



ADVANCING SCIENCE, SERVING SOCIETY

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

Meeting Report July 17, 2012

[View Meeting Agenda](#)

This meeting of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition focused on the ways human rights intersect with the technological applications of science and engineering. Innovative uses of science and technology are reducing the digital divide, enhancing human rights online, and advancing access to medicines, clean water, education and more. Some of these advances, however, present challenges of professional responsibility for scientists, engineers and health professionals. What are the emerging opportunities to use technology and engineering to address human rights concerns? How does the “right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications” help frame these issues? How can educators prepare students to use a human rights-based approach in their work? By exploring these questions, the aim of this meeting was to develop a better shared understanding of ways the scientific and engineering communities can tackle these issues in the future.

Table of Contents

Contents

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition: The Next Frontier.....	4
Morning Plenary Session: Advancing the Right to Development through Science and Technology.....	5
Business Meeting: Technology for Human Rights: Volunteer Opportunities	7
Workshop on the Human Right to Clean Water and Sanitation	8
Workshop on Engaging Your Society in Human Rights	10
Workshop on Building the Next Generation of Socially Responsible Innovators: Integrating Human Rights in Technology & Engineering Curricula	11
Closing Panel: Technology, Human Rights and Professional Responsibility	12
Working Group Report: Welfare of Scientists.....	14
Working Group Report: Ethics and Human Rights	15
Working Group Report: Service to the STEM Community.....	17
Working Group Report: Service to the Human Rights Community	19
Working Group Report: Education and Information Resources.....	21
Committee Report: Communication and Outreach.....	24
Appendix: Session Evaluations.....	26
Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations	32

Acknowledgements

The [AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition](#) is a network of scientific and engineering associations, professional societies, academies, and other formal networks of scientists, engineers and health professionals. The Coalition is devoted to facilitating communication and partnerships on human rights within and across the scientific and engineering communities, and between these and human rights communities. The Coalition strives to improve human rights practitioners' access to scientific and technological information and knowledge and to engage scientists, engineers and health professionals in human rights issues, particularly those that involve scientists and engineers and the conduct of science. Launched in January 2009, the Coalition is currently comprised of 49 professional associations and scholarly societies and 63 affiliated individuals.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition
thanks the
**American Chemical Society, Committee of International
Affairs**
American Educational Research Association
American Physical Society
American Society of Civil Engineers
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
for their support of this meeting

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition: The Next Frontier

The introduction to the day's sessions began with an overview of the Coalition's work and future goals by **Jessica Wyndham** ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)). Launched in 2009, the Coalition has since grown to 49 member and affiliated organizations and 63 individual members. The Coalition's recent work has included: a workshop on connecting science, engineering and human rights beyond human subjects research; the development and dissemination of a starter kit to help professional societies promote human rights; convening focus groups with a variety of different scientific organizations to determine the meaning of the right to benefit from scientific progress (Article 15); and work to uphold the welfare of scientists. Actions by member societies and individual members to date, Wyndham continued, have included a webinar organized by the American Society of Civil Engineers to educate civil engineers about the relationship of human rights to their work and the adoption of an amendment to the International Society of Political Psychology Constitution that incorporates human rights. Future directions for the Coalition will involve providing information for multidisciplinary networks to mainstream human rights and acting as a driving force to protect human rights. Lastly, Wyndham addressed the methods and activities for achieving future objectives established in the newly adopted Plan of Action for 2012-2014, such as membership growth and engagement through a webinar series, development of an open access journal, and the integration of human rights into science and engineering curricula through professional development of professors.

Margaret Vitullo ([American Sociological Association](#)), one of the co-chairs of the Service to the STEM Community Working Group, detailed her engagement in the Coalition. Vitullo first drew attention to the passage of the Coalition's Plan of Action and its importance in establishing benchmarks for societies in their human rights activities. She noted that while the ASA has not yet undertaken all of the activities these benchmarks measure, members' work with Sociologists Without Borders has served to bring human rights to the forefront. Vitullo then transitioned to the accomplishments of her working group. To date, they have conducted 12 focus groups to collect perspectives of scientists and engineers on how Article 15 relates to their discipline. She acknowledged the interest in the scientific community for such discussions, and mentioned that she hopes to organize additional focus groups, particularly with engineers as well as physical and biological scientists.

Constance Thompson ([American Society of Civil Engineers](#)), another co-chair of the Service to the STEM Community Working Group, began her discussion by describing a webinar conducted by the ASCE to understand members' interest in and comprehension of the intersections between technology, science, and human rights. The webinar, she explained, had 220 registrants. Of these individuals, 90% saw a correlation between civil engineering and human rights and 75% indicated they would be interested in learning more about how their work can apply to human rights. Thompson additionally drew attention to an anti-corruption training film, [ETHICANA](#), which focuses on corruption within construction projects. The ASCE, one of the main sponsors of ETHICANA, received a Summit Award for its far reaching voice and impacts. Thompson drew on this project as an example of what the Coalition can accomplish.

David Proctor (Affiliated Individual) a co-chair of the Outreach and Communication Committee, discussed the various ways in which individual members can become more engaged in the Coalition. The Committee is reaching out to students to encourage participation in the Coalition. He added that this engagement should be piloted locally at first. Proctor encouraged members to think about the kind of competitions that could be offered to students to engage them in the Coalition and what the outcomes of the competition should be.

Morning Plenary Session: Advancing the Right to Development through Science and Technology

Stephen P. Marks ([Harvard School of Public Health](#)) described the relationships between the right to benefit from scientific progress and the right to development (RTD), starting with a discussion of the RTD and its origins. The majority of the world, he said, saw their vital human rights concerns as all related to development and thus urged that development itself become recognized as a human right. Marks briefly traced the history of the RTD, from its inception in 1977, to the first international treaty on the RTD (the Banju Charter) to the United Nations (UN) articulation of the RTD in 1986. Marks drew attention to the fact that the US was the only UN member to vote against the UN Declaration on the Right to Development.

Even though working groups and [The High Level Task Force on the Implementation of the Right to Development](#) have been created for the purpose of putting the RTD into practice, Marks acknowledged that implementation has been difficult. As an example of the challenges, Marks quoted Peter Uvin who said that the RTD is “devoid of identifiable parties with obligations and...watered down.” While a few milestones have given the RTD greater legitimacy, including the [World Bank Outreach Issue](#) and the 2011 [Berlin Conference](#), there is still a lack of a consensus as to what the right means. This led the High Level Task Force to recommend the following definition: the right of peoples and individuals to the constant improvement of their well-being and to a national and global enabling environment conducive to just, equitable, participatory and human-centered development respectful of all human rights. However, Marks continued, even when this consensus was reached, the task of evaluating national progress towards implementing the RTD still presented a problem. Marks described backlash received to the [Report of the High-Level Task Force on the Implementation of the Right to Development](#) that the High Level Task Force submitted to the [Working Group on the Right to Development](#), especially towards the criteria, operational sub-criteria, and indicators that were included.

Marks went on to discuss how the RTD relates to the right to benefit from scientific progress, pointing to specific criteria laid out in the report of the High-Level Task Force that aim to promote and ensure access to benefits of science and technology. Specifically, Marks drew attention to three criteria: to promote and ensure access to the benefits of science (criterion 1g), which places emphasis on agricultural, manufacturing, green, health, and information technology, as well as technology transfer; to promote and ensure environmental sustainability and sustainable use of natural resources and technology (criterion 1h), which places emphasis on environmental degradation, access to natural resources, and sustainable energy practices; and to provide for fair sharing of the burdens of development (Criterion 3b), which emphasizes sharing of environmental burdens, compensation of environmental impacts, and the establishment of safety nets.

Marks ended his presentation by noting that the RTD may eventually be articulated in a binding treaty, an approach supported by the [Non-Aligned Movement \(NAM\)](#) Member States. However, he also acknowledged that any mention of a treaty results in negative responses at UN meetings. Even though the [Human Rights Council](#) has discussed the RTD in recent sessions, the US abstained from voting. Regardless, Marks explained, the High Level Task Force will continue to circulate criteria and suggest a legally binding instrument.

Iana Aranda ([American Society of Mechanical Engineers](#)) spoke about the impact of [Engineering for Change](#) and transformative technologies on human rights. Engineering for Change was founded by ASME, IEEE and Engineers Without Borders-USA in 2011. The initiative’s online digital platform focuses on three primary goals: to include content relevant for engineering sectors, to cultivate communities of scientists and engineers practicing in the field, and to focus on collaboration between

sectors. Aranda provided examples of transformative technologies, the first of which is Field Level Operations Watch (FLOW), a tool developed by [Water for People](#) in response to deficiencies in the deployment of water systems. Acting against the backdrop of 50,000 dysfunctional water systems in Africa, FLOW is an open source tool that is used on handheld devices during field surveys. Data entered in FLOW can be crowd sourced to create a regional picture of the status of a water system. As another example, Sweet Sense is a system that captures data on deployed technologies for development, such as [Life Straw](#), a water purification system. Sweet Sense is a combination of sensors that collects real time data and relays it back to [SWEETLab](#), a data platform. Finally, she discussed Biogames, an initiative that promotes efficiency in rural hospitals by providing remote microscopic analysis (telepathology). Aranda closed with her support for further innovation and emphasized Engineering for Change's objective to deliver meaningful solutions.

Robert A. Freling ([Solar Electric Light Fund](#)) opened by highlighting the importance of energy access to development. According to Freling, 1.5 billion people in the world do not have access to modern energy. When the UN articulated the [Millennium Development Goals](#) (MDGs) in 2000, access to modern energy was not included. Freling argued that electricity is often taken for granted. He noted that while initially only used by NASA, solar cells have "reached a point where solar energy is the lowest cost option for generating power in remote villages that are not connected to a grid." Freling's organization, [SELF](#), uses microcredit opportunities to allow rural families to invest in solar cells. Freling has found that there is great interest in purchasing solar power. In 1997, he launched a for-profit company, [SELCO](#), which delivers basic energy services to low income families. In 2001, he developed a model for village-integration of solar energy. Projects that were completed under this model included a solar powered computer lab, water pumps to villages in Nigeria, solar power for health clinics to promote vaccine storage, power to micro-enterprise centers to promote business growth, and a water pump driven drip irrigation system. In his closing remarks, Freling emphasized that, when considering economic development, environmental conservation, information access, water and health, energy has a key role. Certain rights codified in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, including Articles [6](#), [7](#), [11](#), [12](#), [13](#), and [15](#), all require access to modern sources of energy. "Without access, none of the goals can be achieved and none of the MDGs can be achieved," Freling concluded.

Varun Gauri ([Development Research Group, World Bank](#)) opened up the discussion period by highlighting key concepts that drive adoption of appropriate technologies, including peer effects and the importance of entry points for new ideas. A participant asked about the possibility of producing solar panels in Africa rather than importing them. Freling agreed it was a good idea, noting that import taxes on solar cells often prohibit access. He added that local production, joint ventures, and technology transfer could increase access and create jobs. Aranda stressed the importance of involving local communities and indigenous populations in the production of new technologies. Freling mentioned that SELF has only implemented solutions in communities that have invited the opportunity. A participant then asked if there was any positive news about the RTD. Marks responded that actors are exploring opportunities to pursue it "on a parallel track," and continued that even where the formal procedures fail, the utilization of a normative framework still continues. Another participant questioned whether the RTD includes the right to not choose development that may be environmentally destructive. Marks responded that the concept of the RTD is often distorted and confused with national ownership. The actual right, he explained, can only apply to development policies that result in a fair distribution of benefits and are the result of a participatory process.

Business Meeting: Technology for Human Rights: Volunteer Opportunities

Susan Wolfinbarger ([AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program](#)) began the discussion with a brief explanation of the AAAS On-Call Scientists program. She explained that the program began in October 2008 to connect scientists, engineers and health professionals with human rights groups on a volunteer basis. AAAS acts as the connector. When human rights groups approach AAAS with a project with which they need assistance, AAAS will match the group with qualified volunteers, based on the information provided during the online volunteer registration process and also gathered through interviews with volunteers and references they provide. In addition to pairing individual volunteers with human rights projects, the On-Call Scientists program has set up “clinics” for staff at human rights organizations, allowing them to meet with a panel of experts from different disciplines to assess the group’s needs. The Program also has recommended qualified individuals to serve on scientific advisory committees for specific organizations, such as Amnesty International. The [On-Call Scientists website](#) was recently made available in Spanish and French, which should help expand the scope of projects available for volunteers.

Iana Aranda ([Engineering for Change](#)) expanded on her comments in the morning plenary, focusing on volunteer opportunities and the many resources on the E4C website. She explained that the group does not do work on the ground, but instead focuses on gathering knowledge and ideas in a public place where anyone can comment on or add to them. The three goals of the organization, she explained, are information gathering, engagement and research. As well as being a place for volunteers to share their ideas, the website hosts a range of resources from monthly webinars to research on seven broad topics: water, energy, health, structures, agriculture, sanitation and information systems.

Ken Ludwa ([Engineers Without Borders](#)) spoke about his volunteer experience as a mentor at the Howard University chapter of Engineers Without Borders (EWB-USA). He explained that as a mainly volunteer-based organization EWB-USA operates through local chapters which are either based at universities or based in a city with engineering professionals. The national board of EWB-USA provides standards for projects and performs technical reviews to make sure that all of the chapters meet requirements and are able to perform their volunteer tasks successfully. Project selection usually comes through this national clearinghouse, with non-profits submitting the projects with which they need assistance and local chapters applying to take on the project. However, sometimes members of local chapters use their own connections to find projects. Ludwa also explained that most successful projects are undertaken with a non-profit organization that has an existing relationship with the local community. Finally, he emphasized that participation is open to anyone with interest, even those without engineering backgrounds; knowledge of foreign languages, conditions in developing countries, community health, and other related areas are all deeply relevant and helpful.

Workshop on the Human Right to Clean Water and Sanitation

Benjamin Mason Meier ([University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill](#)) opened the workshop with a brief history of the right to clean water and sanitation. He explained that today about 750 million people lack access to safe drinking water and about 2.6 billion lack sanitation, despite the right to clean water and sanitation being recognized in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) as well as the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs). However, Meier explained, global access to water is improving – making it one of the MDGs that will be met by 2015. That said, global access averages can hide the harsher realities of the poorest countries. Many standards focus on water and sanitation as steps to achieving economic development by improving public health and human capacity, but in doing so they lose sight of water and sanitation as a distinct human right.

Salman M. A. Salman (formerly of the [World Bank](#)) began with an examination of the legal foundations for the right to clean water and sanitation. Although the right was officially codified in 2002 in [General Comment 15](#) to the ICESCR, Salman explained that its legal roots go much deeper. First, its genesis is in Articles 11 and 12 of the [ICESCR](#), the right to food and the right to health, respectively. Since water is essential for growing and preparing food, and clean drinking water is crucial for maintaining good health, the right to water was always acknowledged implicitly in the ICESCR. Next, Salman pointed to the [second](#) and [third](#) articles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, those entitling all people to the enjoyment of their rights and defining the right to “life, liberty, and security of person”. These articles support the “centrality and necessity” of the right to water and sanitation, he argued. Finally, he mentioned other international instruments that include references to the right to water and sanitation, such as the [Convention on the Rights of the Child](#), the [Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women](#), the [Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities](#) and even the [Geneva Conventions](#). Salman concluded his presentation by explaining the difficulty of implementing this right, especially making it “affordable.”

Ralph P. Hall ([Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University School of Public and International Affairs](#)) presented multi-use water systems as a possible solution to the challenges of supply, quantity, quality and pricing of water. He explained that because people use water for a multitude of purposes when they are provided water intended for only one purpose – such as water for drinking – they will either use that source for all their water needs, or use that source in conjunction with other traditional sources. This will result in either over-drawing from the new water source or continuing the spread of water-borne diseases from the traditional source. A multi-use system accounts for the multiple needs for water and deals with each accordingly. It requires a larger investment in the beginning, but because water is available to support health and livelihoods, a multi-use system is better suited to long-term success. To ensure these successes, Hall advocated for holistic planning approaches that involved community input and complementary education and policy programs. He admitted that in most systems, sanitation needs were not included, but Hall insisted that including sanitation was a possibility for future models.

Eric Tars ([National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty](#)) brought the discussion back to the United States with an example from Sacramento, CA. He told the ongoing story of a group of homeless people, many of whom lost their homes to foreclosure in 2008, and initially set up a camp in a parkway near downtown Sacramento. When the media brought this camp to the attention of the city, officials tried and were eventually successful, in evicting the people from the parkway. The camp residents organized to protest for safe ground, arguing that they needed to be somewhere where they had access to facilities such as drinking water and toilets. They claimed that the police were locking public restrooms and water points in order to make it harder for them to survive. The situation escalated to the point that UN Special Rapporteur on the Human Right to Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation, Catarina de Albuquerque, heard testimony from members of the group and issued a statement in the form of an [open letter](#) to the mayor of

Sacramento. Tars emphasized that the group hoped that language in this statement would appeal to California laws against “cruel and inhumane” treatment of people, giving the group some legal leverage.

The discussion following the presentations focused on the challenges of local context, particularly in the remote parts of developing countries that tend to have the greatest need for water and sanitation services. One participant asked about the use of new technologies for testing water quality that greatly reduce the time and costs of such tests. Hall pointed out that even if the actual test does not cost much, one must include the costs of travel to the site and water sampling, activities that can be very costly in remote places. In general, all of the speakers agreed that understanding local practice and perspective is essential to developing the best solution.

Workshop on Engaging Your Society in Human Rights

Margaret Vitullo ([American Sociological Association](#)), moderated this discussion. She has been an active member of the Coalition and serves as the Co-Chair of the Service to the STEM Community Working Group. **Douglas Richardson** ([Association of American Geographers](#)) discussed the ways the AAG has mainstreamed human rights into many of their projects, both through their own work and on the AAG website. He noted that geographers around the world are uniquely poised to document and monitor human rights abuses via imagery, GIS, and fieldwork. This research is collected and published in an online [human rights clearinghouse](#) on the association's website, to be used for educational and research purposes. The website also includes information about the Coalition, lists upcoming events and activities, and provides links to other organizations. The AAG also hosts workshops which levy high profile speakers to draw attention of the membership to human rights issues. Finally, the AAG has written a human rights component into their [ethics statement](#).

Constance Thompson ([American Society of Civil Engineers](#)) spoke about the connection between civil engineers and human rights. Civil engineers consider themselves to be at the center of sustainability, and are tasked with improving life today and tomorrow for citizens. One of the seven fundamental canons of the ASCE includes attention to safety, health and welfare, an expectation with a clear connection to human rights. Another demonstration of the connection is addressed by ETHICANA, a film created in 2008 that highlights the types of corruption that may occur at a construction site and the ethical obligations of engineers to respond. The film's website provides tools and trainings for how individuals can behave ethically in similar situations. In 2009, ASCE became a member of the Coalition and in 2010 ASCE developed a policy statement on the Millennium Development Goals. A 2011 webinar on civil engineering and human rights received overwhelmingly positive feedback, with 90% of the participants indicating that they recognized a connection between civil engineering and human rights. This year the ASCE has deepened its relationship with the Coalition, with a representative co-chairing the Service to the STEM Community Working Group, and helping to plan this meeting's theme. The primary goal going forward is to engage more members from the engineering community in the work of the Coalition.

Sam McFarland (Affiliated Individual) described the challenges he has faced incorporating human rights in his organization's framework. In June 2009, he recommended that the International Society of Political Psychology (ISPP) join the Coalition, but the governing council declined this request in 2010. McFarland speculated that a number of factors may have influenced this decision: fear of politicizing the organization, concerns that a US-based network might not fully represent ISPP's views, and perhaps even a lack of member interest in human rights. As an alternative approach, McFarland successfully advocated for an amendment to the organization's [Constitution](#) stating that the practical significance of their work would be guided by principles of human rights. McFarland has not lost sight of the goal to encourage the ISPP to eventually join the Coalition.

The ensuing discussion touched on the benefits of Coalition membership, after one participant asked about how research-oriented disciplines such as mathematics could be involved in human rights work. Throughout the following conversation, participants concluded that the value of a diverse membership is that each society contributes resources, skill-sets, information and knowledge to the Coalition, which shares a common goal of using science and engineering in an interdisciplinary way to support human rights. Speakers also discussed less tangible impacts such as coming away feeling inspired. Richardson noted that this feeling is common, "Most people want to do something meaningful in the world, not just their science. With human rights, there's a response. I don't think you need to sell that, you just need to explain it."

Workshop on Building the Next Generation of Socially Responsible Innovators: Integrating Human Rights in Technology & Engineering Curricula

This workshop addressed the value of integrating human rights education into technology and engineering curricula and examined some ways this can be accomplished. In his introduction, **Mark V. Frezzo** ([Sociologists Without Borders](#)) highlighted the importance of integrating a human rights framework into codes of ethics for scientific disciplines. He asked workshop participants to consider how a human rights based code of ethics can be built into scientific disciplines. He added that future conversations need to expand on the role of the right to enjoy the benefit of scientific progress and its applications.

Thomas M. Powers ([Delaware Biotechnology Institute, University of Delaware](#)) opened by describing a course he teaches on ethics in nanoscience. The class has five components: basic principles of nanoscience, recent developments in nanoscience, theories of ethics and applied ethics, case studies, and a workshop in nanoethics. This last component, Powers noted, is essential. To illustrate why, he drew upon the [National Nanotechnology Initiative](#). Over \$21 billion was spent on research and development. The current program has a budget of \$2.1 billion. However, very little of that budget was spent, or is currently being spent, on research into the ethical implications and environmental impacts of nanoscience. Connecting nanotechnology and engineering, Powers continued, requires much more ethical thinking, especially in terms of commercial development, production and industry distribution. These are not judged just by ethics and values but also by markets, insurer underwriting and effective legislation. One key value of early consideration of ethics is to help us choose beneficial technologies and just distributions. The novel properties of nanotechnology raise specific ethical concerns, such as privacy issues related to nanotechnology surveillance. Regardless of what ethical framework is taken, Powers continued, if a basic human need is violated, then there is a violation of human rights. The potential for harm creates ethical responsibilities for scientists and engineers. Those in nanotechnology research live in a state of partial ignorance, as little is known about the fate, transport, life-cycle, reactivity and toxicity of nanoparticles. To illustrate this, Powers mentioned the 2009 Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) ban on a washing machine developed by Samsung that used a nanoscale silver oxide disinfectant; little was known about the effects of the rinse water on the environment. He added that while the responsibility of scientists to protect the public can only apply to what they know, scientists have an obligation to consider future ethical and environmental impacts. In order to accomplish this, science needs more funding. Powers closed by stating that nanotechnology has the promise to provide solutions for energy, water, medicine, and other needs, but scientists need to learn more about the worst case-scenarios and the effects on human health and the environment.

Joe Manous ([U.S Army Corps of Engineers](#)) traced the history of the code of ethics for civil engineering. The code of ethics serves to maintain the trust of clients, other professionals and the public. Engineers deal with incomplete information daily, but it is this trust that allows them to make decisions. A code of ethics serves its role by providing ‘rules of the road.’ A workshop participant pointed out that a code of ethics also has an aspirational role – to create and establish better than ‘best practices.’ Another participant suggested that protecting human rights should be the baseline rather than an aspirational vision. Manous noted that a large problem with ethics codes for engineering is that ethics are seen in terms of the end product and in procedural applications, such as the construction process. This, he said, is what ethics training in engineering education can change. While only Texas requires ethics training in engineering education, there are close to 20 states that require ethics training for engineering license renewal. However, he continued, while engineering ethics focuses on social responsibility, there has been very little effort to incorporate human rights. Manous said that more work is needed to identify methods for those interested in engineering ethics to use a human rights lens.

Closing Panel: Technology, Human Rights and Professional Responsibility

Sif Thorgeirsson ([Business & Human Rights Resource Centre](#)), a human rights and corporate lawyer, introduced the panel theme and the speakers. **Vijaya Tripathi** ([Benetech® Human Rights Program](#)) discussed Benetech's human rights program, focusing on two projects in particular: Martus and Human Rights Data Analysis. [Martus](#) is a free, open source software tool Benetech designed to meet the technological needs of the human rights community. The software can be used to securely gather, maintain and back up human rights documentation. Tripathi listed four criteria that are used to identify whether working with Martus is appropriate and beneficial for certain groups: evaluating leadership, strategic objectives, the capacity of the organizational staff, and the infrastructure of the group. If, after analyzing these aspects, it seems like partnering with Martus would be successful, a new set of recommendations are developed by Benetech. These involve understanding the readiness of the partners, identifying measures to increase the partners' readiness, adapting the ideals of the project to the partners' expectations and meeting existing needs.

Tripathi emphasized the importance of openness in all aspects of their [Data Analysis Projects](#), the aim of which is to develop rigorous, scientifically sound statistical evidence on behalf of human rights projects. Building understanding among scientists about selection bias, bad statistics, and convenience data is crucial to avoid painting a misleading picture about a situation. She also noted four ways in which databases may fail to capture reality: 1) organizations' resources can change in terms of staff, presence or logistics; 2) relationships with local populations may change over space and sector; 3) incentives to provide support to certain types of victims can be influenced by political opportunity, assistance or reparations; and 4) the security of a situation may change. These aspects may affect access to and quality of information, so that the given data is not a reflection of reality. Tripathi's advice was to assess, understand, and evaluate information, and to raise awareness of challenges of these projects.

John Crowley ([Harvard Humanitarian Initiative](#)) gave a presentation entitled *Formalizing the Informal – The Rise of Codes of Conduct Among Digital Humanitarians*. He spoke about the availability of new information obtained from crowdsourcing, a new data collection system by which the lowered cost of communication encourages more volunteer involvement and a quicker tempo for data collection. Whereas previously information of this nature had been obtained at a sovereign level, now diasporas and crowdsourcing groups can link up to and contribute at a grassroots level. Crowley noted ethical questions that confront this field: What opportunities and risks arise from data collection via crowdsourcing? Is it still ethical to collect data remotely, without the ability to curate the communications in the specified location? He also addressed the challenges of microtasking, breaking large amounts of data into smaller portions for individuals to look at and analyze. Crowley posed several questions over the course of his presentation: What steps can be taken to ensure that data is not personally identifiable? Are people without formal training eligible to analyze the data? What is the responsibility to hold back certain data? Are the data being collected a result of implicit permission, or a result of lack of education? What standards should be used to maintain the safety of data? What biases are introduced into data sets by people who do not have training? How do these biases affect the analysis and aggregation processes? What is the code of conduct for volunteers? These questions demonstrate areas in need of ethical consideration.

Amy Lehr ([Foley Hoag LLP](#)) discussed the intersection of business and human rights. She opened with background about the [UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights](#) that were developed by John Ruggie, the UN Special Representative on Business and Human Rights. The first principle is that governments have a duty to protect against human rights violations, including those violations in which businesses and industry may be involved. Secondly, companies have a responsibility to respect human

rights. And finally, victims of human rights violations have a right to remedy. This framework was adopted unanimously by the UN, setting an important global standard.

Lehr then discussed the obligation to respect human rights as process-based standards driven by the notion that companies should avoid contributing to human rights violations. She put forth the idea that policies embodying commitment to human rights should be developed and enacted, human rights impact and risk assessments should be conducted, and the response effectiveness should be recorded. Lehr identified two main areas that could present a risk for businesses: the risk of being complicit with human rights violations in product development, with respect to procedures for medical testing, and a risk during the product design phase and with relation to customers. Specifically, products should neither be created for explicit use in conducting human rights abuses, nor should they be sold to customers when there is an indication that the products will be used in a way that violates human rights. Companies are capable of creating designs which reduce the risk that the product could be used to violate human rights. By knowing their customers and being conscious of the customer's policies and practices, business will be more able to respect human rights.

Thorgeirsson then moderated an open discussion. When asked about the biggest technological benefit for protection of human rights, panelists identified the publicity of all actions, the networks that can arise from technologies, and the abilities for technologies to protect human rights defenders. In response to another question about the quality of data, panelists discussed the importance of being straightforward and honest about how much information was known. The idea is that acknowledging the limitations of data strengthens the analysis. The conversation also touched on ways that non-state actors hold businesses and governments accountable and mentioned future challenges in online privacy and with censorship. Panelists emphasized the importance of informed consent, and agreed that information should be used only for the purposes for which it had been obtained.

Working Group Report: Welfare of Scientists

The Welfare of Scientists working group is devoted to the protection and defense of scientists and engineers under threat, and will work to increase the effectiveness of professional societies in defending the human rights of our colleagues.

Co-Chairs: **Alec Greer**, Committee of Concerned Scientists
 Alex Ingrams, Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues

Progress since last meeting

- Final edits made to Primer on Scientific Freedom and Human Rights.
- The Welfare of Scientists Network, an interactive web platform hosted by ACS for posting alerts about the abuse of human rights of scientists, has featured posts calling for action to defend several urgent cases including Omid Kokabee, Burs Ursanli, Maxwell Dlamini, and the Bahraini scientists.
- Potential outside support for work on a guide on Connecting Article 15 and Scientific Freedom has been explored.

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

A template will be created for recording the basic facts and background of current cases of human rights violations against scientists.

The Primer on Scientific Freedom and Human Rights will be shared on the Coalition listserv and made available in hard copy to attendees at the next Coalition Meeting.

Ideas Generated

The group expressed interest in further exploring a possible project on academic freedom and the internet. Group member Seth Bouvier will share information on the issue for discussion by the group.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

- Requesting support of an intern to design template for profiles of scientists under threat.
- Requesting support of an intern /website technician to put the Primer on the Working Group webpage.

Next meeting date:

October 2, 2012

Working Group Report: Ethics and Human Rights

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

Co-chairs: **Robert Albro**, American Anthropological Association
Douglas Richardson, Association of American Geographers

Progress since last meeting

1. Our working group completed its report project, “Intersections of Science, Ethics and Human Rights: the Question of Human Subjects Protection”, which discusses the several ways that human rights can enhance the ethical frameworks guiding scientific work with human subjects, with particular attention to social sciences.
2. Our working group successfully organized a symposium, “Connecting Science, Engineering, Ethics, and Human Rights: Beyond Human Subjects Research”, held at the AAAS in Washington D.C. on June 18. This symposium launched the next report project, which switches attention to promoting attention to the frontiers of human rights and ethics, with particular reference to the physical, engineering, life, and health sciences.

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

1. Select six specific case studies for further elaboration as the backbone of the next report project, in collaboration with working group members in the appropriate science and engineering societies and with the Service to the STEM Community working group’s focus group project (immediate follow-up required, date to be determined).
2. Revise our first report, in the range of 6,000-7,000 words, for possible publication in a leading geographical scholarly journal.
3. Define meaning and extent of “scientific responsibility,” as this applies to Article 15 of the ICESCR, as contribution to Coalition’s joint initiative, and in support of the Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program of the AAAS, as it works with the UN special expert to better define the content of the right (either as incorporated into report or as stand-alone project, to be decided).
4. Further define potential use of digital archive (at present comprising only six case studies) of emerging ethical frontiers across the sciences.

Ideas Generated

1. Consider how the working group might usefully promote human rights as part of the NSF’s new concern for the demonstration of “broader impacts,” in the process of grant-seeking. This idea was promoted by working group member George Middendorf (Howard U).
2. Organize a project under the umbrella of “sustainable human development,” as a follow-up to the recent Rio+20 Earth Summit and UN conference on sustainable development, which would aim to have an impact on the shape, going forward, of the new post-2015 Development Agenda. This would be interdisciplinary, aimed at working directly with relevant stakeholders involved in shaping the Agenda. And it would give particular attention to the human rights implications both of technology and of technology transfer, as these inform the working concept of sustainable

human development (e.g., the human rights implications of social entrepreneurship in the energy sector as one possible case). This work would also draw its cases from among the physical, life, engineering and health sciences. The animating question would be: How is a human rights framework pertinent to the ways we engage with technology, as integral to our disciplinary practice? This idea was promoted by working group member Stephen Marks (Harvard U).

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

Not at this time.

Next meeting date:

No meeting date has been scheduled at this time, but we will be convening soon to move forward with 1-4 of the stated goals for the working group in the next six months. This will be done first via email, to elicit a core of participants, after which we will convene a teleconference to discuss in more depth.

Working Group Report: Service to the STEM Community

The Service to the STEM Community working group is devoted to building the commitment and capacity of scientific 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
Constance Thompson, American Society of Civil Engineers
Margaret Weigers Vitullo, American Sociological Association

Progress since last meeting

The year between August 2011 and July 2012 has been an active one for the working group, so much so that the decision was made to bring on a third co-chair (Constance Thompson) and establish subcommittees to make it easier to build and maintain momentum on working group projects.

- Initiated process of incorporating engineering into working group and Coalition foundational documents.
- Conducted a webinar on intersection of civil engineering and human rights with the American Society of Civil Engineers.
- Conducted nine Article 15 focus groups and have at least 3 more in process now.
 - Have produced transcripts for each focus group.
 - Established analytic framework for qualitative analysis of focus group transcripts and participant comments.
 - Have applied that framework to the transcripts and have begun preliminary analysis.
- Conducted an evaluation of the working group including:
 - Telephone interviews with a subsample of working group members.
 - Contacted each member of the working group to confirm their interest and willingness to contribute substantively to the working group.
- Based on the results of the working group evaluation, developed a three year plan of action for the working group with concrete yearly objectives and outcomes.
- Established three subcommittees within the working group to move the group's Plan of Action objectives forward.
- Held regular quarterly working group meetings at AAAS. At June 6 working group meeting broke into subcommittees and began work on Plan of Action objectives.
- Streamlined communication channels for working group by:
 - Establishing a working group listserv. (Hosted by the American Sociological Association)
 - Creating a "Team Site" to foster collaboration among working group subcommittee members. (Hosted by the American Psychological Association)

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

Our working group has formed three subcommittees. Members working in each subcommittee are included on our working group roster (attached here). Goals for the next 6 months for each subcommittee are:

- Subcommittee #1: Human Rights Starter Kit

- Update formatting and organization of document, including adding photos and graphic design elements.
- Add case studies and newsletter examples.
- Explore possibility of adding Google for Non-Profits to increase visibility; if feasible install.
- Add Google analytics to site to track usage.
- Subcommittee #2: Human Rights Webinar Series
 - Develop template webinar.
 - Develop plan for how to measure impact of webinars.
- Subcommittee #3: Article 15 Focus Groups
 - Recruit additional disciplinary societies to host focus groups, optimally from the physical, biological and engineering disciplines.
 - Complete focus group data collection.
 - Finalize template and produce reports for giving feedback to disciplinary societies about their focus groups.
 - Continue coding transcripts and begin drafting analytic reports.
 - Explore the feasibility of giving focus group participating organizations/individuals a chance to read and respond to UN report based on the focus group data before it is finalized. Rationale for this concept comes from a participatory action research model, including the concept of member validation of results.

Ideas Generated

- Consider how to engage other working groups and their chairs in mutually beneficial collaborative efforts on working group projects, beyond the Article 15 cross-group effort.
 - Related topic is measuring impact of all of the on-line resources produced by the various working groups.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

- Starter Kit: If an intern had graphic design skills, it would be helpful to have that person begin the reformatting of the starter kit. Optimally, under the direction of the graphics department at the AAAS.
- Article 15: Continued assistance is needed for drafting the feedback reports for disciplinary societies, as well as assistance with on-going coding of transcripts.

Next meeting date:

Next co-chairs meeting (these meetings occur roughly every two weeks).

- August 2, 2012. 11:00 am. Via conference call.

Next working group meetings:

- September 5, 2012, 12:30 – 2:00 pm
- December 5, 2012, 12:30 – 2:00 pm
- January 31-February 2, 2013 (Coalition Meeting)
- April 24, 2013, 12:30 – 2:00 pm
- July 2013 (Coalition Meeting)
- October 23, 2013, 12:30 – 2:00 pm

Working Group Report: Service to the Human Rights Community

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

Co-chairs: **Brian Gran**, American Sociological Association
Susan Hinkins, American Statistical Association
Patricia van Arnum, Affiliated Individual

Progress since last meeting

- Draft of the *Human Rights Projects: Guidelines for Scientists and Human Rights Organizations* submitted to Steering Committee for review, before the July 2012 Coalition meeting
- Green Paper on *Indicators of Article 15: Right to the Benefit of Science* ready for submission to Steering Committee for review
- Finalized informational materials for use in communicating the On-Call Scientists program to human rights organizations
- Developed the Plan of Action for the working group for 2012-2014
- Began planning for an informational workshop for human rights organization to be held in New York on program evaluation in late fall 2012
- Developed a discussion/concept presentation for a peer-reviewed open-source journal to share scientific methods and technical tools which have been used by human rights organizations or which would be beneficial to their work.

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

- Promote *Human Rights Projects: Guidelines for Scientists and Human Rights Organizations* Guidelines through On-Call Scientists, Coalition partners and others
- Based on the material in the Green Paper *Indicators of Article 15: Right to the Benefit of Science*, work on developing examples of indicators for the right to benefit from scientific progress in order to develop a White Paper on indicators.
- Pursue potential funding for the work on indicators
- Organize and hold a session in the New York City area to provide material to human rights organizations on a particular area of interest (such as program evaluation) where scientific skills could add value
- Continue to identify and engage human rights organizations in programs related to the use of scientific tools in human rights work, including outreach to HRO-oriented NGOs in the UN Department of Public Information
- The consensus of the attendees at the meeting was that we should pursue the idea of a peer-reviewed open-source journal to share scientific methods and technical tools as described above. To this end, we will review other open-source journals and develop the 'next steps'.
- Pursue the projects and activities as laid out in the Plan of Action 2012-2014.

Ideas Generated

Would like to set up 30-minute monthly conference call through AAAS to all Working Group Members to provide updates of specific projects and as a means to increase engagement among Working Group

members with a follow-up report distributed monthly to all Working Group members. Individual meetings/calls on specific projects among Working Group members will continue separately.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

- Would like to conduct a membership audit of email/contact information of Working Group members to ensure current email/contact is current and to confirm continued interest in participation in the Working Group.
- Further assistance in identifying and generating lists of human rights organizations for outreach on an individual HRO basis or in the formation of informational workshops.

Next meeting date:

As per our goal, would like to begin monthly Working Group conference calls beginning in September.

Working Group Report: Education and Information Resources

The Education and Information Resources working group is devoted to producing a variety of accessible information materials for the promotion and support of collaboration between scientists, engineers and human rights practitioners.

Co-chairs: **Mark Frezzo**, Sociologists Without Borders
 Sam McFarland, Affiliated Individual

Progress since last meeting:

In light of the addition of new members to the Education and Information Resources (EIR) Working Group, this report will revisit the items covered in the last Progress Report (June 2012) and the Plan of Action for 2012. The previous report delineated three objectives for the EIR Working Group:

- **Objective 1:** To facilitate deliberation on practical ways of illuminating the connections between science, engineering, and human rights among Coalition members.
- **Objective 2:** To contribute to the professional development of science and engineering teachers' including high school and college teachers and human rights educators, and promote a deeper understanding of human rights among students in science, engineering, and health classes, including raising student awareness of the ethical and practical applications of science to the field of human rights and developing educational materials on the human rights of scientists, engineers and health professionals.
- **Objective 3:** To promote a deeper understanding of the practical applications of science, engineers, and the health professions to human rights among practitioners (whether working for local, national, or international organizations or independently).

In accordance with Objective 1 and the EIR Plan of Action for 2012, each Coalition member was asked in May to respond to the following question by June 30: "What are three main ways that your discipline could contribute to the realization of human rights?" The EIR Working group has begun receiving responses; as of July 8, four responses have been received. The EIR Working group will continue asking for these and will integrate the responses into a report by the January 2013 meeting.

In accordance with Objective 2 and the Plan of Action, each Coalition member was asked also to respond the following question by June 30: "Can you suggest a few scholars in your discipline who would be able and willing to write one or two brief but good educational modules on your science and human rights? These modules should be about 10 - 12 double-spaced pages and should focus on ways your discipline has been used to advance or violate human rights." The EIR Working group has begun receiving responses.

In accordance with Objective 3, since July 2011, the working group has pursued the project, initiated in 2010, to develop science and human rights modules that can be incorporated into science curricula, with particular targets of college ethics courses in the various sciences. In keeping with proposed activities in the Plan of Action, these are to include teaching modules on an overview of human rights, Article 15, and discipline-specific case studies in which each science has abused and/or contributed to human rights. To date, the following modules have been written and submitted to other experts for review: Brief overview of modern human rights, discussion of Article 15, and two modules for psychology.

Other modules (including one on history and human rights and another on sociology and human rights), are in preparation, and a few others (including one devoted to international development and human rights) have been promised. The EIR Working Group is conducting conversations with others to prepare modules for specific disciplines. This constitutes the most significant goal of the EIR Working Group [see below].

Overall, the July 17 meeting of the EIR Working Group was a success. Fourteen persons attended the meeting, including one newcomer who had joined just prior to the meeting and another who expressed an interest in joining at the meeting.

After introductions of new and returning members, a review of the Plan of Action, a review of activities since the January meeting, and a status report on teaching modules, discussion focused on three interrelated issues: (1) the need recruit more members to the group; (2) the need to solicit more teaching modules (especially in the natural sciences, the applied sciences, engineering, and technology); and (3) the purview of the group (as an entity designed to reach university professors). While there was widespread agreement on issues 1 and 2, there was considerable debate on issue 3.

To date, the mission of the EIR Working Group has been to provide materials for university professors (at both the graduate and undergraduate levels). Arguably, this is consistent with the mandate of the coalition. Many coalition members work for or alongside universities; and the AAAS as a whole represents a large number of academic disciplines and their professional organizations. Nevertheless, a forceful argument was made for reaching out to K-12 teachers. The question of whether to engage in human rights education for grades K-12 was left unresolved. It will be addressed in the next meeting (to be held either on Skype or on the telephone).

Modules to date:

- Sam McFarland has written *A Very Brief Primer on Modern Human Rights* (25 double-spaced pages) that has been reviewed by several readers and seems in pretty good shape as a text.
- Sam wrote *Making Sense of Science as a Human Right* (15 pages) on Article 27 of the UDHR and Article 15 of the ICESCR and recent developments on science as a human right. It was reviewed by Audrey Chapman, who offered a few corrections and suggestions. This paper will be revised soon.
- Sam has written two modules on psychology and human rights (12 pages each), one on how psychologists contributed to “enhanced interrogation techniques” and one on how psychologists helped advance the rights of LGBT individuals. Clinton Anderson has reviewed both, and they will be revised soon.

Other modules in preparation by members of the EIR Committee:

- Mark Frezzo and Bruce Friesen are preparing a module or two on sociology and human rights.
- Liljana Stevceva is writing a module on medicine and human rights.
- Sheryl Beach is writing a module on history and human rights.

In late May, an email was sent to representatives of all Human Rights Coalition societies. In response to this email, Nancy McClellan has agreed to write a module on Industrial Hygiene and Workplace Health.

Also, the following expressed interest, but follow-up is needed:

- Thomas Wellems of NIH expressed a strong interest in writing a module in on Tropical Medicine and Hygiene and human rights. He forwarded an excellent article on the problem of substandard medicines in the need to monitor them in developing countries. That article almost fits our needs.
- Raj Sampath has expressed strong interest in writing a module on Sustainable Development and Human Rights
- Michael Irwin and John Gallardo have expressed strong interest on writing a module or two on physics and human rights.
- Constance Thompson has expressed interest in writing a module on civil engineering and human rights, or helping find someone to do so.
- Ellen Bergfeld has expressed interest in helping prepare modules on agronomy and human rights.
- Ali Arab has expressed an interest in preparing a module on statistics and human rights. Susan Hinkins also expressed an interest in helping find someone to write such a module.
- Liepa Gust expressed interest in preparing a module on orthopsychiatry and human rights.
- Paula Skedsvold will try to find someone to prepare a module on brain science and human rights.
- David Schrader, with the help of Tom Powers, expressed an interest in helping prepare modules on philosophy and human rights.

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

The group's most significant goals are as follows: (1) to make more rapid progress in producing and distributing the teaching modules that have been proposed; (2) to expand the group and, in the process, solicit more teaching modules (especially in the natural and applied sciences, engineering, and technology); (3) to add more information (e.g., course syllabi) to the website; and (4) to facilitate dialogue on human rights education among coalition members.

Ideas Generated

1. Write a template for future teaching modules. Mark Frezzo will produce a draft to be circulated among group members.
2. Investigate the NSF-IGERT program for possible links to the group's activities.
3. Contact the sponsors of various "ethics bowls." Consider submitting human rights-oriented questions to existing ethics bowls. Consider organizing an ethics—or, better yet, a human rights—bowl under the auspices of the coalition.
4. Consider reaching out to teachers in grades K-12.

These ideas will be placed on the agenda for the next meeting (to be held on Skype or on the telephone before the end of August).

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

The EIR Working Group would like to request intern assistance. We will make a more specific request in the near future.

Next meeting date:

The EIR Group intends to meet more frequently—whether via Skype or conference call. The next meeting will occur before the end of August.

Committee Report: Communication and Outreach

The Outreach and Communication committee is devoted to expanding the impact of the Coalition's work by increasing the Coalition membership and building bridges with scientific, engineering, and health professionals as well as the human rights community.

Co-Chairs: **David J. Proctor**, Affiliated Individual
Jeffrey H. Toney, Sigma Xi

Progress since last meeting

Although the Outreach and Communications Committee was established by the Coalition foundational documents in 2009, there was limited committee membership and activity between 2009 and 2011. There is now a core committee membership of 10 participants.

Beginning in January 2012, the Outreach and Communications Committee undertook the evaluation and planning process as part of the development of the 2012-2014 Plan of Action. This task has produced a draft plan of action.

The Outreach and Communications Committee has begun discussing activities to take place at the January 2013 Coalition meeting that are intended to engage students and student associations in human rights activities. These activities include competitions wherein students will contribute to Coalition goals, such as by describing the interface between their discipline and human rights in a poster session, and where students may assist in the development of resources for use by the working groups, such as template documents for dissemination of working group documents, online resources such as blogs and web pages, and publicity tools like a Coalition logo. Successful student submissions would compete at the January 2012 Coalition meeting, with winners being recognized publicly and rewarded with mentoring opportunities, course credit, professional association memberships, or other prizes.

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

The following activities were agreed, with the individuals listed being subcommittee leaders and participants:

- Publicity - Jeff Toney
- Working Group Liaisons:
 - Welfare of Scientists - Michele Irwin, Liezl Perez, Heather Dawn Gingerich
 - Science Ethics and Human Rights - George Middendorf, David Schrader
 - Service to the STEM Community - David Proctor
 - Service to the Human Rights Community - Oliver Moles, Art Kendall
 - Education and Information Resources - Sam McFarland
- Technology Resources - Bruce Friesen, Liljana Stevceva
- Twitter - Michele Irwin, Liljana Stevceva, Ali Arab, Heather Dawn Gingerich, Constance Thompson
- Student Engagement:
 - What institutions and organizations do we involve? - Ali Arab
 - How do we involve students in the Coalition meeting? - Heather Dawn Gingerich
 - How will participating students be recognized, and how will winning participants be rewarded? - David Proctor, Jeff Toney, Constance Thompson

Ideas Generated

Some discussion of different methods of publicity were discussed, including publications in online blogs such as the Huffington Post.

Also, we had an extensive discussion about student engagement, including who to involve, what sort of competition may be held, and what sorts of awards would be provided for successful student entrants.

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

We'll get back to you on this.

Next meeting date:

To be determined.

Appendix: Session Evaluations

Morning Plenary

Advancing the Right to Development through Science and Technology

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	1	3	16	13	5	4.24
Usefulness of Presentations	0	3	6	13	11	4	4.17

Comments:

- It was a bit more logistical/organizational than I expected. Speakers didn't necessarily introduce themselves, assuming too much familiarity.
- I thought it was great!
- I would like to see the powerpoints of the presenters posted to the website.
- The engineering for change program is truly inspiring!
- I particularly liked the engineering4change presentation -- very informative!
- Very interesting, but specificity of presentations made them difficult to apply.
- All presentations were highly professional and useful.

Working Group Meetings

	Response Count	Response Percent
Welfare of Scientists	6	15.4
Ethics and Human Rights	6	15.4
Service to the STEM Community	6	15.4
Service to the Human Rights Community	5	12.8
Education and Information Resources	10	25.6
I did not attend a working group meeting	6	15.4

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Welfare of Scientists							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	2	1	3	0	4.17
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	3	2	0	4.17
Ethics and Human Rights							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	1	3	2	0	4.17
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	2	2	2	0	4.00
Service to the STEM Community							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	0	5	1	0	4.17
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	0	3	3	0	4.50
Service to the Human Rights Community							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	2	0	3	0	4.20
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	2	0	2	0	4.00
Education and Information Resources							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	1	3	3	3	0	3.80
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	1	4	1	4	0	3.80

Comments:

- I look forward to following through on these projects! Really amazing ideas for indicators and for open source resources.
- Follow-up will be critical for the meeting to have been of any value.
- Some discussions got bogged down by extensive discussion on definition of ethics vis a vis human rights.

What would be the most productive way to use working group meetings?

- Leave them the way they are now.
- Review assignments and provide progress reports.
- Give an overview of current projects and how to contribute to them. Discuss and try to stimulate new ideas for projects.
- As opportunities to discuss what has already been sent by e-mail (which is not what happened, but would represent an improvement).
- Follow up the meetings with action.
- Have "closed" meetings of only those who are group members. This could happen the morning of the first day, and the current meetings could be used to inform those who might be interested in joining.
- To continue the two-fold project of work and planning.
- I would make the working group longer and reduce the time for speakers. More doing and less sitting and listening.
- The working group meetings are a mixture of old hands and new participants. They must be structured to explain current activities for new participants, and then break out into smaller groups so that the old hands can actually do something.
- Taking a little time to show new members how to do some of the work/research/analysis that is necessary.
- We need more interaction between the different working groups; collaboration is needed and perhaps arranging common sessions will be productive.
- I liked the current set-up - might have been useful to aim for concrete next steps.
- Make basic information available in advance so meeting time is not required to bring people up to date. Create action items with responsible names and due dates at the meeting.
- Provide more time for working sessions with clear milestones as "deliverables" at the end.

Business Meetings

	Response Count	Response Percent
Outreach and Communication	15	39.5
Planning the January 2013 Coalition Meeting	9	23.7
Technology for Human Rights: Volunteer Opportunity	3	7.9
I did not attend a business meeting	11	28.9

Outreach and Communication Committee

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Format	0	1	5	4	5	0	3.87
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	1	4	4	5	0	3.93

Planning the January 2013 Coalition Meeting

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Format	0	0	3	3	3	0	4.00
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	4	2	3	0	3.89

Technology for Human Rights: Volunteer Opportunities

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Format	0	0	1	2	0	0	3.67
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	2	0	0	3.67

Workshops

	Response Count	Response Percent
Engaging Your Society in Human Rights	10	27.0
Building the Next Generation of Socially Responsible Innovators	7	18.9
The Human Right to Clean Water and Sanitation	7	18.9
I did not attend a workshop	13	35.1

The Human Right to Clean Water and Sanitation

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	1	1	5	0	4.57
Session Format	0	0	1	3	3	0	4.29
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	1	3	3	0	4.29

Engaging Your Society in Human Rights

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	1	4	5	0	4.40
Session Format	0	0	2	6	2	0	4.00
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	1	5	3	0	4.22

Building the Next Generation of Socially Responsible Innovators: Integrating Human Rights in Technology & Engineering Curricula

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	2	1	4	0	4.29
Session Format	0	0	2	0	4	0	4.33
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	1	0	3	0	4.50

Closing Plenary

Technology, Human Rights and Professional Responsibility

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Average
Session Topic	0	0	4	9	10	10	4.26
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	4	8	10	10	4.27

Comments

- Again, I thought that both plenary sessions were very informative and useful. Each one contributed to my knowledge of human rights and human rights activities.
- I loved the Benetech speaker who worked with human rights activists! Truly inspiring.
- All presentations were highly professional and useful.
- Actually got beyond warm and fuzzy talks and into meaningful details.
- Each speaker was clear, concise presenting new material. Very engaging.

Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations

How did you hear about the Coalition meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Email from AAAS/Program	36	15.4
Program Facebook Page	0	0
AAAS/Program Website	0	0
Word of Mouth	5	12.5
Other	6	-

Affiliation

	Response Count	Response Percent
Professional Society/Association	25	61.0
University/College	10	24.4
Government	1	2.4
Human Rights Organization	0	0
Business/Industry	0	0
Nonprofit	3	7.3
Press/Media	0	0
Self-employed	2	4.9

What was your main reason(s) for attending? (Check all that apply)

	Response Count	Response Percent (of total number of respondents)
To learn how my professional society can become involved in the Coalition	13	32.5
To learn how I can personally become involved in the Coalition	21	52.5
To learn more about science, technology and human rights	26	65
To learn how my organization can respond more effectively	20	50
To obtain help in engaging members of my discipline in human rights	19	47.5
Other (see below)	10	--

Other responses:

- Participate in the Coalition Council.
- To fulfill my obligations as a representative to the Coalition.
- To examine the intersection of HR and Environmental Science.
- Help others get involved.
- To help EIR work move forward.
- To facilitate my organizations participation in the ongoing work of the Coalition.
- To present a project to my working group.
- To advance my understanding of human rights and science.
- Main reasons were to learn about substance of several panels (water and sanitation/development) and to see whether there were possible links with an international law human rights project I work on with the Coalition, and with science and technology organizations more broadly.

Overall, how satisfied were you with the meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Very satisfied	25	69.4
Moderately satisfied	10	27.8
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	0.0
Moderately dissatisfied	1	2.8
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0

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

- Interactions with other coalition members.
- Breadth, Clarity.
- Working group meeting - moving projects forward.
- The descriptions (in various forms) of the challenges of educating policy makers, scientists, and young people about HR.
- Future goals on the human rights.
- This meeting seemed to be more effective than some past meetings at facilitating dialogue.
- Networking, learning about the coalition, learning about how I can get involved and help.
- Coming up with new projects to pursue.
- The business meeting, but only because I needed it to go well in order to make progress with the Outreach and Communications Committee.
- The opportunity to engage with experts on human rights.,
- Presentations and working group meeting.
- Workshop and discussions.
- The presentation in the focus theme of the meeting; all have been excellent
- The closing plenary was very good.
- The Executive Director's circle, the Council meeting, the sessions I attended, and discussions with others all provided an opportunity to think about how I can effectively engage scientists more fully in this work.
- Sense of community - like-minded people striving for similar things.
- Finding out what has been done, what is the focus, and what is in the planning stage. Also, making contacts with colleagues with whom I can start working on some of the issues we have discussed. There are concrete problems to work on.
- Hearing from fellow societies about how they integrate human rights into their activities and programs.
- Both learning about history and current state of right to development as well as domestic relevance and challenges to the current formulation of the rights to water and sanitation, and networking.
- Networking with AAAS and with other society representatives.

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

- For some reason which I cannot identify, the presentations this year did not provide much fodder for general discussion, did not stimulate discussion beyond the session.
- Our own EIR working group was less productive than I would have hoped.
- The Executive Directors meeting
- Mere consideration of theory.
- I'm a social scientist so sadly, some of the more technical pieces of the opening session went over my head.
- Too many talks about general stuff instead of focusing on what exactly can be done through the coalition. The meetings oftentimes feel like they are focused on people who have never heard of human rights.
- I was frustrated with my working group meeting because I am involved in reviewing the starter kit but was not asked to run that portion of the discussion in the absence of the group leaders. As a result, we ended up reviewing past discussions a lot. It did turn out to be somewhat useful, however.
- The schedule was changed from what was originally posted on website. This led to some confusion.
- The topic was a little limiting in its specificity.
- Finding a location to have lunch and leverage the time to make new connections/networks.
- Presentation of details without background information.
- The topics and talks were of interest, but I want to see a coalition meeting focused on topics that would FORCE the physical sciences to attend. Pick a theme that will force us to invite physical scientists to speak, and thus draw them to attend and participate. Those are the scientists who we need to draw to the Coalition. Thus, we need to pick topics that draw them in. 1) Science & diplomacy. 2) How certain countries are inhibiting the rights of scientists and how their colleagues are responding.
- The lecture style presentations.

How can future meetings be improved?

- More focus on how the coalition can have a concrete impact in affecting human rights policies and practice, especially with regard to prevention of abuse, monitoring and enforcement.
- Video tape all of the sessions.
- See my earlier comment on "closed" meetings with active committee members.
- Advance agendas for meetings such as the executive meeting.
- Let us start with a case study, which is result oriented
- Less talks, more workshops and more time to come up with serious plans of what needs/will be done next.
- Make the morning introductory session shorter for at least one of the two meetings per year. For example, perhaps it is only necessary to review the progress of the Coalition every January.
- Provide the handouts for the presentations.
- A reception at the end of the day or a longer break to network and talk to representatives of other associations.
- We are constantly running against the clock; it seems the allocated time is too short, although how could it be otherwise. One-on-one interaction is extremely important and for that one has to skip one or more sessions.

- A break between each session of at least a few minutes written into the schedule so that there is time if one goes over time. There was not time to flip the rooms from one session to the next.
- I think the meeting is well-organized and interesting. My biggest hurdle is finding a day and a half of free time in my schedule to attend the Council and Coalition meetings.
- Broader topic areas that apply to array of organizations. Children's rights seems like it should be an interesting one.
- Stream the sessions live and archive on the Coalition website.
- Get more information out to participants in advance. Make sessions more action rather than report oriented.
- We discussed adding a student session; may require more than the one day format.
- Include more action-oriented sessions

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

- International interpretations of human rights
- A focused debate on what role (if any) the coalition should play in pressuring US officials to ratify various treaties and protocols on human rights.
- Manipulation of science and engineering.
- Ethical responsibilities for scientists -- there was one young woman asking questions relating to her professional experience which indicated she wasn't getting support/education on these issues.
- More examples/case studies that use environmental justice as a lens to view HR issues.
- Perhaps on the psychology of what makes people care about human rights, but that is my own research concern.
- Past accomplishments
- How to simplify and use of rules/book of Human Rights (HRs) in each field.
- It would be good to review a topic from a previous meeting - see what has changed etc. Also, it would be nice if at least once per year an award could be given at the opening or closing session of the meeting. Oh and there should be at least a 5 min closing session.
- Public Health
- Science and children's rights would be my suggestion, and it's already being implemented! Yay! I would also suggest the role of science in creating humane settings/environments for people (e.g., homes, communities, schools, treatment facilities, immigrant detention, prisons, etc.)
- Distinctions between "ethics" and "human rights".
- International partners in relation to Article 15. Perhaps will be useful if this question is repeated in a few month's time after pondering.
- Other parts of human rights law that are applicable to science other than Article 15 should receive some attention.
- Science and technology with human rights emphasis vs. military industrial complex
- Exploring the intersection between women's issues and human rights. Exploring the connection between the interests of underserved racial/ethnic groups (domestically) and human rights.
- More basic definitions (preferably presented in advance but then elaborated and discussed at the session). Education.
- Theme that will force scientists from the physical sciences to attend and speak. There are too few involved in the coalition, and we need to target them. Pick a theme/topic(s) that will FORCE them to attend/ be involved.
- Keep up with the strong health focus, and links to other rights along with article 15. Also possibly considering how scientists can link up with other disciplines (e.g., law) to advance human rights. As well as ways that science and accountability can contribute to such cross-cutting human rights issues as participation and accountability.

- Domestic (U.S.) human rights issues; more vantage points from outside the U.S. on domestic abuses and what U.S. can do to address them -- need to reconfigure the definition of the "other". Sometimes I believe that the U.S. looks outside its borders for problems when there are abundant problems within the U.S. that are not only of concern, but worsening.

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

- The Coalition inspired me to create a Human Rights Think Tank at the University of Tampa where I teach. We put on our first interdisciplinary conference in April, have sponsored several rights-related forums with the ACLU, and plan to bring in geneticist Spencer Wells in 2013. The impact of his genomics project is that homo sapiens are one family, each worthy of respect.
- I've learned a lot and had my own thoughts on the subject. Thank you.
- I am particularly concerned to investigate more on the development of the Right to Development, the topic presented by Stephen Marks. I have since been in touch with him, and he has sent me an extended bibliography on the topic.
- I will be better able to incorporate HR discussions in my teaching at various levels.
- This meeting has inspired me to be more active in getting scientists in my discipline active.
- None yet, but I think it will! I'm excited to be a part of the coalition and contribute in whatever way possible.
- My involvement in the Coalition has had a substantial impact on my life and my work, both professionally and personally. It has brought me new contacts, new opportunities, and taught me a great deal about how professional societies function (or don't).
- I have just finished my dissertation on the impact of new media technologies on youth civic engagement in Lithuania, a young democracy where most citizens do not take advantage of their civil and political rights, and I love that this Coalition works to further this type of work. Also, big thanks to Jessica and Theresa and AAAS staff for your hard work!!
- I have learnt a great deal and would like to continue learning about the interplay of science and technology with human rights.
- Nothing yet - depends on follow-up.
- It has continued to bring fresh perspectives to my own work as an educator and a scientist.