



AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

Meeting Report

July 26-27, 2010

Opening Plenary: Enjoying the Benefits of Scientific Progress	2
Business Meetings	3
Welcome	3
Coalition Council Report	4
Presenting the Joint Initiative Plan of Action	4
Planning Meeting for January 2011 Meeting	4
Sessions and Workshops	5
Engaging Your Organization in the Coalition: Opportunities and Obstacles	5
Human Rights and Professional Ethics: Developments and Dilemmas	6
Climate Change: Rights and Responsibilities	7
The Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights:	9
Progress and Problems	9
Defining the Right to Benefit from Scientific Progress: Scientists' Perspective	10
The Next Generation: Incorporating Human Rights into Science Curricula	10
Working Group Reports: Progress and Plans of Action	11
I. Welfare of Scientists	11
II. Science Ethics and Human Rights	15
III. Service to the Scientific Community	18
IV. Service to the Human Rights Community	21
V. Education and Information Resources	26
Appendix: Meeting Program	29
Appendix: Member and Affiliated Organizations	34
Appendix: Steering Committee (2010)	36
Appendix: Session Evaluations	37

Opening Plenary: Enjoying the Benefits of Scientific Progress: Access, Innovation and Impediments

The human right to the benefits of scientific progress (Article 15, International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights) is central to the work of the Science and Human Rights Coalition, explained **Jessica Wyndham** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program), opening the Coalition meeting. First internationally recognized in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the right remains largely undefined. Recently, however, increased attention has been paid to the right by: UNESCO, which has begun a process of promoting the right; by the AAAS Board of Directors, which adopted a Statement in April 2010 urging the scientific community to engage in the process of defining the right; and by the Coalition, which is committed to addressing the right as the focus of its Joint Initiative. The opening plenary, Wyndham suggested, presented an opportunity to broaden our understanding of not only the needs and challenges to access, of which the Coalition should be aware as it moves forward in its work, but also the options that can be pursued to address these needs and overcome barriers to access.

Audrey Chapman, of the University of Connecticut and former director of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Program, laid the framework for the discussion, asserting that science must be practiced in accordance with human rights principles and giving particular attention to the right to benefit from scientific progress. In outlining a human rights-based approach to science, Chapman argued that human dignity had to be respected as well as the principles of universality and equality, non-discrimination, and transparency and accountability in decision-making. Chapman urged that we measure progress not in the aggregate, but by disaggregating sectors of society so that we may clearly address discrepancies among vulnerable and disadvantaged groups, who are often left behind by medical and technological advances.

Ethan Guillen, of Universities Allied for Essential Medicines (UAEM), and **James Love**, of Knowledge Ecology International, continued the discussion with a focus on accessibility in medical treatment. Both panelists argued that the current model in which the price of medicine is directly linked to R&D expenses is unfeasible if we are to ensure access for the developing world. Love presented an alternative “cash prize” model for development, which he favors over the current model of patents that provide companies “the exclusive rights to sell products”. Under the cash prize system, governments would award drug developers money based on the nature and impact of their innovations, but not exclusive patents on their drugs. Love argues that this approach would sever the link between R&D costs and drug pricing, thus encouraging research on the less profitable drugs needed to combat diseases of the developing world.

Guillen argued that our current research and development model not only ignores the demand for developing world medicines but also “does not take adequate account of human rights”. He favors a system where universities pursue “global access licensing”, whereby medications that incorporate university research findings would be licensed “with a concrete and transparent strategy to ensure affordable access in developing countries”. Considering that over one-third of HIV/AIDS drugs incorporate university research, this licensing process would make a large number of such treatments affordable and accessible in the developing world. In response to a question about how global access licensing might impact the funding universities receive as a result of drug licensing, Guillen indicated that most universities make little if any profit from licensing, and many take a net loss on such research projects.

Gregg Alton, of Gilead Science, discussed a third model, which the pharmaceutical company has used to make HIV and other medications more readily available within the developing world. Despite adhering to the traditional R&D financing schemes practiced in the United States, Gilead has modified their licensing and pricing framework to provide drugs at reduced and not-for-profit prices in the developing world. Recognizing that “the standard commercial model of drug distribution does not work in regions where large numbers of patients cannot afford medications”, Gilead has partnered with companies in India and South Africa that, under non-exclusive licenses, produce generic drugs at reduced cost. Despite these efforts, medications are still too expensive for many patients, an audience member said, and asked if Gilead has considered partnering with the NGOs that currently provide (and pay for) medications in Uganda. In response, Alton cited Gilead’s current partnerships with Doctors Without Borders, the Clinton Foundation and the AIDS Healthcare Foundation.

Business Meetings

Welcome

Welcoming participants to the second day of the meeting, **Jessica Wyndham** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) highlighted the Coalition’s accomplishments of the past six months and highlighted a few challenges. She noted several completed and ongoing projects, including: an annotated list of associations working to protect the welfare of scientists, which will form the basis for an information-sharing network; the development of case studies demonstrating dilemmas in science ethics that may provide an opening for a science ethics-human rights framework; the development of a “Starter Kit” to promote association involvement in science and human rights; the drafting of “guidelines” to facilitate collaboration between scientists and human rights organizations; and the development of modules to introduce human rights into science curricula. In addition to these individual working group projects, Wyndham noted the commencement of the Article 15 Joint Initiative project. Before concluding, Wyndham called attention to two challenges the Coalition is currently facing: to increase working group and committee participation rates among existing Coalition membership and to diversify

membership to include more life, physical and engineering sciences. She welcomed suggestions and discussion toward overcoming these challenges.

Coalition Council Report

John Gillespie (American Physical Society) provided a summary of the Coalition Council Meeting held the preceding day. The Coalition currently comprises 28 member associations, 16 affiliated associations and 52 affiliated individual scientists. Gillespie addressed progress by the working groups and highlighted a revised resource list of organizations working to promote the welfare of scientists and a “Starter Kit” to facilitate engaging one’s organization in the Coalition. The Council also considered strategies to engage and recruit membership to the Coalition, with particular attention paid to opportunities for approaching new organizations in the life, physical and engineering sciences. Council members recommended calling on personal and professional contacts when recruiting new organizations, suggested that both membership and leadership would need to be engaged, and welcomed offers by current members to introduce their colleagues to the work of the Coalition.

Presenting the Joint Initiative Plan of Action

Jessica Wyndham (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) introduced the Joint Initiative Plan of Action (2009-2011), highlighting the significant developments that had occurred in the past year in the international and domestic context with regard to Article 15, including: the adoption of the *Venice Statement on the Right to Enjoy the Benefits of Scientific Progress and Its Applications* following the three-year UNESCO process, and the adoption of the AAAS Board of Directors Statement committing AAAS to engage the scientific community in the process of defining the right..

In presenting the document, Wyndham emphasized the importance for the scientific community to become engaged in the ongoing international process of defining this right, ensuring that the voices of scientists were represented in this process. To this end, the principal activities to be pursued by each working group are as follows: (1) A Guide: The Connection Between Scientific Freedom and Human Rights; (2) Article 15, Human Rights to Science Ethics: An Analysis; (3) Engaging Scientific Associations to Define Article 15; (4) Indicators: Measuring Compliance with Article 15; (5) A Primer: Options and Opportunities for Scientists to Use Article 15 in their Work. These activities will be completed by the end of 2011 when the Coalition will present its findings to the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and other relevant groups.

Planning Meeting for January 2011 Meeting

Clinton Anderson (American Psychological Association) led the discussion of the January 2011 Coalition Meeting. Topics including science diplomacy, climate change and a workshop on using human rights in a scientific career were proposed and discussed, along with ideas for broadening the reach of the Coalition. Members recommended engaging the scientific community in Article 15 as one way to publicize the work of the

Coalition, and also considered use of online media and social networking sites to promote science and human rights. Toward the objective of incorporating human rights in science curricula, members entertained the inclusion of student papers and/or poster sessions at future meetings. There was a general consensus that more time was needed to consider outreach strategies.

Sessions and Workshops

Engaging Your Organization in the Coalition: Opportunities and Obstacles

Panelists **Jerry Baker** (Sigma Xi), **Doug Richardson** (Association of American Geographers (AAG)), and **Ed Walsh** (Acoustical Society of America (ASA)), outlined the steps they have taken to engage their organizations in the Coalition, and discussed the techniques they found to be most successful. Panelist **Sam McFarland** (International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP)) addressed his organization's decision not to join the Coalition and what he sees as next steps to encourage engagement.

Overwhelmingly, the panelists found that having a mission statement directly or implicitly supportive of human rights facilitated involvement, and that joining the Coalition was rooted in both executive-level and member support of human rights issues. Sigma Xi and AAG have promoted mainstreaming of human rights within their organizations through emails, online discussion fora, and workshops at annual meetings. The ASA hosted a Special Session, "Science in the Service of Human Rights: Roles and Responsibilities of Scientists and Scientific Societies", at a recent meeting and is exploring the establishment of a formalized human rights presence in their organization.

Panelists discussed ways in which they have promoted not only the Coalition as an entity, but also the engagement of their membership in Coalition activities. Baker has charged delegates to find ways to promote science and human rights in their own chapters and to identify projects related to Coalition goals. He has also encouraged academic chapters to promote the inclusion of science and human rights in science curricula. Richardson recommended engaging society leadership in order to have a broader impact on the organization, such that human rights become a mainstream objective rather than a "ghetto-ized" section of the organization.

Walsh discussed his organization's participation as a Coalition affiliate, which "provides a platform for active but limited participation, allowing the organization to more thoroughly explore the opportunities for partnership and determine the course for further development of human rights activity with the ASA." At present, the ASA draws Coalition participation from its Panel on Public Policy (POP). Walsh noted that this limits member engagement to a small, but dedicated, group of individuals. He envisions that through their partnership with the Coalition, POP will be able to raise awareness of

human rights issues beyond POP membership and thus expand the relevance of science and human rights for the ASA community.

McFarland discussed ISPP's decision not to join the Coalition, and highlighted the objections he had received. Four primary concerns formed the basis of ISPP's decision not to join: many non-American members feared that the AAAS, an American association, would adopt "an American slant on human rights"; members were unclear on the purposes of the Coalition, despite attempts to clarify; many members feared that joining the Coalition would be the beginning of a "slippery slope" toward political activism; and several members feared that joining the Coalition would be divisive, and that the organization was too small to withstand such a divide. Despite the decision not to become a part of the Coalition, McFarland intends to raise science and human rights issues with interested ISPP members. He received audience encouragement to persevere.

Human Rights and Professional Ethics: Developments and Dilemmas

In this workshop on science ethics and human rights, panelists addressed the common philosophical threads between science ethics and human rights, the actual and potential integration of the two, and the dilemma of being beholden to two distinct codes of ethics. Examining the integration of human rights and science ethics, panelists considered the potential for human rights to guide ethical decisions proactively, rather than as a reaction to controversial ethical behavior. Panelists also addressed how human rights may disparately impact the behavior of societies, such as anthropology, with "aspirational" codes of ethics as compared with societies that employ enforceable codes of ethics, as are prevalent in the health professions.

Rob Albro (American Anthropological Association (AAA)) addressed the AAA's recently revised code of ethics and its review process. At present, the code is undergoing review in response to the involvement of anthropologists embedded in American military units in Iraq. Albro noted that these programs create a dual obligation for anthropologists, between the ethics of anthropology that obligate scholars to "do no harm", ensure "free and informed consent" and uphold transparency with regard to research and results, and the requirements imposed by American military strategy, in particular with regard to information deemed "classified".

Stephen Behnke (American Psychological Association (APA)) continued the discussion with case examples from the APA. In particular, Behnke addressed the significance of reactive, as opposed to proactive, integration of human rights into codes of ethics, with specific attention to the participation of psychologists in military interrogations. As a reaction to these interrogations, the APA revised its code of ethics to state "under no circumstances may [the code] be used to justify human rights violations." Behnke urged societies to begin proactively engaging human rights principles in discussions of ethics, recognizing the existing similarities between science ethics and human rights as well as the challenges of integrating the two.

Allen Keller (New York University (NYU)) closed the discussion arguing that human rights *are* professional ethics. Drawing from his experience working with Physicians for Human Rights (PHR) and the NYU Survivors of Torture Program, Keller argued that scientists are not only beholden to uphold human rights *per se*, but are also specially placed advocates for human rights, with “crucial voices as scientists”. He criticized the APA for, in his opinion, promoting the role of health professionals in interrogations; and applauded their current position in favor of withdrawing licenses from psychologists who participate in torture.

These comments began a lively discussion among the panelists regarding the ethical problems that arise when scientists are accountable to competing ethical obligations. The panelists expressed varying support for the role human rights can and should play in guiding the ethical resolution of future dilemmas, ranging from the incorporation of discipline-specific rights to the adherence to human rights principles generally. In response to a question from the audience, the panelists considered how enforceable codes of ethics, such as those for the health professions, may diverge from “aspirational” codes in upholding human rights protection within their disciplines. They reached no specific conclusion regarding the implications of this distinction.

Climate Change: Rights and Responsibilities

Lee Herring (American Sociological Association (ASA)) and Co-Chair of the Service to the Scientific Community Working Group introduced the panel discussion with a brief history of what he called “eco-cidal behavior”, the habit of humans over the ages polluting their natural environments. Shifting to the modern era, Herring highlighted the growing attention paid to global climate change that involves research from across the scientific disciplines. He underscored the relationship between climate change or “eco-cide” and human rights, recognizing the right to “an adequate or satisfactory environment”, and the “responsibility to protect and improve the environment for present and future generations.” The discussion among the panelists proceeded to encompass these rights, responsibilities and the role of technology and scientific innovation in promoting full enjoyment of environmental human rights.

John Knox (Wake Forest University) opened the discussion with a firm endorsement of the human rights framework for climate change. While he recognized the problematic lack of enforcement of climate change provisions, and the lack of an effective international human rights court, he argued that the legal duties established through human rights law and the international oversight of human rights compliance provide a needed forum where climate change policy can be discussed and where those affected by climate change can raise awareness of their situation. Knox stated, “Those trying to draw the attention of human rights bodies to climate change hope that by placing climate change in the framework of human rights, they will help us all to put a human face on climate change, and thereby change the urgency with which we do something about it.”

Roberta Cohen (Brookings Institution) followed Knox's presentation with a discussion of equity in the face of natural disasters. Referencing the tsunami of 2004-05, where three times as many women as men perished, and Hurricane Katrina, where the US government made no evacuation provisions for individuals without private vehicles, Cohen drew our attention to the inequities that are exacerbated by natural disasters. Although the United Nations will adopt new Operational Guidelines making "human rights the legal underpinning of all humanitarian work pertaining to disasters," Cohen reminded us of the challenges facing a human rights approach. She highlighted anticipated climate change issues, such as displacement due to drought or flood and loss of statehood should small island nations be submerged, affirming that "conceptual frameworks, legal standards and institutional arrangements are therefore needed to protect the rights of the environmentally displaced."

Peter Rosenblum (Columbia University) discussed the potential competition and counterproductive behaviors of the human rights and climate change agendas, despite a shared concern for the promotion of human dignity. A recent Columbia Law School study, "Climate Change and the Right to Food," calls for applying a human rights framework to climate change in order to safeguard the right to food and integrate the tools of both fields to better protect the world's poorest and most vulnerable who are likely to be most affected by climate change. Examining the right to food in the face of climate change, Rosenblum called for improved data collection and analysis of potential threats to this right, as well as the development of innovative solutions to protect food access in the face of climate change. He argued that a collaborative approach will provide human rights practitioners with the tools and knowledge of climate change to better protect human dignity, while the application of human rights to climate change will reduce inequities that result from lack of attention to vulnerable populations.

David Waskow (Oxfam America) reiterated Cohen's and Rosenblum's concern for the plight of the most vulnerable in the face of natural disasters and climate change. Waskow presented research depicting vulnerability to climate hazards as a matrix of socioeconomic factors and environmental risk, in which lower socioeconomic classes with higher environmental risks are most vulnerable. Based on these findings, Waskow argued for a system that prioritizes protection of vulnerable groups, particularly with regard to access to information and participation in climate decision-making.

During the Q&A session, panelists were asked about the role of scientists in engaging a human rights framework for climate change. Panelists stressed the role for scientists in effectively estimating the impact of climate change on humans and the need for scientists to develop and facilitate adaptations to a warming climate, such as the current project in the Maldives to build a sea wall around the most populous island.

The Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights: Progress and Problems

Set for 2015, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are a series of targets aimed at promoting poverty reduction, education, maternal health and gender equality, and combating child mortality, AIDS and other diseases. Though not specifically referenced in the MDGs, human rights provide a valuable framework for implementing and monitoring progress toward achieving them. This workshop brought together experts in development and human rights to discuss the status of the MDGs, the role for human rights and the role of science and technology in advancing these rights. The panelists underscored the need for improvement on maternal health and maternal morbidity rates, the need for clear accountability practices and the role science and technology can play in furthering progress toward MDGs.

Sarah Farnsworth (United Nations Development Program) and **Marianne Mollman** (Human Rights Watch) highlighted the need for improvement particularly in the area of maternal health. The panelists called for increased transparency in healthcare spending and policy in order to accomplish significant improvement in maternal health and reduce maternal mortality. Mollman labeled maternal health and mortality as both development and human rights concerns, and addressed how a human rights approach could bolster the policies needed to implement development goals. “Women’s dignity means a woman’s right to voluntary motherhood, to receive reproductive care, and to be educated about her health and rights,” said Mollman, “to uphold a woman’s right to a life of dignity also means to uphold her right to reproductive services.” She maintained that maternal mortality is an issue of inequality and lack of access to healthcare that is most prevalent in the developing world, but is also reflected in the US where women of color are disproportionately more likely to die during childbirth than are white women. Mollman called on scientists to advocate for a woman’s right to receive reproductive services and medical treatments, and urged the incorporation of scientific tools to measure progress toward improved maternal health and decreased maternal mortality.

Sakiko Fakuda-Parr (New School) devoted much of her discussion to the role for science and technology in promoting the Millennium Development Goals. Like Mollman and Farnsworth, she underscored the need for access—in this case, access to technologies and medicines that will improve compliance with the MDGs. Arguing that “developing technological solutions should be a priority,” she outlined the need to develop drought-resistant crops and medicines to combat developing world diseases, among others. While recognizing the merits of the MDGs as a measurement tool and for establishing a consensus on the need for poverty reduction, Fakuda-Parr drew attention to Goal 8, with no timeline or quantifiable targets, which calls for partnerships between the developing and developed world.

In the Q&A session that followed, attendees asked about the role of Article 15 (the right to benefit from scientific progress) in promoting MDGs and what recommendations the panelists had for the Coalition. The panelists concluded that Article 15 has not been used to promote access to technology and medical treatments, in part because member states

are reluctant to introduce human rights into the MDG discussion. With regard to the Coalition's role, panelists urged the scientific community to produce pro-poor technologies, such as affordable computers for the developing world and medications for developing world diseases. Looking beyond 2015, the panel envisioned the involvement of scientists in setting new goals and in encouraging the incorporation of evidence-based assessments of MDGs.

Defining the Right to Benefit from Scientific Progress: Scientists' Perspective

As part of the Coalition's Joint Initiative, the representatives of member and affiliated associations will be asked to work with their colleagues to define the right to the benefits of scientific progress as it relates to their discipline. **Jessica Wyndham** (AAAS Science and Human Rights Program) led this workshop aimed at providing participants with the knowledge and tools necessary to engage members of their discipline in such a process. The right includes various components, not only to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress but also the responsibility to conserve, develop and diffuse science, to respect the freedom indispensable for scientific research, and to encourage international contacts and cooperation. Participants considered the meaning of each component of the right, and the actions government could take to respect, protect and fulfill these rights. Following the workshop, several participants agreed to work with the Coalition and AAAS to engage their association and colleagues in this initiative.

The Next Generation: Incorporating Human Rights into Science Curricula

Allen Keller (New York University (NYU)) led a dynamic workshop focused on incorporating human rights into science curricula. Audience members provided examples from their own teaching experience and asked questions of Keller and fellow attendees regarding optimum methods for incorporating human rights content. There was a general consensus among participants that human rights provided an appealing inroad to encourage students to apply scientific principles to contemporary—perhaps even local—events. Keller strongly encouraged this style of teaching, whereby students learn to apply scientific and human rights principles to a particular case or problem. In Keller's example, students are provided a "human rights 101", and then presented with a case study that raises human rights issues. Students are asked to apply their knowledge of both human rights and their scientific discipline to the case study, identify human rights concerns and develop a plan of action to promote and protect human rights.

Working Group Reports: Progress and Plans of Action

I. Welfare of Scientists

Co-Chairs: **John Gillespie** (American Physical Society)
Brad Miller (American Chemical Society)

The Welfare of Scientists 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.

Progress

The working group identified the following priorities for 2009:

1. Compile a resource guide to assist scientific organizations in responding to situations of persecuted scientists.
2. Organize a one-day training session with Scholars at Risk on “Best Practices for Defending the Human Rights of Scientists.”

On January 21, 2010, the group hosted a training session on “Best Practices for Defending the Human Rights of Scientists.” The session was conducted by Scholars at Risk and attended by approximately twenty members of scientific societies and associations. The group has also updated a Resource List of organizations working on behalf of the welfare of scientists, providing a brief synopsis of each organization’s work on behalf of scientists, as well as direct links to websites and contact emails. The organizations included in the Resource List are scientific organizations with a committee or subgroup working on behalf of the human rights of scientists, as well as organizations that work across disciplines. The Resource List has a two-fold objective: to connect scientists in need of assistance with organizations that can support them, and to provide case examples of organizations protecting scientists’ human rights. In addition, the group anticipates developing a network among the existing members of the Resource List to promote “early detection” of scientists at risk and a forum for disseminating information about such cases. With the assistance of a Science and Human Rights Program intern, the group will solicit information from this network to develop a Resource Guide to assist scientific organizations in responding to situations of persecuted scientists. Pending Steering Committee approval, the updated list will be posted on the Coalition website and information about the List, its contents and function, will be disseminated via the network of involved organizations and through the Coalition and Science and Human Rights Program newsletters. Between Coalition meetings, this group communicates via email with limited member participation.

Concurrent Projects

The working group’s programmatic activities are carried out along two parallel tracks: pursuit of the Coalition’s overarching initiative and specialized area of activity projects. These activities are envisioned to be mutually supportive and reinforcing, with progress on one enhancing the likelihood of progress in another. The group is currently pursuing the following projects.

Connecting Article 15 and Scientific Freedom: A Guide

- Goal:** To encourage the human rights community to address scientific freedom as an issue of human rights, which is particularly relevant to the obligation on governments to “respect the freedom indispensable for scientific research” (Article 15(3)).
- Activity:** Identify scientific associations and human rights organizations with experience in addressing the welfare of scientists; conduct an analysis of existing and previous cases of persecuted scientists and scholars at risk; identify and research multiple cases to determine the human rights implications of restricting scientific freedom in each case; and work with scientific associations to identify positive examples of steps taken by governments to promote scientific freedom.
- Output:** A comprehensive and annotated list of ways scientific freedom is restricted in practice; multiple case studies demonstrating the human rights impact of restricting scientific freedom; multiple exemplars highlighting positive government measures that promote scientific freedom.

“Early Detection” Program

- Goal:** To establish relationships with human rights organizations that may receive early indications of threats to and the violation of the human rights of scientists.
- Activity:** Meet with human rights organizations in the DC area to discuss the role scientific organizations play in promoting and protecting the human rights of scientists. Create an open line of communication with these organizations to facilitate speedy updates on threats to and violations of scientists’ human rights, and encourage these human rights organizations to join the Network (below).
- Output:** Cases brought to the group’s attention via the “Early Detection” Program will be publicized through the Network (below).

Network: Shared Alerts

- Goal:** To increase awareness of current cases involving threats to and the violation of the human rights of scientists.
- Activity:** Group members, with the assistance of an AAAS intern, will elicit participation in a network alert system. This network will comprise

scientific associations and human rights organizations working on behalf of the human rights of scientists, as well as individual members of the working group. Operated as a listserv, the network will provide a venue for associations and organizations to communicate and collaborate on the protection of human rights of scientists. By sharing information, participants will ensure cases reach a broader community of activists and, thus, a broader base of support.

Output: A listserv incorporating members of the Resource List that will generate alerts and cross-dialogue on cases of abuse of human rights of scientists. The listserv will be advertised in the SHRP and Coalition newsletters.

“Successful Practices” Guide for Associations

Goal: To develop a resource document to assist associations working to protect the human rights of scientists.

Activity: Under the supervision of the working group, an AAAS intern will compile a set of case studies, resources and contacts relevant to the protection of the human rights of scientists. The intern will solicit the content from the organizations on the Resource List. The final product will address the multiple ways in which scientists’ human rights may be violated, complete with examples of successful protection, as well as specific contacts and resources, for each type of violation.

Output: The Guide will be made available on the Coalition Resources webpage, with periodic revisions to remain up-to-date.

Report from the July 2010 Working Group Meeting

Key Next Steps and Decisions Made:

Resource List: The Resource List has been approved by the Steering Committee and is live on the AAAS website as of August. Working group members committed to publicizing the List to their societies’ membership. Cook indicated the Committee of Concerned Scientists is preparing an article about the Resource List. To view the list, go to: http://shr.aas.org/coalition/AreasofActivity/Welfare_of_Scientists_orgs.shtml.

Network: Shared Alerts: On August 3rd, the group launched a social media site for individuals and organizations concerned about the human rights of scientists. Members of the Resource List have since been invited. The site is hosted by the American Chemical Society at: <https://communities.acs.org/groups/welfare-of-scientists>. For more information, visit www.acs.org/network or contact intlacts@acs.org.

The Joint Initiative: The group discussed identifying historical cases of violations of scientists’ human rights to provide examples of how Article 15 has not been respected. The work will be presented to the United Nations as examples of non-compliance with Article 15. Members have also committed to discussing Article 15 in their human rights-related correspondence and to begin an Article 15 discussion on the ACS Network.

New Ideas Generated During the Discussion:

Members proposed that a AAAS intern could be helpful in supporting the group's Joint Initiative project.

Additional Comments:

Many members of the working group were unaware of the AAAS Action Alert System that is still operational. They have now committed to remind colleagues that the system exists. It can be accessed from the Resource List or via <http://shr.aaas.org/actionalert/about.shtml>. Action Alerts are distributed through the listserv, and published on the Science and Human Rights Program website and in the bi-monthly newsletter.

Gillespie reported that the Committee of Concerned Scientists and Scholars at Risk have offered to share their information on human rights violations with the working group.

It was noted that the working group membership would benefit from a more diverse representation across the scientific disciplines.

II. Science Ethics and Human Rights

Chair: **Rob Albro** (American Anthropological Association)

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

Progress

The working group identified the following priorities for 2009:

1. Determine and assess the basic challenges of incorporating human rights into science ethics, as illustrated by a series of “case studies”
2. Produce a “landscape document” analyzing common themes in domestic and international codes of ethics, which will form the basis for a discussion of how to introduce human rights language into science ethics codes

Since July 2009, and with the assistance of an AAAS intern, the working group completed a survey of societies and associations that incorporate human rights language into their ethical framework, finding eight organizations that directly incorporate human rights into their ethical codes. The Group has analyzed these findings, and drafted and solicited three case studies highlighting the interaction of human rights with specific scientific associations’ ethical standards. Three case studies in anthropology, computer science and psychology are currently being drafted, and an additional three case studies are expected to pull from geography, intellectual property, medicine and/or weapons development. The group expects to have completed the analysis of codes of ethics and three case studies by the Coalition Meeting this July. Going forward, work will proceed on an additional three case studies and an associated guide for incorporating human rights into scientific codes of ethics. The group has established a googlegroup platform for sharing documents and members are currently working on various aspects of the landscape document and accompanying case studies.

Concurrent Projects

The working group’s programmatic activities are carried out along two parallel tracks: pursuit of the Coalition’s overarching initiative and specialized area of activity projects. These activities are envisioned to be mutually supportive and reinforcing, with progress on one enhancing the likelihood of progress in another. The group is currently pursuing the following projects.

Article 15, Human Rights and Science Ethics: An Analysis

- Goal:** To facilitate professional scientific associations in the United States draw more explicit links between international human rights principles and their own ethical frameworks for professional conduct
- Activities:** Survey and evaluate the current ethics codes of scientific associations in order to determine the presence/absence of elements of Article 15; together with the Education and Information Resources working group, identify potential doorways or locations in ethics codes for the introduction of Article 15, including taking into account disciplinary differences in ways leading to different strategies for different scientific associations
- Outputs:** A landscape document that compares international ethics instruments with domestic ethics codes, in terms of a series of particular ethics case studies, as a white paper that includes discussion of the current status of Article 15 in ethics codes; a case-driven panel at the biennial AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition meeting on the subject of the relevance and application of Article 15 across select scientific disciplines.

Landscape Document: A Tool for Identifying and Developing the Relationship between Science Ethics and Human Rights

- Goal:** To encourage scientific associations to incorporate human rights frameworks into their codes of ethics and disciplinary ethical discussions.
- Activity:** The Landscape Document will take shape in three parts, with a draft of the first two completed by the July, 2010 Coalition Meeting.
- Part I: A summary analysis of international human rights agreements as relevant to science ethics.
- Part II: A series of up to six case studies from a variety of scientific disciplines that address current trends in ethical debates, with attention to the role human rights has (or has not) played in the outcome.
- Part III: A discussion synthesizing the relationship between human rights and ethics, as outlined in Parts I and II, followed by a “toolkit” for approaching a scientific association about incorporating human rights into its code of ethics.
- Output:** A landscape document discussing human rights and science ethics, with emphasis on the role human rights can (and does) play in scientific associations’ codes of ethics, and recommendations for how to go about incorporating human rights more systematically into codes of ethical conduct. The document will be made available on the Coalition Resources website and publicized via the SHRP and Coalition newsletters.

Report from the July 2010 Working Group Meeting

Key Next Steps and Decisions Made:

The White Paper/Landscape Document: Group discussion raised questions regarding the applicability of human rights to all sciences, which led to a discussion of how case studies can reflect the discipline-specific applications. The White Paper is moving forward with the aim of having a near-final draft by September.

III. Service to the Scientific Community

Co-Chairs: **Clinton Anderson** (American Psychological Association)
Lee Herring (American Sociological Association)

The Service to the Scientific Community 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.

Progress

The working group identified the following priorities for 2009:

1. Develop a "Starter Packet" to support and promote organizations' commitments to human rights
2. Help scientists apply their disciplinary perspectives to human rights
3. Compile a list of annual meetings for 2010 and propose trainings or presentations at those meetings
4. Compile syllabi of science courses that incorporate human rights.*
5. Conduct a literature search and compile a bibliography.*

Since July 2009, the group has developed and finalized a "Starter Kit" that will be launched on the Science and Human Rights Coalition website and promoted at speaker events over the next year. The Starter Kit contains examples, suggestions and resources for organizations seeking to develop or expand their commitment to human rights. Moving forward, the group will work with a Science and Human Rights Program intern to develop a list of speakers, including members of the working group, who are available to address topics of interest to organizations that wish to expand their human rights work. This project will begin with a survey soliciting topics of interest from member organizations. Over the past year, attendance at meetings has generally been high and productive, but member involvement between meetings has been more difficult to solicit.

*Since July 2009 the Education and Information Resources Working Group have produced a compilation of syllabi and developed an annotated bibliography. As a result, these items have been removed from the priorities of the Service to the Scientific Community Working Group.

Concurrent Projects

The working group's programmatic activities are carried out along two parallel tracks: pursuit of the Coalition's overarching initiative and specialized area of activity projects. These activities are envisioned to be mutually supportive and reinforcing, with progress on one enhancing the likelihood of progress in another. The group is currently pursuing the following projects.

Engaging Scientific Associations to Define Article 15

- Goal:** To increase awareness of and engagement in Article 15 among the scientific community.
- Activities:** Analyze the *Venice Statement* to identify relevant content and messaging for outreach; develop information materials on Article 15 for conducting outreach to scientific associations; work with scientific associations to bring Article 15 to the attention of their members; conduct targeted outreach to the scientific associations represented in the working group and Coalition and engage their governance and special interest groups to determine the meaning of Article 15 in the context of each discipline
- Outputs:** Information packet about Article 15 and the activities of the working group to be used in outreach to the scientific community; news article template about Article 15 and the activities of the working group for members to use in outreach to their associations; report on scientific associations' recommendations concerning the application of Article 15 to specific science disciplines.

Starter Kit: Finishing and Publicizing

- Goal:** To complete and publicize the Starter Kit, a tool to help scientific organizations become (more) involved in human rights activities.
- Activity:** With the assistance of AAAS, design a PDF and html version of the Starter Kit. Develop a marketing strategy for disseminating and promoting the use of the tool.
- Output:** A Starter Kit that can be navigated online or printed, and accompanying marketing materials, will be made available via the Coalition Resources webpage. The Kit and/or marketing materials will also be available at presentations and workshops of scientific organizations interested in beginning or increasing their human rights activities (below).

Survey of Needs and Interests of Scientific Societies

- Goal:** To elicit information from scientific societies regarding the types of human rights presentations and workshops that would be of most use and interest to their members.
- Activity:** Develop an online survey to poll scientific societies about their interest in human rights work and the programs that would most help them become (more) involved. The survey is intended to provide information for the development of relevant presentations and workshops for scientific associations (below).
- Output:** A set of data, derived from the online survey, to prompt development of workshops and presentations for scientific societies interested in becoming more involved in human rights.

Presentations and Workshops for Scientific Societies

- Goal:** To develop and deliver a series of workshops to scientific societies interested in beginning or expanding their human rights commitment.
- Activity:** Based on the above survey, frame a series of presentations that can be delivered to interested scientific societies. With AAAS support, develop a series of stock PowerPoint slides that may be modified for a variety of presentations. Compile a roster of speakers, principally from among working group members, who are available to deliver presentations to interested scientific societies.
- Output:** Presentations and workshops for scientific societies, and template PowerPoint slides for use by working group members and others. The availability of speakers and resources, as well as the variety of topics addressed, will be advertised on the Coalition website, through the SHRP mailing list and via personal contacts.

Report from the July 2010 Working Group Meeting

Key Next Steps and Decisions Made:

The Starter Kit: The group is awaiting web and paper-based design information, and will then proceed to publish the Starter Kit. Additions will include: how to contact the Coalition and how to submit feedback on the Kit.

The Joint Initiative: The group is moving forward with a letter from AAAS soliciting associations' input on Article 15.

Key Questions:

The Working Group has been largely focused on the basic information document and the Article 15 initiative. How we now begin to act on the broader mission of the Working Group?

New Ideas Generated During the Discussion:

The group discussed ideas for the Survey and Presentations projects (see "Concurrent Projects", above).

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 in efforts to advance human rights.

Progress

The working group identified the following priorities for 2009:

1. Begin documenting how scientific associations provide services to the human rights community*
2. Open a dialogue with human rights organizations concerning their science and technology needs
3. Make a short presentation at the AAAS meeting in February 2010
4. Begin defining “Guidelines” for scientists working with human rights, in order to better prepare scientists for working with non-science organizations and in particular human rights organizations.

Since July 2009, the group has laid the framework for a set of Guidelines aimed at facilitating collaborations between scientists and human rights organizations. In late June, a subset of the working group met with “on-call” scientists and members of the human rights community to discuss the proposed content of the Guidelines. In addition to the Guidelines, working group members have reached out to personal contacts within human rights groups for the purpose of developing a dialogue with the human rights community concerning their needs, and the potential role and function of scientists. Drawing from these discussions, and with the assistance of AAAS Science and Human Rights Program staff and interns, the group will proceed to establish participatory “clinics” in which human rights organizations and scientists will meet to identify human rights projects that could benefit from scientific expertise. This group operates under the leadership of three co-chairs who are each responsible for one area of the working groups’ activities.

*Since July 2009 the Education and Information Resources Working Group has produced a set of case studies illustrating how scientific associations provide services to the human rights community. As a result, this item has been removed from the priorities of the Service to the Human Rights Community Working Group.

Concurrent Projects

The working group's programmatic activities are carried out along two parallel tracks: pursuit of the Coalition's overarching initiative and specialized area of activity projects. These activities are envisioned to be mutually supportive and reinforcing, with progress on one enhancing the likelihood of progress in another. The group is currently pursuing the following projects.

Indicators: Measuring Compliance with Article 15

- Goal:** To develop a guide to assist human rights organizations monitor and track how well a government is meeting its obligations under Article 15.
- Activities:** Conduct research concerning current evaluation techniques relevant to economic, social, and cultural rights; coordinate with the Service to the Scientific Community working group to select several indicators, of different types, to focus on "how" to evaluate progress towards compliance with Article 15; investigate available data sources and develop potential measures; demonstrate application of metrics with reference to select indicators.
- Outputs:** List of indicators by which to measure implementation of Article 15; analysis of data sources and data needs to effectively apply indicators; identification of barriers to collecting data relevant to applying indicators; analysis of US progress towards realizing Article 15 with reference to select indicators.

Guidelines for Scientists Working with Human Rights Organizations

- Goal:** To produce a set of guidelines to facilitate and promote cooperation between scientists and human rights organizations.
- Activity:** Work in conjunction with members of the human rights community and "On-Call" Scientists to develop a guide to facilitate the collaboration between scientists and human rights organizations, and promote greater involvement of scientists with human rights work. Drawing on prior experience of collaborating scientists and human rights organizations, the document will address the unique role science and scientists can play in human rights work and set out how to build a strong working relationship and manage expectations of both parties.
- Output:** The final 15-20 page Guidelines will be made available via the Coalition website and directly publicized through human rights clinics (see below) and AAAS's "On-Call" Scientists program.

Clinics to Connect Scientists and Human Rights Organizations

- Goal:** To engage scientists and human rights organizations in a constructive dialogue aimed at identifying specific opportunities for scientists to

- contribute to the organizations' work and facilitating partnerships between scientists and the organizations.
- Activity: Engage human rights organizations in an informal process to identify those organizations that may benefit from the contribution of a scientist. Invite each organization to take part in a 1-2 hour discussion (Clinic) with an interdisciplinary team of 2 or 3 scientists to develop specific recommendations for how scientific assistance may benefit the human rights organization's work. In collaboration with AAAS's "On-call" Scientists program, facilitate the development of partnerships between the human rights organizations and scientists. Monitor and evaluate the effectiveness of the Clinics as a mechanism for facilitating the application of scientific techniques and methodologies to human rights work.
- Output: The first Clinic is expected to take place in August or September, 2010, with subsequent clinics every 2-3 months. Reports of successful pairings from a Clinic will be posted on the Coalition and/or "On-Call" Scientists webpage, to encourage future participation by other human rights organizations and scientists. Opportunities for publishing the impact of the Clinics, including within widely circulated human rights publications, will be pursued.

Short Questionnaire to Assess a Human Rights Organization's Needs

- Goal: Resources permitting, to research and develop a short questionnaire to assist human rights organizations in assessing their scientific needs.
- Activity: Conduct a feasibility assessment, through work with Clinic participants. If it is agreed that a survey is feasible and beneficial, develop a survey to assist human rights groups in determining whether and how a scientific expert may be able to contribute to their work. The survey will be based on preliminary research of Clinic participants, as well as Clinic discussions and feedback from both scientists and human rights organizations. Modifications and additions to the survey are expected as the group receives more feedback from Clinic participants.
- Output: The survey will be made available online via the Coalition webpage, and may be sent to potential clinic participants to solicit preliminary information. The survey will also be provided to AAAS for distribution to a global network of human rights organization, to encourage greater participation by human rights organizations in the "On-call" Scientists program.

Guide for Publishing in Human Rights Journals

- Goal: Resources permitting, to research and develop a guide for scientists publishing in human rights journals. The guide would be accompanied by an informational handout or article encouraging such publications.
- Activity: Conduct a feasibility assessment, through dialogue with scientists who have already published in human rights journals and/or have worked on

human rights projects. Elicit feedback on the process of publishing in human rights journals or, if such publications have not been attempted, the reasons for which scientists are reluctant to publish in human rights journals. If it is agreed that a guide is feasible and would encourage and facilitate scientific publications in human rights journals, a guide will be developed based on input from scientists, science editors, human rights publishers and human rights practitioners.

Output: A short online guide for scientists interested in publishing in human rights journals will be available online and will be circulated via Coalition members and “On-Call” Scientists.

Report from the July 2010 Working Group Meeting

Key Next Steps and Decisions Made:

The Guidelines: feedback from the working group meeting was mixed, but specific recommendations were in keeping with the intent of the Guidelines. The project is anticipated to be at least 50% complete by the January Coalition meeting. Mandy Sozer will schedule the next Guidelines call for September, with an aim to review written content in October.

The Clinics: are moving forward with an anticipated Clinic in mid-September with the American Friends Service Committee. Oliver Moles has been in contact with Friends and will work with Susan Hinkins, Patricia Van Arnum and Jen Makrides to bring about the first Clinic. The group will begin soliciting future Clinic participants in August.

The Guidelines for Publishing in Human Rights Journals: the group expressed very little enthusiasm toward this project, and suggested we may wish to consider relevant newsletters and on-line publications over peer-reviewed journals.

The Joint Initiative: there was a very spirited and helpful discussion around the difficulty of trying to develop measures of an as yet undefined right. Sakiko Fukuda-Parr joined the session and her insights were very helpful. The suggestion made was to look at the right to the benefit of science from the perspective of health and attempt to first define one or two examples of ‘what’ to measure in order to begin work on ‘how’ to measure. Brian Gran is leading this task and Susan Hinkins is helping. The focus at the moment is trying to identify one or two reasonable examples of ‘what’ to measure in order to move forward and elicit other members’ participation.

New Ideas Generated During the Discussion:

Transform the suggested *Guidelines for Publishing* in peer-reviewed human rights journals into a guideline for publishing in newsletters and other mediums that do not require peer review.

The work that hopefully will occur on the issue of measurements undertaken for the Joint Initiative is an area that this working group could continue and expand on for improving indicators and measurements for other rights --- a thought for sometime in the future.

Additional Comments:

The additional time for the meeting, compared to last time, was much appreciated. We still had difficulty finishing on time but I believe that the discussion was running out of steam by the end of 90 minutes -- we would not have made much further advancements with more time.

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 is devoted to identifying, compiling and developing resources and creating opportunities for exchange to establish a stronger foundation for productive, and collaborative between the scientific and human rights communities.

Progress

The working group identified the following priorities for 2009:

1. Develop a series of case studies that describe ongoing collaborations between science and human rights organizations
2. Compile a representational, searchable bibliography on science and human rights
3. Survey Coalition members, AAAS affiliates and human rights organizations to determine the information resources they would find most useful
4. Solicit input and materials, research existing models and develop human rights modules for science curricula
5. Compile a list of science and human rights activities within the United States and abroad for distribution to Coalition members, including workshops, conferences, and webinars.

Since July 2009, the group has developed a searchable database of materials on science and human rights, and posted the following resources on the Coalition website: an annotated bibliography based on related materials, eight case studies of scientists working with human rights groups, and a list of 67 syllabi and three training modules integrating human rights and a wide variety of general and discipline-specific science curricula. The syllabi list and bibliography were compiled with the assistance of a Science and Human Rights Program intern. The group anticipates updating these materials on a regular basis. This group has also researched science funding opportunities that incorporate human rights criteria into their grant requirements, and will move forward with a campaign to increase the number of grants that incorporate explicit reference to human rights standards. This group has had moderate success inviting members to join a googlegroup listserv to facilitate discussion and collaboration. They have requested assistance in promoting the listserv group membership and in investigating other technologies for online networking.

Concurrent Projects

The working group's programmatic activities are carried out along two parallel tracks: pursuit of the Coalition's overarching initiative and specialized area of activity projects. These activities are envisioned to be mutually supportive and reinforcing, with progress on one enhancing the likelihood of progress in another. The group is currently pursuing the following projects.

A Primer: Options and Opportunities for Scientists to Use Article 15

- Goal:** To facilitate and encourage scientists and scientific associations to incorporate the right into their education, research and policy activities.
- Activities:** Conduct focus groups to identify potential applications of Article 15, including in the areas of equitable access to science, science education, funding for R&D, international cooperation, and the rights of scientists; based on the outcome of the focus groups, develop a primer outlining the content and significance of Article 15, and detailing examples of how scientists can use and apply Article 15 in their work.
- Output:** A practical online guide for incorporating Article 15 into the daily practices of scientists who may be employed among a variety of institutions.

Web-based resource list of potential funding sources for science and human rights projects

- Goal:** To promote greater funding opportunities for science and human rights projects.
- Activity:** Review the grant requirements of science funding agencies, and compile a list of those agencies that offer funding of potential relevance for science and human rights projects and programs. Once the initial review is completed, the group will explore options to encourage the greater provision of funds projects at the intersection of science and human rights.
- Output:** A detailed list of funding opportunities for science and human rights projects will be made available online as part of the Coalition Resources, and will be updated on a regular basis.

Human Rights Modules for Science Curricula

- Goal:** To develop flexible human rights modules for incorporation into university-level science curricula.
- Activity:** 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 2011. 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.

Report from the July 2010 Working Group Meeting

Key Next Steps and Decisions Made:

Modules: The group is proceeding with the modules and will meet with SHRP staff and an advisory committee (TBD) to discuss the format and development of the modules. At present, the predicted structure includes background reading, a case study for discussion, and relevant discussion questions.

Key Questions:

Should we look toward growing the group and/or general Coalition membership?

Appendix: Meeting Program

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

26-27 July 2010
Washington, DC

Monday, July 26

5:00pm Registration

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

Panel: **Enjoying the Benefits of Scientific Progress: Access, Innovation and Impediments**

Scientific advances have brought progress and prosperity to many societies. Yet, at the same time, access to essential medicines, potable water, basic sanitation and other benefits of science remain illusive for many vulnerable and marginalized populations. Enjoying the benefits of scientific progress is a human right, the practical realization of which will require a reconsideration of incentive mechanisms for innovation, a commitment to removing barriers to access, and pro-active approaches to bringing the benefits of science to remote and impoverished communities. This panel will canvass a number of innovative strategies that have been proposed, and in some cases implemented, to give marginalized persons access to the benefits of scientific progress.

Panelists: **Gregg Alton**, Gilead
Audrey Chapman, University of Connecticut
Ethan Guillen, Universities Allied for Essential Medicines
James Love, Knowledge Ecology International

Facilitator: **Jessica M. Wyndham**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

7:00 - **Reception** *2nd Floor Reception*
8:00

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition thanks the
Association of American Geographers,
the Federation of Associations in Brain & Behavioral Sciences
and
Kean University, College of Natural, Applied and Health Sciences
for their sponsorship of the reception

Tuesday, July 27

8:45 am Plenary *Auditorium*

Welcome

Jessica M. Wyndham, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

Coalition Council Report

John Gillespie, American Physical Society

Presenting the Joint Initiative Plan of Action

Jessica M. Wyndham, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

9:15 Workshops (concurrent)

“Engaging Your Organization in the Coalition: Opportunities and Obstacles” *Revelle*

Through the efforts of scientific organizations’ members and staff, membership in the Coalition has more than doubled since January 2009, and organizations’ human rights activities continue to expand. Based on the lessons learnt in the past year-and-a-half of the Coalition’s existence, this workshop will prepare participants for the questions asked, concerns raised, and options available for getting their association involved in the Coalition and human rights activities. Each participant will receive a “Starter Kit” to assist in following-up from the workshop.

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

Presenters: **Jerry Baker**, Sigma Xi
Sam McFarland, International Society of Political Psychology
Doug Richardson, Association of American Geographers
Edward Walsh, Acoustical Society of America

“Human Rights and Professional Ethics: Developments and Dilemmas” *Haskins*

Scientists and academics have a history of supporting many of the core principles of human rights as intrinsic values to the scientific endeavor. However, a review of scientific associations’ codes of ethics reveals that only eight explicitly mention human rights. This session will highlight the relevance of human rights to questions of science ethics, address recent developments in the incorporation of human rights into professional ethics codes, and identify persisting challenges in linking human rights with standards of professional conduct.

Facilitator: **Debra Mathews**, Johns Hopkins, Berman Institute of Bioethics

Presenters: **Rob Albro**, American Anthropological Association
Stephen H. Behnke, American Psychological Association
Allen Keller, New York University

10:30 Break

11:00 **Areas of Activity: Working Group Meetings (concurrent)**

In keeping with the Coalition's commitment to action and measurable outcomes, Coalition members and affiliates are required to contribute to one of five working groups. Through these meetings, working groups will take stock of progress made and, together with new and potential members, will continue work toward their objectives for 2010.

Welfare of Scientists *Room 207*

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: **John Gillespie**, American Physical Society
Brad Miller, American Chemical Society

Science Ethics and Human Rights *Abelson*

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

Co-chairs: **Rob Albro**, American Anthropological Association

Service to the Scientific Community *Haskins*

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

Co-chairs: **Clinton Anderson**, American Psychological Association
Lee Herring, American Sociological Association

Service to the Human Rights Community *Revelle*

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

Chair: **Brian Gran**, American Sociological Association
Susan Hinkins, American Statistical Association
Amanda Sozer, Affiliated Scientist

Education and Information Resources *Room 700*

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

Co-chairs: **Judith Blau**, Sociologists Without Borders
Amy Crumpton, Affiliated Scientist

Jeffrey Toney, Sigma Xi

12:30 Lunch

1:15 **Areas of Activity: Working Group Reports-back** Auditorium

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

Facilitator: **Jessica M. Wyndham**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

1:45 **Planning Meeting for January 2011 Meeting** Auditorium

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

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

2:15 **Sessions (concurrent)**

“Climate Change: Rights and Responsibilities” Revelle

The links between climate change and human rights are evident. From threats to livelihoods to rising sea levels, mass migration to reduced food supplies, climate change threatens the enjoyment of human rights by individuals and communities globally. What is more, the human rights framework will be helpful in approaching and managing climate change. This panel will explore several of the key human rights implications of climate change and outline the value of a human rights-based approach to addressing the causes and impact of climate change.

Facilitator: **Lee Herring**, American Sociological Association

Presenters: **Roberta Cohen**, Brookings Institution
John Knox, Wake Forest University
Peter Rosenblum, Columbia University
David Waskow, Oxfam America

“The Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights: Progress and Problems” Haskins

Set for 2015, the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are a series of targets aimed at promoting poverty reduction, education, maternal health, gender equality, and combating child mortality, AIDS and other diseases. Though not specifically referenced in the MDGs, human rights provide a valuable framework for implementing and monitoring progress toward achieving them. This workshop will address progress made and challenges in

achieving the MDGs from a human rights perspective, with a particular focus on science and technology, health, food, and water.

Facilitator: **Brian Gran**, Case Western Reserve University

Presenters: **Sarah Farnsworth**, United Nations Development Program
Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, New School
Marianne Mollmann, Human Rights Watch

3:45 Break

4:15 **Workshops (concurrent)**

“Defining the Right to Benefit from Scientific Progress: Scientists’ Perspective” *Revelle*

On April 16, 2010 the AAAS Board of Directors called on the scientific community to add their “voice, interests and concerns” to the process of defining the right to benefit from scientific progress. This workshop will provide participants with the knowledge and tools necessary to engage their colleagues, associations, and departments in the process of defining the right and identifying how best to implement it in practice. Participants with prior training in the right to benefit from scientific progress are encouraged to attend.

Facilitator: **Jessica M. Wyndham**, AAAS Science and Human Rights Program

“The Next Generation: Incorporating Human Rights into Science Curricula” *Haskins*

Across campuses in the United States and beyond, there is an increase in the number of professors seeking to incorporate human rights into their science curricula, whether in the life, physical, social or behavioral sciences. Based on decades of experience in promoting understanding and application of human rights principles, this workshop will provide participants with the basic tools necessary to develop an effective and comprehensive human rights module for inclusion in science curricula.

Trainer: **Allen Keller**, New York University

5:45 **Meeting Adjourns**

Appendix: Member and Affiliated Organizations (as of July 1, 2010)

Member Organizations

American Anthropological Association
American Educational Research Association
American Historical Association
American Industrial Hygiene Association
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 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 52 Affiliated Scientists.

Appendix: Steering Committee (2010)

- **Rob Albro**
American Anthropological Association
robert.albro@verizon.net
Chair, Science Ethics and Human Rights Working Group

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

- **John Gillespie**
American Physical Society
gillespie.jr@gmail.com
Co-Chair, Welfare of Scientists Working Group

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

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

- **Jeffrey Toney**
Sigma Xi
jetoney@kean.edu
Co-Chair, Education and Information Resources Working Group

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

Appendix: Session Evaluations*

Opening Plenary: Enjoying the Benefits of Scientific Progress

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	1	6	3	4.20
Choice of Presenters	-	1	3	5	1	3.60
Quality of Presentations	-	-	6	2	1	3.44
Session Format	1	-	4	3	2	3.50
Overall Usefulness	-	1	3	4	1	3.56

Attendance: 68

Evaluations: 10

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Audrey Chapman's presentation.”

“Hearing from organizations that I had no knowledge of.”

“It was nice to have a topical plenary but at the same time this was less interesting to me as a non-medical scientist.”

“The variety of speakers- a good mix.”

“The discussion of ways to reduce costs and inaccessibility of patented medicines.”

“Gilead: viable model as a real example and the hope that it provides.”

Q: How can we improve future sessions?

“The participants need to be given much more time for them to be an invaluable asset to the session.”

“Perhaps a more generalized plenary next time.”

“Consider broadening beyond drugs.”

“More of the above [see Gilead comment above]”

“Schedule Plenary in a manner that will encourage dialogue- when the last speaker stops seven minutes before the scheduled end of the session it puts a real chill on the dialogue. Try fewer speakers.”

* In some instances the evaluations have been edited.

Session: Human Rights and Professional Ethics - Developments and Dilemmas

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	1	5	7	4.46
Choice of Presenters	-	-	2	5	7	4.36
Quality of Presentations	-	1	2	5	6	4.14
Session Format	1	1	1	6	4	4.46
Overall Usefulness	-	2	1	5	5	4.00
Attendance: 28		Evaluations: 14				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Torture and licensure are in a category of their own- most scholarly ethics guides are aspirational and enforceable through moral suasion—this is a more typical matrix and should have more focus.”

“Detailed information of associations’ activities.”

“I appreciated the discussion of torture, the attempts of societies to address the problem.”

“The topics: human terrain-mapping and interrogations.”

“The topic is of utmost importance- Keller was especially good.”

“Presentations by Keller and Behnke.”

“Presenters offered range of perspectives.”

Q: How can we improve future sessions?

“More time for discussions/questions.”

“More careful analysis of the ethical issues.”

“Did not deal with problems that, eg physical science would have, they view human rights issues as relevant to them only if members of their disciplines are involved.”

“The layout of chairs blocked view of speakers.”

“Almost all sessions seem designed to discourage conversations. In this session the last speaker stopped 35 seconds before the scheduled end of the session- that chills dialogue.”

“Summaries and copies of the slides would be helpful.”

Session: Engaging your Organization in the Coalition

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	1	2	3	4.33
Choice of Presenters	-	-	3	-	3	4.00
Quality of Presentations	-	-	3	2	1	3.67
Session Format	-	-	1	1	4	4.50
Overall Usefulness	-	-	2	1	3	4.17
Attendance: 19			Evaluations: 6			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“The choice of presenters, but more importantly the high level of participant involvement.”

“I enjoyed learning about the effective strategies for engaging the leadership within a scientific society to mainstream human rights.”

“Candid presentations. Lots of practical useful info.”

“The candid presentations of opportunities and obstacles in considering engagement of the Science and Human Rights Coalition and sustaining engagement.”

“Hearing the ‘nonsuccess’ story from International Society of Political Psychology.”

Q: How can we improve future sessions?

“More specific examples of how scientific organizations address human rights within the USA.”

“Perhaps a commentator might draw summary lessons or stages by which organizations might evolve.”

“A more diverse representation of societies (discipline and representation).”

“Break down of participants to share in the deliberations.”

Session: Climate Change - Rights and Responsibilities

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	1	5	10	4.56
Choice of Presenters	-	-	2	5	9	4.44
Quality of Presentations	-	1	3	4	8	4.19
Session Format	1	-	1	6	8	4.25
Overall Usefulness	-	-	4	4	8	4.25
Attendance: 25		Evaluations: 16				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this session?

“Fantastic.”

“Very timely.”

“Great session.”

“Topic.”

“Knox’s, Rosenblum’s and Cohen’s presentations were outstanding. They raised important issues very effectively.”

“Panel presentation, many different individuals.”

“The emphasis on the variation of effects by communities.”

Q: How can we improve future sessions?

“Some specific cases/examples of where climate change scientists and human rights practitioners are working together.”

“More on the responsibility of scientists to help out.”

“As in other cases, schedule fewer speakers and allow time for dialogue.”

“I’d like more focus on science- all spoke from a human rights perspective and incorporated climate change. I would like to see someone speak from a climate science [perspective] and include human rights. I didn’t see enough science or technical information - a two-sided issue seen only from 1 side.”

Session: The Millennium Development Goals and Human Rights

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Session Topic	-	-	3	2	11	4.5
Choice of Presenters	-	-	3.5	6.5	6	4.16
Quality of Presentations	-	2	4	6	4	3.75
Session Format	-	3	1	7	5	3.88
Overall Usefulness	-	1	3	6	6	4.06
Attendance: 27		Evaluations: 16				

Comments

Q: What did you like best about the session?

“Excellent panel.”

“Great presentations.”

“Discussion about human right underpinnings of the Millennium Development Goals.”

“Wealth of information, candid comments by presenters.”

“Focus on a specific human right-women's maternal health, poverty.”

“Panelist with on-the-ground perspective (Mollmann, Human Rights Watch).”

“The diverse perspectives- pro/con.”

“Discussion and comments from the audience.”

Q: How can we improve future sessions?

“Different room arrangement. Chairs and walkways are poor.”

“Can a scientist (statistician) be added to such a panel to exemplify their role?”

“Needs to be more structured, more science based.”

“More discussion of S&T application. It became more about human rights and whether MDGs are working or not, but missed the main point (how S&T is involved).”

“Make a connection to the work of the Coalition and the topic -in the morning.”

“Balance the gender of the presenters.”

“Ask presenters to specifically address science and human rights (with a human rights framework) and the role of scientists, academic institutions and societies.”

Workshop: Defining the Right to Benefit from Scientific Progress - Scientists' Perspective

	Poor	Fair	Good	Very Good	Excellent	Average
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	
Usefulness of the information	-	-	2	4	8	4.43
Quality of the presentation	-	-	3	5	6	4.21
Usefulness of the materials	-	-	2	5	7	4.36
Workshop Format	-	-	1	7	6	4.36
Overall usefulness	-	-	2	5	7	4.36
Attendance: 20			Evaluations: 14			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this workshop?

“My group of 3.”

“Collaborations, exchange of ideas.”

“Challenging questions/ Interesting discussion opportunity to learn how to move forward on this topic.”

“The factual information paired with interactive discussion.”

“Presentation.”

“Having to participate.”

“Engaged audience.”

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

“NA.”

“Don’t know.”

Workshop: The Next Generation - Incorporating Human Rights into Science Curricula

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	Average
Usefulness of the information	-	-	-	5	6	4.55
Quality of the presentation	-	-	-	2	8	4.80
Usefulness of the materials	-	-	1	4	5	4.40
Workshop Format	-	-	1	2	8	4.64
Overall usefulness	-	-	2	3.5	5.5	4.32
Interest in more workshops on this topic	-	-	-	1	8	4.89
Attendance: 21			Evaluations: 11			

Comments

Q: What did you like best about this workshop?

“Very practically based, engaging, interactive/ best presentation of the day- great way to end a conference!”

“Keller was wonderfully effective in eliciting and developing ideas through involvement of the group in ongoing dialogue.”

“Exploring ethical/ human rights issues.”

“Engaging speaker, great interaction between presenter and participants.”

“Very inspirational presentation- Dynamic, encouraged participation and sharing of experiences.”

“Covering the most basic info that will need to be presented in a class.”

“Good presentation and discussion.”

“Interactive aspects.”

Q: How can we improve future working group meetings?

“Several presenters.”

“While audience participation can be good, too much of it can keep the session from covering much information or they can get stuck on their own topics of interest.”