)  
 Kohl Gill (individual scientist)  
 Mary Gray (individual scientist)  
 Art Kendall (Capital Area Social Psychology Association)  
 Teri Krebs (individual scientist)

Cynthia Mesh (Harvard University Committee on Human Rights)  
Yvonne Milewski (individual scientist)  
Amanda Sozer (individual scientist)  
Susan Wolfenbarger (individual scientist)

### **Education and Information Resources Working Group**

---

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

Co-chair:     **John C. King** (International Studies Association)  
                  **Julie Mertus** (International Studies Association)

### **Area of Activity Presentation**

Facilitated by John C. King, this session took the form of an informal discussion focused on exploring the kinds of expert knowledge that scientists and human rights specialists can bring to one another to help make each better informed communities whose members are better prepared to work together. Two areas of focus were: historic collaborations between scientists and human rights specialists, and, b) specific suggestions for how science can complement human rights work. Participants received a handout developed by Julie Mertus on science and human rights and rights and responsibilities.

### **Key questions**

- How can the human rights community inform scientists about the many ways they could complement the realization of human rights throughout the world?
- What specific tactics might work best at recruiting young scientists in particular into collaborative work with human rights specialists?

### **Helpful suggestions**

- Development of a translational document is needed to bridge the scientific and human rights communities, specifically to dispel myths and assumptions shared by each group about the other, e.g., misconceptions among scientists that human rights work is legalistic and only appropriate for lawyers.
- Consider creative options for bridging the scientific and human rights communities, including a booklet of actual case studies describing collaborations between scientists and human rights scholars and/or practitioners, or brochures with dotted items whereby students (especially in science) could easily see applications in human rights work.
- There is need for the development of a web-based portal providing access to online training programs and/or other tools to give students an overall perspective of techniques (e.g., in spatial mapping or in biotech) and how those skills can be applied to the realization of human rights.

## **Priorities for 2009**

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

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

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

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

### **New working group members:**

Amy Crumpton (History of Science Society)  
Jeff Toney (individual scientist)

### **Draft Plan of Action (2009-2011)**

Susan Hinkins (American Statistical Association) presented highlights of the Draft Plan of Action (2009-2011). She reminded participants that the Coalition is structured so that its programs will be carried out through working groups, currently five, devoted to specialized areas of activity as well as an overarching initiative: the right to “the benefits of scientific progress and its applications” (Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights). As part of the three-year plan, each working group will consider how it can contribute to the Joint Initiative and how the Joint Initiative can contribute to the working groups’ objectives, which means “all working groups will both contribute to it and benefit from it.” To that end, each working group will develop a detailed three-year plan for its activities, projects,

and objectives. Hinkins added that “being a scientific organization, we are going to develop baseline data to measure our progress, provide measurable targets, and benchmarks.”

To help in that effort, the Draft Plan of Action (2009-2011) contains suggestions for working group activities that will meet some of the common objectives of each working group and cut across all the working groups. In addition, however, because each working group has its own specific objectives, each will need to develop plans specific to that area of activity. The working group plans are to be completed by March 2009.

With regard to the Joint Initiative, Hinkins emphasized that, by cutting across all the working groups, it is intended to provide a project that will engage the entire membership. She further explained that, because it addressed a human right that is both largely ignored and requires scientists to be realized, the initiative “was a natural choice” as the Coalition’s overarching project. She concluded by pointing out that the Plan of Action for the Joint Initiative, which is both “well-developed and ambitious, culminates with presentations to the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in 2011.”

### **Questions/Comments from Participants**

- *Science funding:* An excellent service to the scientific community, and one with possible larger implications, is to advocate for the National Science Foundation (US), the National Institutes of Health (US), and other important funders of scientific research to include human rights in what they are soliciting from the researchers they fund. This will help motivate scientists to take up human rights related work.
- *Membership:* The current terms of reference confine membership to scientific associations, and that focus makes sense, but human rights centers and human rights practitioners can help spread the word. Many associations may not be joining because they are too busy doing other things, yet there is likely to be goodwill and interest in joining if they knew more about it. Human rights centers have a role to play, therefore the Coalition might consider an affiliated status for human rights centers.
- *International activity:* It would be important to spread the word about the Coalition beyond the US, but that will need to be done with care. The document currently says the Coalition “welcomes the participation.” A better way might be to say the Coalition “wishes to develop partnerships.” “Partnerships” is a good word of equality.
- *Infrastructure:* We hear about the difficulties of getting data and tools that are necessary to do sound scientific work on specific human rights issues. It is very encouraging to hear about the Coalition’s plans to build infrastructural resources, including communication materials, frameworks, media for outreach, and databases. But we are a tiny piece of the global initiative to improve human rights. What we need to do in addition is to encourage others (from the UN, other partnership countries, and others) to also think about how they can contribute to building databases, tools, and methods to contribute to continual improvement in the capability of scientists to take up human rights challenges.

*Note: Suggestions will be taken to the Coalition Council in July*

## Closing Remarks

Doug Richardson (Association of American Geographers) expressed his appreciation for the opportunity to work with so many others who want to make a difference in the world. He noted that although the Coalition is “just one of many global efforts to address human rights, we are serious about making a difference in ways that we can, and by bringing scientists together to focus on human rights, not only within their own organizations, but in the world, the Coalition can make a difference in curtailing and limiting human rights abuses that are so pervasive. This is a worthy goal and a goal to which we can make progress.” Richardson went on to say that from his experience in such endeavors, “one of the great keys to success is to stay focused and to set doable goals, and if we do that – set goals that we can achieve, that will make a difference, and remain focused – we will be successful, at the same time, we should not lose sight of the overarching goal of making a difference in human rights in the world.” He added a second critical element to success is persistence. “Persistence is a great element in making things happen. If you just keep going, despite ups and down of any organizations’ cycle of activity, and you keep going through adversity, through frustration, through even moments of success when you may be tempted to quit because you’ve achieved something, if you persist, remarkable things can happen. I hope that we can do that and that in the end, in five years or ten years, we can all look back at this as the beginning of something that we can feel really good about having spent some of our time and some of our energy doing. I think we can, and I’m sure that with the talent here and what I’ve seen in terms of commitment that we will be successful. I look forward to working with you in helping to make a bit of difference in the world.”

Richardson concluded by reminding participants to join, and reminding participants who have been active in building the Coalition to confirm membership with the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program and submit the names and contact details of two representatives. Details for both are on the Coalition website: <http://shr.aas.org/coalition/membership.htm>.

Mona Younis (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) announced the next Coalition meeting date: Friday, July 24<sup>th</sup> at AAAS in Washington, DC. The Coalition meeting will be preceded by a meeting of the Coalition Council on the afternoon of Thursday, July 23<sup>rd</sup>. She then thanked the Association of American Geographers, the American Psychological Association, and the Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences for their contributions to the opening reception. She then closed with a quote from Mary Robinson’s speech:

“Scientists have been responsible for advancements in every realm of human life. Agronomists have made previously unimaginable levels of food production possible. But we also need you with us in advising governments on how they can fulfill the human right to adequate nutrition for all people. Psychologists have documented the damage that brutality causes. But we also need your help in both preventing acts of brutality and securing mental health services as a human right. Hydrologists have identified the threats to the world’s water resources. As human rights organizations work to ensure equitable access to clean water, will you be there? In short, your expertise is vital both for improvements in the human condition as well as the realization of human rights – two inter-related but distinct projects.”

## Appendix 1: Launch Program

# AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Launch

14-16 January 2009  
Washington, DC

## Wednesday, January 14

5:00 pm **Registration**

6:00 **Opening Plenary** *Auditorium*

**Welcome:** Alan Leshner, AAAS Chief Executive Officer

**Speakers:**

**Mercedes Doretti**, co-founder of the Argentine Forensic Anthropology Team, and 2007 MacArthur "Genius Award" recipient

**Sidney Verba**, Carl H. Pforzheimer University Professor Emeritus and Research Professor of Government at Harvard University, and current Chair of the Committee on Human Rights of the National Academies

**Mary Robinson**, former United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights, and former President of Ireland

7:30 - 9:00 **Reception** *2nd Floor Reception*

## Thursday, January 15

8:00 am **Breakfast**

8:45 **A Personal Perspective on Science and Human Rights** *Auditorium*  
**Peter Agre**, Johns Hopkins University and AAAS President-elect

**Introducing the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition**  
**Mona Younis**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

What are its origins?  
What will it accomplish?  
How will it do this?  
Who can join?  
How will it be organized and operate?

**Scientific Associations and Human Rights**  
**Douglas Richardson**, Association of American Geographers

How might scientific associations contribute to and benefit from the Coalition?  
Why should scientific associations join the Coalition?

10:00 **Break**

10:15 **Sessions (concurrent)**

These sessions will demonstrate the varied contributions that science and scientists can make to human rights, and highlight the scientific needs of human rights organizations.

### **Science-based Solutions to Human Rights Challenges: Examples from the field** *Abelson*

The session will highlight the value of science and scientific expertise for human rights work by featuring three scientists who have worked on human rights projects that yielded important outcomes and lessons.

Panelists: **Jana Asher**, Washington Statistical Society  
**Chris Beyrer**, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health  
**Lars Bromley**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program  
**Yvonne Milewski**, Office of the Medical Examiner, Suffolk County, New York

Facilitator: **Mark Frankel**, AAAS Scientific Freedom, Responsibility and Law Program

### **Scientific Associations Engaged in Human Rights: Learning from their experience** *Haskins*

This session will feature the work of three scientific associations' human rights committees, the different roles and contributions they each make, and their experience in setting up and sustaining human rights programs.

Panelists: **Rachel Franklin**, Association of American Geographers  
**Bradley Miller**, American Chemical Society  
**Gary Shapiro**, American Statistical Association

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

### **Hearing from the Human Rights Community: How science and scientists can contribute** *Revelle*

This session will present an opportunity to hear directly from members of the human rights community about how scientists and scientific tools, techniques, and technologies can contribute to human rights work.

Panelists: **Cathy Albisa**, National Economic and Social Rights Initiative  
**John Bradshaw**, Physicians for Human Rights  
**Theresa Harris**, World Organization for Human Rights USA  
**Matthew Smith**, EarthRights International

Facilitator: **Sage Russell**, AAAS Science and Technology Policy Fellowships Program

11:45 **Lunch** *2nd Floor Reception*

1:00 **Areas of Activity (concurrent)**

These sessions will provide meeting participants the opportunity to identify the working group to which they wish to contribute and to provide input into the groups' plan of action for 2009-2011.

### **Service to the Human Rights Community** *Revelle*

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

Co-chairs: **Susan Hinkins**, American Statistical Association  
**Hormuzd Katki**, Washington Statistical Society

### **Science Ethics and Human Rights** *Abelson*

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

Co-chairs: **Rob Albro**, American Anthropological Association  
**Paula Skedsvold**, Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences

### **Welfare of Scientists** *Haskins*

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

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

2:00 **Break**

2:15 **Areas of Activity (concurrent)**

**Service to the Scientific Community** *Revelle*

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

Co-chairs: **Clinton Anderson**, American Psychological Association  
**Jessica Wyndham**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

**Information Resources** *Abelson*

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

Co-chairs: **John C. King**, International Studies Association  
**Julie Mertus**, International Studies Association

**Welfare of Scientists (repeated)** *Haskins*

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

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

3:15 **Break**

3:30 **Workshops (concurrent)**

These workshops will equip scientific associations with information and tools needed to enable robust engagement in human rights.

**Article 15: The Human Right to the Benefits of Scientific Progress** *Abelson*

This workshop will provide participants with a basic understanding of the significance of this human right, and provide tools for incorporating the right into the activities of the scientific associations.

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

**Human Rights and the Conduct of Science** *Haskins*

This workshop will increase participants' knowledge of international human rights and their implications for the conduct of science. Participants will acquire tools to enable them to apply human rights to their disciplines.

Trainer: **Julie Mertus**, International Studies Association

**Best-practices in Defending the Human Rights of Scientists** *Revelle*

This workshop will prepare scientific associations to respond to alleged violations of the human rights of scientists. Participants will be trained in best-practices in the defense of scientists' human rights.

Trainers: **Robert Quinn**, Scholars at Risk Network  
**Sinead O’Gorman**, Scholars at Risk Network

5:00 **Break**

5:30 - 7:30 **Reception** *2nd Floor Reception*

## Friday, January 16

8:45 am **Area of Activity Working Groups - meetings over breakfast**

Welfare of Scientists *Abelson*  
Science Ethics and Human Rights *Revelle*  
Service to the Scientific Community *Haskins*

Service to the Human Rights Community *Room 207*  
Information Resources *Revelle*

10:15 **Break**

10:30 **Where do we go from here?** *Auditorium*  
**Susan Hinkins**, American Statistical Association  
**Brad Miller**, American Chemical Society

Areas of Activity – report back  
Highlights of Draft Plan of Action (2009-2011)  
Q+A for potential members

12:15 **Closing Remarks** *Auditorium*  
**Douglas Richardson**, Association of American Geographers  
**Mona Younis**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

12:30 **Meeting Adjourns**

## **Appendix 2: Participating Scientific Associations**

### **Scientific Associations, Professional Societies, and Science Academies represented at the Launch of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition (as of January 11, 2009)**

Acoustical Society of America  
American Academy of Arts and Sciences  
American Anthropological Association  
American Association of University Professors  
American Chemical Society  
American Educational Research Association  
American Institute of Physics  
American Medical Association  
American Meteorological Society  
American Philosophical Association  
American Physical Society  
American Psychiatric Association  
American Psychological Association  
American Public Health Association  
American Society of Agronomy  
American Society of Agronomy-Crop Science Society of America-Soil Science Society of America  
American Society of Civil Engineers  
American Society of Health-System Pharmacists  
American Sociological Association  
American Speech-Language-Hearing Association  
American Statistical Association  
American Water Resources Association  
Association for Women in Science  
Association of American Geographers  
Biophysical Society  
Capital Area Social Psychological Association  
Consortium of Social Science Associations  
Council on Undergraduate Research  
Ecological Society of America  
Federation of American Scientists  
Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences  
History of Science Society  
International Association for Dental Research  
International Association for Impact Assessment  
Linguistic Society of America  
Mathematical Association of America  
National Academy of Sciences  
National Communication Association  
Optical Society of America  
Scholarly Publishing and Academic Resources Coalition  
Scholars at Risk  
Sigma Delta Epsilon/Graduate Women in Science  
Social Science Research Group  
Society for Psychophysiological Research  
Society for Research in Child Development  
Society for Science & the Public  
Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues  
Society for the Study of Evolution  
Union of Concerned Scientists  
Washington Statistical Society

## Appendix 3: Founding Steering Committee

### AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Steering Committee (2009)

- **Rob Albro** (American Anthropological Association), [robert.albro@verizon.net](mailto:robert.albro@verizon.net)  
Chair, Outreach and Communication
- **Susan Hinkins** (American Statistical Association), [HINKINS-SUSAN@norc.org](mailto:HINKINS-SUSAN@norc.org)  
Co-chair, Service to the Human Rights Community
- **Julie Mertus** (International Studies Association), [mertus@american.edu](mailto:mertus@american.edu)  
Co-chair, Education and Information Resources
- **Brad Miller** (American Chemical Society Office of International Activities), [b\\_miller@acs.org](mailto:b_miller@acs.org)  
Co-chair, Welfare of Scientists
- **Douglas Richardson** (Association of American Geographers), [drichardson@aag.org](mailto:drichardson@aag.org)  
Chair, Membership
- **Paula Skedsvold** (Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences), [pskedsvold@fbpcs.org](mailto:pskedsvold@fbpcs.org)  
Co-chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights
- **Mona Younis** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program), [myounis@aaas.org](mailto:myounis@aaas.org)  
Coordinator

## Appendix 4: Session Evaluations

### Session Evaluations\*

#### Session: Science-based solutions to human rights challenges: Examples from the field

---

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Session Topic	-	-	-	2	7	9	4.7
Choice of Presenters	-	-	1	2	6	9	4.5
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	3	6	9	4.6
Session Format	-	-	1	2	6	9	4.5
Overall Usefulness	-	-	2	3	4	9	4.2

### Comments

---

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Hearing the perspectives from different sorts of scientists”

“Personal stories and specific examples of work done”

“Plenty of time was given to group discussion which was very good for generating dynamic discussion. But also individual personal accounts from panelists were interesting”

“Everybody’s participation”

“The coverage of urgent topics by the panel and general participation was excellent”

“Diversity of panelists and experience plus lots of good audience questions”

“The discussion between the audience and the panel”

“Personal stories- issues of access, uses/benefits of human rights work”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“Longer presentations, fewer audience questions”

“Would have enjoyed an additional panelist who works specifically on HR of scientists, rather than HR as a whole”

“If moderator doesn’t make every panelist to participate in every individual comment”

“One of the presenters tended to be hostile and quite negative”

“A round table discussion after the panelists present”

“It was excellent- though there appeared to be a hassle with the microphone”

---

\* In a few instances, comments have been edited.

## Session: Scientific Associations Engaged in Human Rights: Learning from their experience

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
<b>Session Topic</b>	-	-	1	12	12	25	4.4
<b>Choice of Presenters</b>	-	-	9	10	6	25	3.9
<b>Quality of Presentations</b>	-	2	13	5	5	25	3.5
<b>Session Format</b>	-	1	4	14	6	25	4
<b>Overall Usefulness</b>	-	2	5	14	4	25	3.8

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Q & A session allowed scientific societies to bring up issues/challenges they foresee in getting their organizations to commit to join the coalition. This was a great starting point for discussion”

“Recommendations for organizing value statements/documents to share at our leaders and members respective”

“Q & A with specific examples”

“The Q & A was very helpful”

“Question/Answer session”

“Geography & stats examples very useful”

“Nuts & bolts ideas”

“Discussion”

“Question & answer session”

“Learning about what the associations are doing”

“Discussion session, when focus was on what societies can do, pitfalls in establishing an h.r. program, what coalition can do to help societies get involved in h.r.”

“Good discussion”

“Learning about the activities of the 3 associations”

“Discussion at end”

“Q & A/ Discussion & rest of group”

“A lot of good information”

“Illustrations of different approaches - discussion”

“Open discussion useful & relevant to conference objectives”

“Having plenty of time for discussion/questions was beneficial”

“Finding out what other scientific organizations are doing in this area”

“Hearing the perspective on how each agency was trying to use the tools of its science to aid human rights”

**Q: How could this session be improved?**

“I think this session was useful as is – it’s helpful to learn/understand what other societies have accomplished with human rights work. How each society can contribute will be unique and that will be the harder question (i.e. what works for one society and their members may not work for others.)”

“None- T was very good”

“Less time on the background of the individual societies & more on their human rights activities (e.g. how it started, where does the support come from, what is the staffing, what are the programs.)”

“too much time on nature of organization instead of their human rights work”

“More focus on how societies that are not engaged can “sell” this idea to their executive & member societies”

“More pointer examples of rights issue advocacy success”

“None”

“More focus on general role rather than highlighting what 3 societies have done”

“It could have been more geared towards how to build this sort of activity into our own societies. Where it could live & how to engage people”

“More nuts & bolts on how to get started”

“The coalition needs to sharpen its goals, objectives on how associations can go back to their members and argue for involvement in the Coalition”

“Presentations shorter and to the point of what the associations do specifically for h.r.”

“Like to learn about getting other societies involved. I am a member of [several scientific associations]”

“Less detail on individual associations and more on how to bring in new associations to the coalition”

“Larger room”

“Presenters were a bit too self-congratulatory. This was particularly true of [one] group [with a] very mixed record ...”

“General background about each association was interesting and helpful. Don’t need too much detail”

“It’s nice that AAAS Coalition has adopted a very broad definition of ‘Human Rights’ however, that makes it difficult for an organization to define an activity or structure to address the issue. Another thing that’s missing is how to assess effectiveness of efforts? What metrics can be used?”

“I would have liked more specific statement of how other science agencies could gain from and get involved in this coalition”

“Need more practical description of what organizations have done; broad definition of associations ‘human rights’ groups not as helpful to understand real benefits of efforts in HR”

## Session: Hearing from the Human Rights Community: How science and scientists can contribute

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
<b>Session Topic</b>	-	-	1	9	10	20	4.5
<b>Choice of Presenters</b>	1	2	2	8	7	20	3.9
<b>Quality of Presentations</b>	1	2	6	6	5	20	3.6
<b>Session Format</b>	1	-	7	6	6	20	3
<b>Overall Usefulness</b>	1	4	4	7	4	20	2.8

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Q & A Description of how to sell this interaction ‘evidence-based reports’”

“Q & A”

“Q& A”

“Experience”

“The subject matter was good”

“The speakers were knowledgeable and communicative”

“Q & A”

“The interchange between audience and speakers in terms of new ideas for the coalition to pursue”

“While one speaker was unable to attend, 3 speakers is the maximum that can successfully be accommodated in 90 minutes”

“Good examples of cases”

“The conversations about practical measures that can be done”

“Heard prac HR org reps as to how they use scientists/science evidence in their work”

“Excellent presenters”

“It is a very important topic, but was hopelessly bungled”

“How the Human Rights Organizations stressed that they want scientists to be objective and don’t expect to take a side when assisting these causes”

“Hearing about current projects”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“Inclusion of non-litigation HR monitoring organizations HRW, Amnesty International”

“For a start-up, some initial goal that the break outs would want to achieve might better focus both presenters and audience”

“Have presenters prepare a list of what they need from scientific associations instead of leaving it to the Q & A”

“More practical applications for scientists -- 1) session more litigation focused, but would like to see more ‘scientific focused’”

“The fourth speaker was absent and therefore an important subtopic was missed”

“Someone from AAAS Coalition to take notes on ideas, comment on what Coalition has done to address/answer/work on a specific question”

“Better understanding of goals”

“More discussion. Pathways to action for those in the audience too limited. This should be a major follow-up issue for AAAS”

“Need more practical brainstorming as to how to increase collaboration with HR organizations and scientists, what HR organizations need to know about scientists/scientific community to be more effective”

“More time to discuss”

“The presenters did not seem prepared for the session at all. The session was extremely short and almost immediately moved to questions. Lack of information”

“Great initial discussion, but would be good if more (potential) examples as to how the scientific community could provide their expertise to these organizations. (outside of stats, geography)”

“All speakers talked about science commissioned by HR groups. Add speakers of science initiated by scientists being brought to human rights”

## Area of Activity: Welfare of Scientists

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the Information	-	1	3	3	1	8	3.5
Quality of Presentations	-	1	3	2	2	8	3.6
Presentation format	-	1	3	3	1	8	3.5
Usefulness of materials	-	1	3	3	-	7	2.9
Likelihood of joining working group	2	2	1	2	1	8	2.8

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Discussion of what is already being done and what needs work or improvement”

“Helpful to learn what activities have been conducted to help scientists who are persecuted”

“Seeing what people asked about”

“Discussion on how to pitch this to our associations”

“Q & A”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“Very excited about prospects. Thanks”

“The politics can be complex so it was important to note that a boilerplate approach may not be successful”

“Don’t know”

“I did arrive 5 minutes late so may have missed what the goals were for the session”

## Area of Activity: Science Ethics and Human Rights

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	0	0	4	5	2	11	3.8
Quality of Presentations	0	0	4	5	2	11	3.8
Presentation format	0	1	6	4	0	11	3.3
Usefulness of materials	0	0	4	4	1	9	3
Likelihood of joining working group	2	1	2	1	0	6	1.3

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Some of the comments from the audience”

“Discussion”

“Information about history of codes of ethics. Poor organizations moving toward goals”

“Interacting”

“The follow-up discussion”

“Lots of good issues”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“More focus – It was too diffuse”

“Discuss specific case studies”

“Goals and objectives for leading discussion”

“More time”

“It’s complicated when there is such a large variation in the understanding of human rights, the doctrines and the vocabulary but; despite this, it has been [indecipherable word]”

“Within the time limit, I doubt there’s much you could improve. I want to make sure that someone from my organization is part of it”

## Area of Activity: Service to the Scientific Community

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	0	1	4	9	1	15	3.7
Quality of Presentations	0	1	4	7	3	15	3.8
Presentation format	0	1	4	7	3	15	3.8
Usefulness of materials	0	2	3	4	3	12	2.9
Likelihood of joining working group	2	2	4	3	1	12	2.9

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Breaking down into groups and having small group discussion”

“Open discussion”

“Not much”

“Interactivity”

“The small group discussion was excellent”

“Good format for discussion allowed better focus”

“Discussion”

“Small group discussion”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“It is very difficult to answer what scientific communities need to help human rights organizations without first establishing what responsibilities scientists have”

“More time”

“More examples”

## Area of Activity: Service to the Human Rights Community

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	-	1	5	5	1	12	3.5
Quality of Presentations	1	2	5	3	1	12	2.9
Presentation format	-	1	8	2	1	12	3.2
Usefulness of materials	-	2	3	5	3	13	4
Likelihood of joining working group	2	3	1	3	2	11	2.8

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“The amount of time that was given for discussion”

“Discussion about ethics of involvement in research for HR organizations”

“Relevant”

“Open discussion”

“Good discussion group”

“Good questions”

“Question and answer session”

“The discussion was lovely”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“Possibly having pre-planned points for discussion so that the discussion was used to accomplish a task”

“Allow more freedom to ask questions, the panelists wanted to get through their talks first – I prefer a more open forum”

“The intro presentations were a little piecemeal/sporadic could have been more informative up front”

“The presenters did not seem very prepared and mostly talked about a previous meeting”

“More examples”

“Presentations should have been more cognizant of audience”

“No opinion”

## Areas of Activity: Education and Information Resources

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	1	2	1	-	-	4	2
Quality of Presentations	1	2	1	-	-	4	2
Presentation format	1	2	1	-	-	4	2
Usefulness of materials	1	1	1	-	-	3	1.5
Likelihood of joining working group	1	1	1	1	-	4	2.5

### Comments

**Q: What did you like best about this session?**

“Good intentions but session never came together”

**Q: How could this session be improved?**

“Not fair test because of missing presenter”

“Session leader need[ed] to be [better] informed”

“Taking into consideration that the key speaker could not attend, the session was fair”

## Training: Article 15: The Right to the Benefits of Scientific Progress

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	-	-	2	4	7	13	4.4
Quality of Presentations	-	2	-	3	8	13	4.3
Usefulness of materials	-	-	2	4	7	13	4.4
Workshop format	-	-	2	5	6	13	4.3
Overall Usefulness	-	-	2	6	5	13	4.2
Interest in more training on topic	-	1	3	1	5	10	3.1

### Comments

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Good intentions but session never came together”

“The breakout was good idea to keep people engaged in the session”

“Small group discussion”

“The discussion”

“Background info”

“Structure, interactivity, info”

“Facilitator well prepared, knowledgeable, and flexible. Discussions excellent for both common sense and intellectual content”

“Interesting issues”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“I want more information on this and on Operational 1 Zing It!”

“Jessica did a good job responding to questions and preventing a derailment of the intended discussion”

“I think an introduction to Human Rights, the UNDHR, ICESCR, ICCPR etc would have been more useful as a full-group lecture earlier in the conference”

“Longer”

“More time spent on tools, less on theory”

“More time”

“No way in time frame”

“The moderator seemed not to want to acknowledge that there are fundamental complexities surrounding the notion of human rights”

## Training: Best-practices in Defending the Human Rights of Scientists

---

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very good (4)	Excellent (5)	Total	Average
Usefulness of the information	-	-	-	1	4	5	4.8
Quality of Presentations	-	-	-	-	5	5	5
Usefulness of materials	-	-	1	-	4	5	4.6
Workshop format	-	-	-	1	4	5	4.8
Overall Usefulness	-	-	-	1	4	5	4.8
Interest in more training on topic	-	-	1	-	4	5	4.6

### Comments

---

#### Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Outstanding presenters, interesting suggestions for how to engage in SAR [Scholars at Risk]-related activities”

“Information”

“The materials and recommendations for HR work were very specific and based on experience”

#### Q: How could this session be improved?

“I wish that more attendees had participated”