

AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition Meeting

Report

January 27-28, 2014
AAAS Headquarters
Washington, D.C.

Disability Rights and Accessing the Benefits of Scientific Progress and Its Applications

Throughout the first day of this meeting, participants will deepen their knowledge about the ways in which the human rights of persons with disabilities intersect with science and engineering. Sessions will explore how access to science and technology can affect the rights of people with disabilities, both positively and negatively, and will explore challenges to fulfilling the right to participate in science and engineering as students, practitioners and as the subjects of research.

Article 15 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights guarantees everyone the right to enjoy the benefits of scientific progress and its applications. Since the launch of the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition in January 2009, its core activities have focused on engaging scientists and engineers in an international process to define this right and create opportunities to integrate the right into the activities of scientists, engineers and their professional organizations.



ADVANCING SCIENCE, SERVING SOCIETY

Table of Contents

Session Reports

Introduction	4
Opening Plenary: The Disability Rights Framework and Implications for Science and Technology	5
Plenary: Accessing the Benefits of Science and Technology	6
Plenary: International Human Rights Treaties in the Senate.....	7
Plenary: Participating in Science and Technology	8
Closing Remarks	9

Working Group and Committee Reports

Working Group Report: Welfare of Scientists	11
Working Group Report: Service to the STEM Community.....	12
Working Group Report: Service to the Human Rights Community	17
Working Group Report: Education and Information Resources.....	19
Committee Report: Outreach and Communication.....	22

Appendices

Appendix: Session Evaluations.....	24
Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations	28

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, including those that involve the conduct of science. Launched in January 2009, the Coalition is currently comprised of 51 professional associations and scholarly societies and 70 affiliated individuals.

The AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition
thanks the

American Chemical Society
American Educational Research Association
American Physical Society
American Statistical Association
Association of American Geographers
Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences
Kean University
National Center for Science and Civic Engagement

for their support of this meeting

Introduction

Speaker: *Jessica Wyndham*, Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program, AAAS

Jessica Wyndham welcomed participants, bringing to everyone's attention that January 2014 marks five years since the Coalition launched. From a network of twenty organizations, the Coalition has grown to over fifty organizational members and affiliates and over seventy individual affiliates. Yet, the best measure of the Coalition's success is in the valuable resources developed, important services provided and unique contributions made to contemporary debates at the intersection of science, technology and human rights. Examples include:

- [Primer on Scientific Freedom and Human Rights](#)
- [Intersections of Science, Human Rights and Ethics: The Question of Human Subjects Protection](#)
- [Starter Kit: Helping Your Scientific Society Promote Human Rights](#)
- [Human Rights Projects: Guidelines for Scientists and Human Rights Organizations](#)
- Training series for human rights practitioners on scientific methods and technologies to support human rights work
- [Science and Human Rights: A Select Bibliography](#)
- [Syllabi on Science and Human Rights](#)

The Outreach and Communication Committee has led an initiative to more effectively engage students in the work of the Coalition, including through the appointment of student delegates by member and affiliated organizations, and the integration of a student poster competition into the Coalition meetings.

At the same time, the Coalition has attracted many diverse leaders in the field of science, technology and/or human rights, including: Mary Robinson, former UN High Commissioner for Human Rights and former President of Ireland, who participated in the launch of the Coalition; former Assistant Secretary of State, Michael Posner, who was the plenary speaker at an event to address 'Science and Academic Freedom in the Digital Age'; and Frank la Rue, UN Special Rapporteur on Freedom of Expression who participated in a Coalition meeting and spoke on international scientific cooperation and the right to science.

The 'right to science' is the focus of the Coalition's Joint Initiative. The Coalition has contributed substantively to important deliberations about the meaning of this right at the level of the United Nations, engaging hundreds of scientists and engineers in the process. The culmination of one Coalition project was the presentation of a report by Margaret Vitullo (American Sociological Association) and Jessica Wyndham at a United Nations meeting. The report was based on findings of an 18-month focus group process aimed at eliciting the perspectives of scientists and engineers as to the meaning of the right to science.

Finally, the organizational members and affiliates of the Coalition have undertaken a plethora of human rights activities over the past five years and the quantity, quality and variety of activities continues to grow, from peer-reviewed journals and newsletters related to human rights, to hosting of websites and webinars on human rights specific to a discipline, from awarding of prizes for human rights activities, to public letters and statements on issues of human rights concern.

Wyndham emphasized that this progress was made possible through the ideas and energy generated by Coalition members, thanking them for their continued commitment to the mission and goals of the

Coalition, and challenging all those who support the Coalition to recommit to the long-term goals articulated in the Plan of Action, and to think creatively, remain active and collaborate, as one of the greatest strengths of the network is its multi-disciplinary nature.

Opening Plenary: The Disability Rights Framework and Implications for Science and Technology

Speakers: *Charlotte McClain-Nhlapo*, Coordinator for the Office for Disability and Inclusive Development, USAID
David Morrissey, Executive Director, United States International Council on Disabilities

Moderator: *Maya Sabatello*, Disability Rights in Society Program, Columbia University

One billion people, or about 15 percent of the world's population, have a disability. Eighty percent of those people live in developing countries. Though life for people with disabilities has improved over the last several decades, accessibility challenges for disabled individuals still remain ubiquitous. This plenary examined the role that science and technology are playing within the growing field of disability rights around the world.

One of the key goals of the disability rights movement in the United States today is the ratification of the [United Nations Convention on the Rights of People with Disabilities](#) (CRPD). **Maya Sabatello**, Director of the [Disability Rights in Society Program at Columbia University](#), discussed how the CRPD is both innovative and comprehensive. Sabatello explained that the convention focuses on improving the ability of persons with disabilities to thrive in society, rather than focusing solely on an individual's physical challenges. This means leveling the playing field, providing accessibility and moving from a medical approach to a social approach. Inclusion, Sabatello argued, is a human right.

Charlotte McClain-Nhlapo, Coordinator for the [Office for Disability and Inclusive Development at the United States Agency for International Development](#) (USAID), discussed USAID's efforts to improve the rights of persons with disabilities. For example, USAID funds numerous science and technology projects, particularly ones that increase accessibility such as mobile devices designed for those with special needs. She also highlighted the significance of the international cooperation clause of the CRPD which encourages greater collaboration on disability technologies across borders.

David Morrissey, Executive Director at the [United States International Council on Disabilities](#) (USICD), emphasized the importance of bringing individuals with disabilities into the conversation. In order to make truly impactful policy changes, persons with disabilities must be involved in the process. "Nothing about us, without us," remarked Morrissey. The USICD coordinates a wide variety of projects to improve accessibility and disability rights. For example, they run the [Global Disability Rights Library](#) - funded by USAID - which provides a free online database of resources for persons with disabilities around the world.

All speakers mentioned the notion of 'universal design' in their remarks. This concept broadens the accessibility conversation from how we can support an underserved population to how we can better serve all people collectively. An example of this was given by McClain-Nhlapo. She explained that there was a water pump in a developing African nation that was inaccessible to some individuals because it

was only reachable by stairs. Additionally, those able to reach the pump would frequently spill considerable amounts of water when walking back down the stairs. After some discussion, a ramp was built to replace the stairs. The ramp not only opened access to those with disabilities, but also helped the entire population by preventing people from spilling water. The concept of ‘universal design’ requires extra thought and dialogue but can often lead to sustainable, cost-effective accessibility solutions that benefit all members of society.

In the question and answer session the panelists provided a brief background on why the US has still not ratified the CRPD. Because of the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) in 1990, US law already complies with the CRPD; no new laws would have to be enacted to ratify the treaty. As Morrissey commented, many senators have not voted in favor of ratification due to worries about national sovereignty, which Morrissey argued are unfounded. This specific issue was addressed in-depth during the third plenary, *International Human Rights Treaties in the Senate*. Morrissey directed the audience to www.disabilitytreaty.org, where the public can find a number of resources and ways to call upon their senators to ratify the treaty.

Plenary: Accessing the Benefits of Science and Technology

Introduction: *Alan I. Leshner*, American Association for the Advancement of Science

Keynote: *Vinton Cerf*, Google

Speakers: *James Thurston*, Microsoft
Eric Mathews, Disability Rights International

Moderator: *Edward J. Walsh*, Acoustical Society of America

In his keynote address, **Vinton Cerf**, vice president and Chief Internet Evangelist at Google, described the technological feats we have accomplished over the last several decades and the need to make these technologies more accessible for all individuals. Cerf, who is considered one of the “fathers of the internet” after his leading work with the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), which ultimately formed the foundation of the web. He also played a major role in the development of email, and is known for a wide range of contributions to the field of computer science.

Though technology continues to progress and its rate of advancement increases as well, it has not kept equal pace with accessibility challenges. According to Cerf, there have been some positive strides towards helping those with disabilities, but not nearly enough. He argued for inclusive design principles, urging engineers to consider the needs of all individuals when building new technologies. To this end, Cerf has established a mandatory accessibility training program at Google for all incoming engineers. Similarly, he argued that it is vital to keep individuals with disabilities involved in the technological development process and to value their direct feedback. It is particularly beneficial when companies hire talented engineers who themselves have disabilities because they can provide a unique accessibility perspective during product development. Cerf concluded his remarks by stating that we need to make technological accessibility the norm in society.

James Thurston, Director of International Accessibility Policy at Microsoft, also commented on digital inclusion efforts. Besides the moral imperative to improve technological accessibility, he noted that there are financial incentives that can serve as motivating factors. Designing new devices and improving

the accessibility of prior ones can tap into an undervalued market with many exciting possibilities. He discussed how [Xbox Kinect](#) technology is being adapted for the use of deaf individuals, an idea which could facilitate a whole new medium of sign language communication. Additionally, Thurston mentioned Microsoft's recent launch of its [Technology and Human Rights Center](#), a new department tasked with coordinating the corporation's efforts on a range of human rights and development issues.

Eric Mathews, an Advocacy Associate at [Disability Rights International](#), argued that social factors should also be considered when creating more accessible technology. His organization fights to end mandatory institutionalization of people and children with special needs because of the egregious abuses of human rights occurring at many institutions around the world. While designing technology for greater access is clearly a positive step, he suggested we consider the wider social ramifications associated with new technology. For example, if a government purchases advanced computers for persons with disabilities but implements them into institutions, the technology may only distract from underlying issues and perpetuate abusive practices. However, the same technology can serve society better when implemented in a more beneficial and cost-effective way, such as helping individuals with disabilities remain in private home settings rather than institutions, where they may be subject to abuse and isolation from their families.

The panelists emphasized their excitement with the possibilities of new technology to change lives. From cochlear implants that give deaf individuals hearing to adapting video game consoles for enhanced sign language communication, the future holds endless possibilities for improving the lives of those with disabilities. Moreover, we should focus on uniting technological progress with political and social willpower in order to affect positive change in the field of disability rights.

Plenary: International Human Rights Treaties in the Senate

Speaker: *Michael Gamel-McCormick*, Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions (HELP)

Moderator: *Paula Skedsvold*, Federation of Associations in Behavioral and Brain Sciences

In past Coalition meetings, panelists and audience members have expressed frustration that the United States has failed to ratify many human rights treaties, including the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD). This plenary focused on this specific issue, identifying potential opportunities and persistent challenges associated with the U.S. treaty ratification process. **Michael Gamel-McCormick**, the Disability Policy Director at the [Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions](#) (HELP), addressed this topic, bringing an insider's perspective in conversation with **Paula Skedsvold** from the [Federation of Associations in Behavioral & Brain Sciences](#) (FABBS).

Gamel-McCormick began his remarks by describing the treaty ratification process: the President first signs a treaty he finds constitutional and in alignment with American values; the Administration then analyzes the treaty to determine what changes or additions would need to occur to U.S. law; the Executive Branch, specifically the Secretary of State's office, reviews the treaty and, in consultation with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, creates reservations, understandings, and/or declarations (RUDs) before sending it to the [U.S. Senate Committee on Foreign Relations](#) for consideration. Once the treaty is voted out of Committee, it is sent to the Senate floor where it requires two-thirds approval (67

votes) in order to pass. It is at this final stage that ratification of the CRPD was halted in December 2012. When the CRPD was put up for a vote on December 4, 2012, it fell six votes short of ratification. While six votes may sound insignificant, Gamel-McCormick remarked that acquiring six votes in a partisan Senate can be a major challenge.

Gamel-McCormick explained that there are two major reasons why some senators are hesitant to approve treaties: either they take issue with specific language in a treaty, or they are concerned about a United Nations treaty superseding US sovereignty. For instance, many find the ‘best interest of the child’ clause in the CRPD worrisome, fearing that it may allow for the imposition of limitations on parental rights. Likewise, others who consider themselves pro-life take issue with a specific clause ensuring sexual and reproductive health. These concerns tie into larger issues of distrust towards the UN and fears that the ratification of international treaties will lead to an acquiescence of US independence.

The notion that treaty ratification empowers the UN and diminishes national sovereignty is unfounded, according to Gamel-McCormick. For many of the treaties, there is a UN panel that periodically reviews and assesses the enforcement of the treaty by signators; however, this has no impact on US sovereignty. In fact, the U.S. does not need to enact any new laws in order to meet the legal standards for ratification of the CRPD..

During the question and answer session, several audience members expressed support for U.S. ratification of these treaties as a way to set a precedent for the rest of the world. When the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) passed in 1990, citizens and governments all over the world were compelled to action, and millions of people were inspired to fight for disability rights. Advocacy efforts for the CRPD are ongoing and Gamel-McCormick expects to see the treaty come to the Senate floor for another vote later this year. When asked by an audience member what the public could do to help move along the ratification process, Gamel-McCormick urged the audience to apply constituent pressure and call upon their Senators to support ratification.

Plenary: Participating in Science and Technology

Speakers: *Robert Dinerstein*, American University Washington College of Law
Celia B. Fisher, Center for Ethics Education, Fordham University
Marco M. Midon, Goddard Space Flight Center, NASA

Moderator: *Anju Khubchandani*, Office on Disability Issues, American Psychological Association

In this session, speakers explored some of the challenges to ensuring full participation by persons with disabilities in science and engineering as a human right. A main theme of this session was that “all persons should have equal access to the benefits and burdens of research,” as **Celia Fisher**, of the Center for Ethics Education at [Fordham University](http://www.fordham.edu), proposed during her talk. Another important idea that Fisher raised was about the ethical issues involved in research. In particular she discussed how researchers are able to balance allowing persons with intellectual disabilities to participate in research while protecting that person’s well-being and ensuring that his/her rights are not exploited (e.g., determining that person’s ‘consent competency’). Fisher brought to light a number of thought-provoking questions regarding the rights of mentally disabled people participating in research studies. Some of these questions were: 1) the fairness of requiring a mentally disabled person to take a

“competency to consent” test, to determine whether or not he/she understands the risks and benefits of the research, when others are not required to take such a test; and 2) the ethics of a caregiver or family member overriding the consent (or lack thereof) given by a mentally disabled person to participate in a medical research project (e.g., prescription drug testing). Fisher emphasized that consent procedures must reflect a scientific ethic in which a patient would make an informed decision regarding participation in a research project in collaboration with his/her loved ones as well as with the scientific researchers. She argued that person should not be excluded from the opportunity to benefit from science and research unless there is empirical evidence to support this exclusion.

Marco Midon, Acting NASA Stations Manager for the Near Earth Network Project at the [NASA Goddard Space Flight Center](#), spoke about design decisions in the development of new technologies, specifically with respect to the effects of these technologies on scientists and engineers with disabilities. Midon shared his personal experiences as a NASA engineer with a visual disability. He gave the example of NASA’s agency-wide use of smartphones, which have limited (and initially, had no) functionality for visually impaired users. Midon is a strong advocate that companies should only purchase technologies that allow everyone to benefit from their use, and that employees should have the opportunity to choose preferred types of interface of technological devices (e.g., touchscreen versus keyboard phones) so that all users may benefit from technology.

Robert Dinerstein, Professor of Law and Associate Dean for Experiential Education at the [American University Washington College of Law](#), talked about the necessity of including disabled people in the decision making process when doing or creating something that is for their presumed benefit. This is especially true for matters such as health care decisions and design concepts of new technology. For example, a company creating a new product need consider how this product may be universally designed to benefit everyone, including persons with disabilities. Furthermore, these products should be designed with consideration for people with disabilities from the beginning, rather than altering the products post-fabrication, which often results in sub-par technologies that are inefficient. An overall theme of Dinerstein’s talk was the need to promote greater involvement and inclusion for disabled people as well as the need to provide opportunities for empowerment.

Closing Remarks

Speaker: *Jessica Wyndham*, Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program, AAAS

Jessica Wyndham provided a summary of the major themes that had arisen during the course of the day’s discussion. By way of introduction, she recalled the comments of David Morrissey, that each country is in a “unique place along a continuum” of knowledge, understanding and acceptance of the principles contained within the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. The same can be said of the organizations and individuals that comprise the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition, Wyndham suggested, pointing out that they, too, had evolved in the depth of their knowledge, complexity of their understanding, and commitment to promoting human rights norms.

Wyndham then pulled out five themes from the day's discussion:

- (1) Recurring principles raised throughout the meeting were “inclusion” and “participation” of persons with disabilities,** including in society, in science, in research and development related to persons with disabilities but also in research generally, as well as in policy making. The principles of the social responsibility of scientists and engineers, as well as the corporate social responsibilities of technology companies and others was also a common theme emerging throughout the discussion, with specific examples of how corporate social responsibility can be implemented in practice provided by Vinton Cerf (Google) and James Thurston (Microsoft).
- (2) Addressing scientific and technology issues related to persons with disabilities calls for multidisciplinary involvement.** Some of the examples provided by speakers included: engineers involved in developing the Internet, phones and water pumps; statisticians gathering disaggregated data to identify gaps in accessibility or trends in discrimination; and social scientists documenting and exposing abuse of persons with disabilities, to challenge stigmas and correct misperceptions.
- (3) The goals of science and technology for persons with disabilities are to develop (a) adaptive/assistive technologies and/or (b) technologies with “universal design.”** To achieve these goals means providing the means for persons with disabilities to be able to interact within society, and also to engage in the scientific and engineering enterprises. What is more, achieving these goals can help build markets because what benefits all includes global markets that may not otherwise be served by technological advancements.
- (4) Research and development implies a specific process of thinking if it is to meet the rights of persons with disabilities.** Technology developers as well as researchers should turn their minds to issues of accessibility at the early stages of their work (whether accessibility to knowledge, products or services), this includes involving persons with disabilities and, in many instances, forming cooperative arrangements among government, civil society, the private sector, the scientific and engineering communities as well as the education sector.
- (5) The time is ripe for action to encourage the US Senate to ratify the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.** One speaker had highlighted six forces driving global digital inclusion. He noted that the least effective, currently, but the force with most potential was to increase awareness about disability and universal design. To that end, various suggestions were made for how members of the Coalition could become engaged in efforts to encourage Senate ratification of the CRPD: join the civil society network publicly supportive of ratification; issue public statements in support; and contact the relevant Senators to voice support for ratification.

Working Group Report: Welfare of Scientists

Progress since last meeting

Actions on behalf of individual scientists at risk or under threat: A form has been set up at the site <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s/RZS72GR> to allow the submission of information about individual cases. The group members, who represent several member organizations in the Coalition, continue to be actively involved in defending the human rights of colleagues at home and around the world.

Academic Freedom, Scientific Freedom, Internet Freedom and their connection with Article 15: In an attempt to document the cases of human rights violation of academic, scientists and engineers where use of online technology has played a major role in enabling the abuses, the working group has prepared a resource list of organizations and groups dedicated to monitor:

- Academic and Scientific Freedom - ...because individual freedom is the wellspring of human progress
- Privacy as a Human Right – Internet freedom is essential to scientists. Scientific freedom will not exist without Internet freedom.
- Organizations dedicated to inform and educate the general public on: privacy, right to know, Article 15, digital human rights.

At the January 2014 meeting we had a very productive and informative session with invited experts from the Union of Concerned Scientists and Electronic Privacy Information Center.

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

We will continue to monitor and inform the Coalition and other human right groups and scientific organizations of particular cases of scientists, academic or engineers at risk or in danger.

We expect to make some progress in the report 'Academic and Scientific Freedom and the Internet' as well as in a report connecting Article 15 and Scientific Freedom. Both documents will gain strength and substance if we can establish collaborations with expert organizations actively engaged in privacy rights, academic freedom and freedom online, and related concerns.

Ideas Generated

- Workshop on FOIA to educate scientists, academic and engineers
- Phone and Internet monitoring: what is the chilling effect on international collaborations

Next meeting date

We expect to have phone conference calls the first Friday of every month. This has been taking place for the last six months.

Working Group Report: Service to the STEM Community

Attended

Clinton Anderson, Jerry Baker, Ed Butterworth, Cliff Duke, Andrea Hughes (intern at AAAS), Shannon McClarin (intern at SPSSI), Alyson Reed, Gabe Twose, Margaret Weigers Vitullo, Jessica Wyndham.

Progress since last meeting

The working group has three main areas of activity, plus “additional outreach.” Progress on each of the three main areas of activity are outlined below:

Article 15 Report

- Focus group data analysis and report complete, posted to [AAAS website](#).
 - Additional dissemination needed; that effort to be led by AAAS staff.
 - Additional writing planned – article for social science journal, article for human rights journal.
- Presentation at the UN in October of 2013. Very well received
 - Report mentioned in news articles by [two media outlets](#).
 - Report and presentations proved to be influential in UN decision to begin work on a General Comment on Article 15. Key UN committee staff have already begun to be appointed in preparation for that work.

Starter Kit Project

- Reviewed the Starter Kit in terms of:
 - Organization.
 - Gabe and Clinton worked on organization, identifying missing information. Based on feedback from Wilson Bonner that the Starter Kit doesn’t give people enough specifics about what people could DO. Looking at Coalition Benchmarks – focus on one about communicating with constituencies -- tie this into Starter Kit. Include focus on “baby steps” of small things associations can do – publishing on the website, article in newsletter, host a webinar, use the starter kit!
 - Difficulty in getting feedback from other members of the subcommittee – not feeling empowered to move forward without further input.
 - Can we give Gabe the “go ahead” to make the changes he is envisioning?
 - Jerry Baker – will share with 1 or 2 staff people and get them to give feedback useful? YES, please do that.
 - Dissemination
 - Evaluation

Webinar Project

- At last Coalition meeting rated various slides in previous webinar.
- During this meeting discussed how Associations might use the webinar.
 - Questions:
 - How might this vary by association size?

- What are hot topic issues for associations?
 - Academic freedom as a topic that would appeal to broad range of associations. Campuses in countries where academic freedom and equality are not fully recognized. International freedom to conduct science, access to science. Maybe not geology and human rights, but geologists and human rights easy to do.
- Each webinar has 3-4 case studies, drawn from a bank of 12 or so case studies. Let Association decide which one they would like to have.
 - Iranian linguist who studies Hebrew and was jailed.
 - Don't have to invest a lot of time in getting these – Jessica and the host of each association can develop this. Just create a template slide for plugging in cases. "Library" will build over time as we do more webinars.
 - Include a standard set of references, further reading. Give this to the person who will be planning as well as the participants at the end. Would be great to include some that relate to HRs and that disciplinary association. THIS goes on the planning document for the association.
 - Slide with additional reading divided into two categories – general HR and science and another on HR and [discipline]

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

General

- Margaret: Commits to finishing the report/notes by tomorrow and posting to listserv and team site.

Article 15 Report

- Publicize the Article 15 report to our respective associations
 - **Article 15 report – "Linguists Inform Report to the UN" – tell other associations that they can do this too. It is on the AAAS website. Could also work with the summary provided to each association.**
 - Post to association twitter feeds or Facebook pages.
- Agreed: Article 15 subcommittee ends, members fold into webinar subcommittee.
 - Cliff, Alyson and Margaret.
 - Alyson in particular interested in the international Article 15 follow up work – might shift to that when it gets moving forward.
 - The Article 15 joint initiative is separate - many working groups still have things to contribute to the larger Article 15 project.

Starter Kit Project

- Two levels of work.
 - Evaluate current functioning, and improving that.
 - Larger level – what is it for, and what can we do to pursue that purpose?
 - Between now and March decide about doing a workshop at the next Coalition meeting about how to get started. Focus: communication. Telling people what the Coalition has to offer for various constituencies. DECIDE if doing workshop or not BY APRIL 2.

- Next step (6 months): reach out to other working groups about the products they have developed and what they would like communicating about to audiences.
- Specific action steps by subcommittee members:
 - Gabe sends Starter Kit to Ed Butterworth, Jerry.
 - Jerry will send to staff for fresh view/responses.
 - Will include webinar references in revisions.
 - Focus on Coalition benchmark as a first step to be emphasized in Starter Kit.

Webinar Project

- Tasks for moving forward
 1. Slides – Ed and Margaret really focus on this. Then send draft to Alyson and Cliff for their feedback. They send comments in whatever form works best for them.
 - a. **MWV**: SEND LINKS to shared workspace with recording and slides to Cliff and Alyson.
 2. Letter inviting associations to host a webinar – **Cliff** comes up with a draft letter.
 - a. What’s in it for organization? Value proposition.
 - i. Helping members connect their work to meaning, to contributing to the common good.
 - ii. Include quotes from the focus groups in the letter.
 - iii. Need to think about this for advertising as well.
 - b. **Cliff** talks to Jessica to get the letter that was sent to associations about focus groups.
 3. List of target organizations – Coalition members first.
 4. Planning document outlining steps and timetable and follow up – **Alyson** will create a draft document. **Ed** will create a graphic to illustrate.
 5. Background on logistics and technology. (Based on ASA documents)
 6. Identify the logistics person at AAAS/ASA who will run the software (if not Jessica herself)
- Goals:
 - Time table for production
 - Letters go out in May
 - Follow up phone calls if needed.
 - LSA, ASA, ESA – we have three we can schedule.
 - **1st one in June so we have it done by next Coalition meeting**
 - ASA goes first or third (either before or after LSA)
 - ESA – Sept or October
 - LSA -- summer
 - Outcome goals
 - Check the numeric goal from Plan of Action

Report-writer’s note: The Plan of Action does not include a numeric target for the number of webinars. However, it does include compiling longitudinal data on webinar participation and the impact of webinar on associations and individuals, as well as writing up results for appropriate audiences, including publishing a scientifically informed article on the results. Additionally, we are to explore the possibility of recording webinars and making them widely available via YouTube or some other easily accessible platform.

Ideas Generated

How to publicize Article 15 report to international community?

- Alyson Reed interested in working on international outreach regarding Article 15 report, project.
- Write a letter to international disciplinary associations.
- Let countries know that they can participate in reporting on Article 15 when their review by the committee is coming up.
- Could there be another subcommittee to work on this within the working group?
 - JW does not yet have a clear idea of the best way to do this. Would like to make sure we get other groups involved as well.
 - AR: perhaps a group separate from this one, not limited to this work group.
- Webinars could become a tool for reaching out to international community.

General set of webinars

- Not discipline specific, sponsored by the Coalition.
- Could image a series of Coalition webinars. Pick up on the topics of the semi-annual meetings. For example, the disability and HRs topic – then the Associations’ role is to publicize these.
 - Could this be a 2015-2016 item?
 - Would be available on an archive?

Next meeting date

Webinar subcommittee: Wednesday March 5, 2pm – **Margaret** sends GoToMeeting invitation

Starter Kit subcommittee: Gabe will work with group and set date

Full working group: April 2, 12:30-2:00pm at the AAAS

Working Group Report: Service to the Human Rights Community

Outreach to Human Rights: Evaluate methods of workshops/clinics, etc., and revise plans for future efforts. Based on comments received at the initial workshops, it was decided that it would be valuable to evaluate the past approaches (workshops and clinics) and consider revising our plans for future efforts, in particular looking at topics of interest and preferred presentation formats. To this end, we worked with Theresa Harris at AAAS to design a web-survey of human rights organizations to learn more about the topics of interest. The survey was sent out to known organizations at the end of 2013. Results were presented at the January meeting.

Joint Initiative: The Indicators sub-working group (ISWG) selected three data sets as exemplars of three types of indicators, based on ideas presented in the Green Paper on **Indicators of Article 15: Right to Benefit from Science**. Six individuals collaborated in reviewing the information and evaluating the data for the purpose of developing indicators. Underway is a report describing the data and the issues around creating indicators based on these exemplars. ISWG attempts to hold monthly telephone conference calls to provide updates on the members' work and to discuss goals and future directions of the Indicators work.

Meetings and new member: After a short delay following the July meeting, we have continued to hold monthly conference calls to discuss general topics, as well as separate calls for the subgroups described above. Several new members have joined these calls and contributed ideas for new projects and/or additions to the current projects.

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

July Meeting. The 5th anniversary of the Coalition will be celebrated at our next Coalition meeting July 14-15. We need to determine how we want to use this opportunity to showcase our working group activities and/or tailor our presentation to the HR community.

Outreach: The Outreach subgroup currently is evaluating the best way forward. Several new attendees expressed interest in helping with various aspects of this work (Jim Stansbury, Mindy Reiser and Ken Schechtman) in addition to Ollie Moles, Sue Gunawardena-Vaughn and Susan Hinkins who have previously been involved. A call was scheduled to follow-up on various suggestions made at the meeting, suggestions for how we could extend our outreach to human rights organizations as well as suggestions for workshops. Next steps may include indirect marketing, i.e., presenting further seminars to all takers, and direct marketing to specific HROs and on specific issues such as torture or environmental impact. Working Group member and Council member Sue Gunawardena-Vaughn, Director-Southeast Asia, Freedom House, also offered to assist with setting up introductory/networking meetings at HRO sites for HROs to describe their organizations and project needs and for AAAS to inform HROs about the On-Call Scientists Program and AAAS activities that can assist HROs in their work.

A suggestion had previously been made that we should develop a database with information on HROs, using information from the websites of organizations (what types of projects is the HRO working on and what scientific skills or technology could be useful to the HRO.) This information and other sources of information would be collected in a database. Bill Mawby has offered to outline a proposal for this effort and we will discuss how we want to move forward on our March conference call.

Indicators project. The Indicators sub-working group will complete its first database in the coming months. ISWG is planning its next database, including exploration of sources of data and evaluation of those data. ISWG will seek regular input from experts who are external to ISWG.

Ideas Generated

Outreach: The following suggestions were offered for activities beyond our seminars.

- Workshops at professional meetings.
- Arranging seminars at colleges in departments where future HRO leaders and managers may typically be found.
- Including our work into HRO publications (ACLU publication *Stand* and Freedom House's publication *Freedom in the World* were both mentioned.
- Encouraging scientists to serve on boards of HROs.

Indicators project: ISWG is taking a holistic approach to development of indicators. It will seek input from experts on human rights indicators, particularly experts on indicators of the right to enjoy benefits of scientific progress and its applications (REBSPA).

Request(s) for Intern Assistance

The Indicators sub-working group would benefit from assistance. ISWG members hope to maintain the group's momentum in developing databases. We would ask for support in identifying high priority indicators of REBSPA, previous research on REBSPA, and international experts on REBSPA.

Next meeting date

Monthly calls are scheduled for the first Monday of the month, beginning February 3. Our next meeting is scheduled for Monday, March 3.

Working Group Report: Education and Information Resources

Progress since last meeting

The 2012-2014 Plan of Action for the EIR Working Group fit within the broad goal of “identifying, compiling, and developing resources, but also to creating opportunities for productive exchange and collaboration between the scientific and human rights communities.” Specifically, our work for the Fall of 2013 was consistent with Objective #2:

To contribute to the professional development of science and engineering teachers (including high school teachers, college and university professors, and human rights educators) and promote a deeper understanding of human rights among students in science, engineering, and health classes by 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.

Our specific goals for the Fall of 2013, established at the July 2013 meeting, were to:

1. Submit six or more discipline-based updates to the current annotated bibliography to the Steering Committee for amending the Educational and Information Resources on the Coalition website.

This goal was achieved.

2. Solicit, receive and review at least five additional discipline-based updates for the annotated bibliography.

This goal was also achieved, as a total of eleven discipline-based modules (plus additions to the more generic “Social Science” category) were submitted to the Steering Committee during the fall and approved in November for posting. These updates are now posted at http://www.aaas.org/sites/default/files/Science_Human_Rights_Annotated_Bibliography.pdf. They were shared with the EIR Working Group at the January meeting.

Regarding these postings, three other decisions from our July meeting were also implemented, namely that:

- a) Each society name a “curator” for its bibliographic resources so that these can be updated with vital new references on an on-going basis;
- b) Each society prepare a brief (100-word or less) introduction to its bibliographical listings;
- c) Each society provide a link within its annotated bibliography to its human rights webpage (if one exists).

Each of these decisions was implemented for the eleven discipline websites.

Also, in November, the EIR Working Group decided to seek approval for direct hotlinks for as many of the bibliography references as possible, as we assumed that these links would encourage use of the annotated bibliographies. This recommendation was endorsed by the EIR Working Group at the January meeting.

Also at the January meeting, an annotated bibliography on Public Health and Human Rights was reviewed, as prepared by Jennifer Bronson. The EIR Working Group approved this bibliography and will now recommend it to the Steering Committee to be added to the others now online.

3. Submit the backgrounder, “A Very Brief Introduction to Modern Human Rights,” to the Steering Committee for posting under Educational and Informational Resources on the Coalition Website.

The EIR Working Group decided two years ago that it would be useful to include a brief overview of modern human rights on the AAAS educational resources website, an overview designed for students with little basic knowledge of human rights. Sam McFarland, who regularly teaches a general course on human rights, agreed to write it. Several revisions to a first draft were made with suggestions from both human rights experts and lay readers. Many website links are provided in the overview where readers can learn much more on specific topics.

Following our July meeting, David Burns (EIR Working Group Member and Executive Director of the National Center for Science and Civic Engagement), asked to post the module on SENCER (Science Education for New Civic Engagements and Responsibility). The module is now posted there (see Full Report at http://serc.carleton.edu/sencer/backgrounders/overview_of_modern_human-Rights).

Regarding this backgrounder, the EIR group reached two additional decisions at the January meeting. First, rather than posting it also on the AAAS website, we would leave it on the SENCER website and ask AAAS to provide a link to it. Second, it was decided that, rather than trying to regularly update this module itself, brief annual supplements (e.g. five pages or less) could also be posted on the SENCER website and linked by AAAS. A suggested title for these updates was “The Year in Human Rights.”

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

The EIR Working Group goals for the next six months include:

1. Submit several additional annotated bibliographies to the Steering Committee for posting on the website with those now posted. These will include:
 - Public Health and Human Rights, as approved at the January meeting.
 - Linguistics and Human Rights, now being prepared by Jessi Grieser.
 - Economics and Human Rights. EIR member Julia Milton will contact economists about preparing the annotated bibliography.
 - History (as an academic discipline) and Human Rights, to be prepared by Marivic Windham.
 - Other annotated bibliographies are being sought on Human Rights and Education, Human rights and Engineering, and on the Rights of Scientists.
2. Submit additional annotated listings for Science and Human Rights in general. In this connection, several working group members have agreed to do “peer reviews” of Making Sense of Science as a Human Right, an overview of the issue drafted by Sam McFarland and discussed at the January meeting. Once these reviews are received, the draft will be revised for possible posting on the AAAS website.

3. Obtain from the “curators” of the annotated bibliographies as many hotlinks as possible to be added to the online bibliographies.
4. Submit a teaching module on science and human rights for high school science students to the Steering Committee. This module, drafted by Jennifer Bronson, was reviewed at the July 2013 meeting and several suggestions were made. Jennifer plans to have the revision completed by March, and it will be reviewed by the EIR group on line and pretested with high school students before being submitted to the Steering Committee.
5. Request that the Annotated Bibliography be modified to make it more “user friendly.” All discipline bibliographies now on the AAAS website are in one continuous file, and one cannot now click on a particular discipline (e.g., statistics) and be immediately forwarded to the discipline’s bibliographical listings. All agreed that we should ask AAAS to modify the website so that this action again becomes possible.

Ideas Generated

In addition to formal articles and chapters, other materials that illustrate the interconnection between science and human rights, including popular books, exhibits, movies and plays, articles from popular magazines, articles from Science and Nature may be prepared. Sheryl Beach will circulate to the EIR Working Group a list of such resources for its review. The EIR Working Group will review these resources this spring.

Next meeting date

The EIR Working Group will communicate several times during the spring via our listserv (eir@lists.wku.edu) to review materials cited above.

Committee Report: Outreach and Communication

Progress since last meeting

- The Outreach Committee has held Monthly conference calls regularly (since August 2013) with reasonable turnout (5-8 members per call).
- The Committee has prioritized increasing student engagement in the Coalition as a way to reach its objectives. Since the January 2013 meeting, nine Coalition member organizations have designated student delegates who will attend the January 2014 Coalition meeting. The Committee will work with the students to deepen their involvement and solidify their role in the Coalition's activities.
- The Outreach Committee created an online survey to collect information from committee members about which societies they are affiliated with and if they would be interested in reaching out to those organizations. In July 2013, the survey results were reported by the Outreach Committee and organized into a plan for contacting organizations that are members of the Coalition but not active at this time, or prospective new organizational members that would bring new disciplines if they were to become member of the Coalition.
- The first student poster competition took place at the January 2014 Coalition meeting. Proposals were solicited in December 2013 and selected entries were notified. Posters were exhibited during the Coalition meeting and was judged by a panel of judges. The best poster was awarded a one-year membership for AAAS.
- A project to identify the non-member organization is in progress. Once a list of these organizations/societies is finalized, the committee will plan outreach strategies to reach out to them.

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

- Further development of student competitions/sessions to be held at the July 2014 Coalition meeting
- Further establishing the student delegate role in the Coalition and at Coalition meetings
- Outreach to inactive member organizations and prospective new members
- Increase student involvement in the Coalition
- Increase outreach efforts to inform the public regarding the work of the Coalition

Ideas Generated

At the business meeting of the committee, the following discussions and ideas were generated:

- There was substantial discussion on the student poster competition. One of the students who participated in the poster competition, was also present at the meeting and provided feedback. Also, Brian Gran had collected feedback from other students as well as the judges about the competition.

- In general, the main suggestions were regarding the logistics of the poster exhibition. In particular, it was suggested that the judges go over the posters and ask questions from the students in a separate room as the general audience. Students felt overwhelmed spending time answering questions to the judges while the general audience were going over the posters.
- Also, better instructions to the judges should be provided to avoid inconsistencies, and potential unreasonable expectations of the judges from the students.
- There was consensus on having the student poster competition on a once-a-year basis. However, the committee members present at the meeting agreed that we should move the poster competition to the July meetings, starting July 2014.
- There was discussion regarding travel funds for students to attend the Coalition meeting and the poster competition. There was consensus that universities and professional organizations should be encouraged to cover the travel funds for students to attend the Coalition meetings.
- There was discussion on outreach to nonmember organizations (with emphasis on engineering and economics organizations.)
- Art Kendall suggested that we approach the new publication of ACLU (called STAND) to run an article on the work of the Coalition. We will discuss this suggestion in more details during the upcoming conference call.
- Finally, it was announced that the monthly conference calls will resume in February 2014.

Next meeting date

We will continue our monthly conference calls starting in February (Thursday February 20, 5pm).

Appendix: Session Evaluations

Opening Plenary: The Disability Rights Framework and Implications for Science and Technology

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	2	7	17	5	4.58
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	2	6	14	5	4.39

Comments:

- I wish that there had been information about the speakers and their topics ahead of time.

Plenary: Accessing the Benefits of Science and Technology

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	1	0	5	20	5	4.69
Usefulness of Presentations	0	1	1	7	14	5	4.48

Comments:

- I would like to have heard more about the "rights" debate (brought up by Vint Cerf towards the end of his prepared remarks). Much in this session was news to me, so I felt I learned a great deal.
- I wish that there had been information about the speakers and their topics ahead of time.

Plenary: Introducing the AAAS Science and Human Rights Coalition

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	0	4	23	5	4.57
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	0	3	20	5	4.50

Plenary: International Human Rights Treaties in the Senate

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	0	4	19	9	4.83
Usefulness of Presentations	1	0	1	2	15	8	4.58

Comments:

- I really appreciated the format of this session. A full Q&A with a knowledgeable source was a really nice addition.
- I generally dread these "conversational" formats, but the moderator was excellent and the representative from Sen. Harkin's office was terrific, so this was an extremely useful session, candid, reasonable, helpful.
- I wish that there had been information about the speakers and their topics ahead of time.
- Interview format was very appealing
- I can understand that this topic needed to be covered - sometime, somehow. And I'm glad it's now been 'done'. But it was rather limited in its scope and its usefulness for non-Americans in the audience. Michael was a good choice of speaker.
- It would have been good to have a speaker who could speak to a broader range of human rights treaties, not just the disabilities treaty.

Plenary: Participating in Science and Technology

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Session Topic	0	0	0	3	15	14	4.83
Usefulness of Presentations	0	0	0	4	11	13	4.73

Comments:

- This was pretty extraordinary, particularly the "unplanned" disembodied vocal appearance of the NASA engineer, who was a most compelling and eye-opening, if I may say so, speaker. As I reflected on his message, I realized that the old "rough" versus "smooth" surface issues have been a longstanding challenge among those seeking to accommodate sighted (but mobility challenged) and non-sighted people (curb cuts vs curbs). This session bordered on being profound. Indeed, it may have crossed that border.
- All the presentations were very good and engaging.

Working Group and Committee Meetings: Overview

	Response Count	Response Percent
Welfare of Scientists	4	12.12%
Ethics and Human Rights	3	9.09%
Service to the STEM Community	1	3.03%
Service to the Human Rights Community	4	12.12%
Education and Information Resources	4	15.15%
I did not attend a working group meeting	16	48.48%

Please rate the working group meeting you attended:

	Poor (1)	Fair (2)	Good (3)	Very Good (4)	Excellent (5)	N/A	Rating Average
Education and Information Resources							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	0	1	3	0	4.75
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	0	1	3	0	4.75
Ethics and Human Rights							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	2	0	0	0	3.00
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	0	0	1	3.00
Outreach and Communications Committee							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	0	3	4	0	4.57
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	0	1	2	0	4.67
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	0	2	1	0	4.33
Service to the STEM Community							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	0	0	1	0	5.00
Welfare of Scientists							
Explanation of Current Projects	0	0	1	1	2	0	4.25
Explanation of How You Can Contribute	0	0	1	0	2	1	4.33

Comments:

- Ethics and Human Rights
 - Need to increase outreach - only a few showed up.
- Education and Informational Resources
 - Our co-chairs did a very nice job. This was a focused session during which several agenda items
 - This was the best, most focused EIR meeting I've attended. We covered a great deal in the two hours and there was a very interesting discussion - led by David Burns - on how we might expand from secondary sources (peer reviewed journal articles) to primary sources (more creative works, which might include popular culture artifacts, films, photograph collections, etc.) as part of our growing collection of annotated bibliographies.

In your opinion, what would be the most productive way to use working group and committee meetings?

- I think it might be smart instead of having a full day of plenary talks, to have some mix up of working group and committees throughout. I wound up sitting out of the last plenary talk because it was more useful to continue networking.
- Given that we are all "volunteers," that there's a lot to do, and that a core group of members now have gotten to know and trust (rely on) one another, I think the sessions are working relatively well. It remains to be seen how to incorporate newcomers effectively. This was the best session of our subcommittee so far, I thought.
- To engage member societies more directly in the working group activities (as is done now)
- The current method works very well
- Asking those who plan to attend to send in questions, comments, proposals in advance would help focus the agenda
- I think our current system is effective -- an opportunity to update each other on project progress, explore new ideas, and set assignments and deadlines.
- I believe that the current ways the meeting are done works well.
- To work on producing outcomes and materials
- The current format works very well, I think.
- At end form actionable items to act upon.

Appendix: General Meeting Evaluations

How did you hear about the Coalition meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Email from AAAS/Program	25	80.65%
Program Facebook Page	3	9.68%
AAAS/Program Website	0	0%
Word of Mouth	5	16.13%
Other	6	

Other Responses:

- Been a member for 4 years
- Member Organization
- Have attended previously
- I represent a coalition member org
- Being member for several years
- A former colleague

How would you prefer would you prefer to hear about Coalition events and activities in the future?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Email from AAAS/Program	32	94.12%
Program Facebook Page	3	8.82%
AAAS/Program Website	2	5.88%
Word of Mouth	3	8.82%

Affiliation:

	Response Count	Response Percent
Professional Society/Association	14	45.16%
University/College	13	41.94%
Government	1	3.23%
Human Rights Organization	0	0%
Business/Industry	0	0%
Nonprofit	3	9.68%
Press/Media	0	0%
Self-employed	0	0%

Other Responses:

- Retired (x2)
- Professional Society but also a University Faculty member

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	8	29.6%
To learn how I can personally become involved in the Coalition	9	33.3%
To learn more about science, technology and human rights	21	77.8%
To learn how my organization can respond more effectively	12	44.4%
To obtain help in engaging members of my discipline in human rights	11	40.7%
Other (see below)	11	

Other Responses:

- To continue the work of the Education and Information Working Group
- Member of Coalition
- Important networking opportunities
- Panelist
- For good conversations & cooperation
- As a representative of my association
- Advisor to student selected for the poster competition
- I was invited to Judge the Poster Competition
- I am an EIR working group member
- Just to see what's happening and connect with fellow human rights activists
- To contribute to the effort in concrete ways
- To learn more about science, technology and human rights as it pertains to persons with disabilities

Overall, how satisfied were you with the meeting?

	Response Count	Response Percent
Very Satisfied	23	76.67%
Moderately satisfied	7	23.33%
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Moderately dissatisfied	0	0.0%
Very dissatisfied	0	0.0%

What aspect of the meeting did you find most valuable?

- As always, the formal Monday presentations were informative and inspiring. Just continue to pick good themes on the interface of human rights and science.
- The plenaries I attended were quite good. Jessica's summary on day one was nimble and effective.
- Plenary sessions
- The diversity of professions and viewpoints in the audience
- Engaging in conversations with other disciplines
- Excellent choice of sessions and presenters -- who stuck to their topic, the time limit and were very good speakers
- The speakers
- I think the introductory session explaining the disability rights framework was most valuable.
- I am a biomedical scientist and educator, and find the opportunity to interact with professionals in law and the social sciences extremely rewarding. I learn a great deal from these encounters.
- Service to human rights community
- I learned a good deal about a topic (disability) that I know little about.

- Learning about a topic that I knew little about. I enjoyed the new student poster session.
- Interacting with others who care about this topic
- I think the current format of full plenary sessions in the first day works very well. It creates a growing sense of a shared community of interests - and common reference points - which deepens with every session. Jessica Wyndham's summary of the key points/issues discussed throughout the day in her concluding remarks was most useful.
- Interacting with the people there from so many different disciplines
- Learning about disability issues and opportunities to connect with AAAS Human Rights Coalition
- Information and discussion
- Working Group meetings
- Presentations

What aspect of the meeting did you find least valuable?

- I am not a fan of contests and not an especially great fan of posters, generally. I think that work may need to be re-thought a bit. I spoke about this with the fellow who reported about the posters at the Council meeting and gave some specific feedback. I would not abandon this idea, but I think it needs work.
- The concurrent working groups sessions; we need to ALL know what each working group are involved with and participate in the deliberations
- Some of the talks I went to were a tad weak.
- all the plenaries
- It was all valuable.
- The session on International Human Rights Treaties in the Senate. It was quite limited in its scope. The discussion was rather circular and the broad message could have been conveyed in a paragraph.
- Nothing!
- Not interested in the theme chosen for this meeting.

How can future meetings be improved?

- Having print or video versions of the plenaries would be helpful. I would welcome having a link to the very effective DRI video clip that was shown, for example.
- No recommendations. The meeting was excellent!
- Some of the working groups sessions should be no-concurrents
- Internet access at the plenary!
- Inviting more people/students and university faculty
- More students, better posters, more open dialogue.
- Circulate information about the speakers and their topics ahead of time.
- There was a great diversity of professional backgrounds among the speakers this time. Well done!
- For future meetings: a growing engagement with students and their work.

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

- The responsibilities of scientists to advance human rights
- Public education on science as a step/pre-condition for learning about one's rights and claiming them...What is the role of schools, colleges, informal science educators, etc...in all this?
- What are the limits of scientific developments from a human rights perspective? e.g., Genetics, stem cell & human rights; reproductive technologies
- Gender, race and class
- More on getting bench/biomedical scientists/educators to be present and learn about topics covered. Also, I would like to see some historical context brought in so individuals understand the great dangers of doing nothing or remaining silent in the face of need.
- Case studies, international aspects and cooperation
- This is not a well-defined idea, but something about application of Article 15 to communities in the developing world, in monetarily poor societies, and/or with respect to indigenous peoples.
- more on Article 15
- The role of NGOs and other actors in civil society, Art as a tool in representing/promoting the intersection between science and human rights
- Climate change and human rights

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

- It always inspires.
- I am now thinking of the AAAS SHR program as being in a kind of "curator" role vis a vis my education in matters pertaining to science and human rights (and human rights, generally), so I have come to trust what you, Jessica, Mark, Alan and all the members who plan the meetings decide to "educate" me towards and appreciate the opportunity this has given me to think and learn. As I mentioned in the E.D.'s Circle meeting, Jessica, in particular, has really helped us bring this matter to our community of practice. I hope that will only continue and expand in the years ahead.
- I hope to do more work on improving access to STEM opportunities for persons with disabilities.
- All the meetings have been extremely informative, most in particular last one on disability rights and the reasons why the Senate doesn't ratify UN Human Rights treaties. It is our work as citizens to inform our Senators they are wrong and they should do the right and moral thing. Ratify UN Human Rights treaties
- Involvement in the Coalition has broadened my perspective. Informed me about many important issues and events and has made me more aware in general of human rights concerns and the intersection with science.
- Inspiring!
- My involvement causes me to think out of my box and my comfort zone.
- I began incorporating human rights-related issues into my social science teaching and research many years ago. What my involvement in the Coalition - and with every meeting - has contributed to my work is three-fold: to broaden my understanding of the complex relationship between science and human rights; to read 'human' whereas before I may have read 'national' or 'regional' issues relating to my work; and to probe more deeply into the ethical framework of my teaching and research work.
- It has helped me think outside of my immediate focus and practice as a scientist