

Deliverable for Princeton URGE pods for Friday April 16

April 15: Below is a combination of the original document shared with pods for feedback, and then the feedback in written form below. Following the individual pod meetings, we had an all-pod meeting for further discussion on revisions that could be made to improve the department's existing code of conduct. The plan is to come back to this in the coming months to augment/modify the field code of conduct and also to put together a lab code of conduct, which we didn't make any headway on beyond the brainstorming below.

April 6: original submission to pods:

Section 1: Field Code of Conduct

Princeton Geosciences has recently adopted a field code of conduct, which can be found [here](#). It was written in 2020, and thus has not been field tested yet. It also includes methods of reporting, which would be applicable to and lab code of conduct as well.

- As a follow up to podlet discussions surrounding the existing Field Code of Conduct document, an additional meeting was held after initial discussions surrounding the shortcomings of the document and how to address them (see below for notes)

Feedback on this document is welcome.

Section 2: Department/Lab group code of conduct, general expectations

List here aspects of conduct that either do not appear in the Princeton [Rights, Rules and Responsibilities](#) (RRR), or are worthy of reappearing in a department/lab group specific document.

-“Princeton University does not tolerate sexual misconduct, including sexual harassment. Such conduct is harmful to the well-being of our community members, our learning and working environments, and the collegial relationships among students, faculty, and staff.” -RRR

-“The University encourages open and honest communication between members of the community. There are a variety of resources available to individuals who may be called upon to assist in informal conflict resolution. These are, in the case of students and faculty: the dean of the faculty, the dean of undergraduate students, and the dean of the Graduate School, and, in the case of staff: a supervisor or department head, the human resources representative, and the Employee Assistance Program counselor.” -RRR

-“Observing basic honesty in one's work, words, ideas, and actions is a principle to which all members of the community are required to subscribe.” -RRR

More specifically, students should never tamper with or make up data.

-“We seek to enable all members of this community to pursue their educational, scholarly, and career interests in an environment that recognizes both the distinctiveness of each person's experience and the common humanity that unites us all.” -RRR

“Princeton University is committed to creating and maintaining an educational, working, and living environment free from discrimination and harassment based on a protected characteristic.” -RRR

Aka, we aim to support students and make them feel welcome regardless of their race, religion, gender expression, sexual orientation, physical/mental ability, and/or socioeconomic status. We will not tolerate discrimination or harassment based on these characteristics.

-Students should stay home and take care of themselves when they are sick.

Section 3: Department/Lab group code of conduct, specifics

It could be that faculty supervisors wish to have a document that lays out expectations in their group that may cover topics such as personal/interpersonal conduct, either a) because certain things aren't covered in the RRR or b) because they want them to be emphasized in their group so group members know that the faculty member cares about them.

Such a document could also cover expectations of an advisor/student working relationship and/or expectations of various other things.

List here:

- Expectations for when and how quickly students should respond to emails
- How many hours you expect your students to work, whether you expect them to work weekends
- expectations for sharing of lab duties
- Encouraging students to ask for your help when they are struggling, either academically or personally
- Dress code for more formal lab events such as conferences and presentations
- Clarifying whether students will be allowed to read your recommendation letters and/or grant applications
- any avenues for self evaluations and supervisor evaluations?

April 13: Our pod held an additional meeting to discuss revisions to the existing Field Code of Conduct

There are the notes:

Some podlet discussion points

- code of conduct recommendations field section: currently the existing code reads more as a waiver rather than mechanism to provide resources to the student and how to protect the student. Point out where document is lacking to guide where we want changes to be made.
- Intent behind writing the field code of conduct looks like it didn't come out
 - idea was that everyone (including group leaders) sign this, and was intended to be an agreement between all parties - on how to treat each other in the field AND to provide resources when not treated that way
 - comments indicate we need to change some things so it does this
- Recommendation - points trying to address are good, but the language (the use of "I", explicitly define which roles need to be filled "student", "TA", "Leader", "organizers", "PI",...and whatever roles are relevant etc) to help it feel more like a 2-way document instead of 1-way document
- original envisioning of document's purpose was to codify things to expect from group leader, and removing power dynamic
 - one issue is that it seemed like the responsibility of the (powerless) student to seek out information themselves - rather than making it clear what the rights of the participants are. It seems that knowing the right to have these things doesn't make it obvious where these things are coming from. So should explicitly say "the expedition leader will give these items..."
- need more guidance for folks organizing the trips - and more clear where/who to report to if any infractions occur - bring them up at the start. It would be better to have something that gives more concrete guidance. Something simple as expedition leaders making sure that the pace (walking/hiking) pace of the group follows that of the participants. And this guidance should be visible to participants.
 - agreement wrt personal space section. Specify more to help include all group members
- difference between getting a list of my rights versus knowing that the leader/organizer knows not to break/infringe on rights - more we need to know that rights will be protected
- intent shouldn't be to have a recourse once a violation has occurred, instead ensure that in the field that those rights are taken care of that that you have a leader that is properly trained/briefed
 - Vision is to go through the document point by point as a group to open up a dialogue between all parties involved. Just to make sure these are done upfront. One fear was having a document too long that addresses specifics. Where is the balance for a useful document

- **Presenting document to students as a clarification of rights, but for leaders it should be a commitment from leadership to not abuse power**
 - This can and should be made more clear
- comment on the 2 persons wrt to bullying (current wording makes the statement wrongly imply that bullying occur b/t only 2 people)
- the intent - if situations with 2 people where there is a power dynamic should be avoided ideally to avoid bullying
- general question/comment: this code of conduct could serve as a template to fill out more fully just make it clear that the agreement isn't the ONLY thing available, and that more info/details/safety plan will be forthcoming. **SO, Add wording that clarifies this**
- even though brevity seems to be one of the goals, having further examples and resources available, and make it clear that we can go back and revisit the template
 - one idea was to include this doc and other useful articles (about harassment in the field in geosciences) available for folks as well.
- **Request to see a supplementary doc focuses on what organizers need to do to prepare for the trip** - a link from this code doc to a bigger handbook. It should be considered WHERE you have the field trip....organizers should do their BEST to avoid locals that are not welcoming to all genders/races/ethnicities ... Who is going through this with the PI - where is the document that PIs turn to when they are organizing - it isn't good enough to leave it up to individuals
 - there is a clear set of instructions for leaders available (and answers available to the participants) ALONG with a form (like this one) for participants to sign once packet answers all their questions. Participants should know what things the organizers are supposed to do in preparation.
- reiterate - especially for teaching trips, there are some sites that are unacceptable, esp Morocco as a class trip (where homosexuality is criminalized) so taking students there is offensive and asks a lot of the students participants. Not safe, fun, definitely the power dynamic impacts the teaching - especially if a participant is in threat of being tried due to just their identity. This should really be considered by Dept as a whole. One solution is to have an INCLUSIVE list of field sites rather than and EXCLUSIVE one. Again - need explicit guidelines for organizers
- post trip survey and reporting. Lack of detail is somewhat concerning. Who gets to see them? Are they anonymous? Where do these complaints actually go?
- no one doc can cover everyone's needs. To make trips inclusive some of these require disclosing information they may not be comfortable outing.
 - consider a non-academic chaperone on any trip itself. Person had direct access to resources needed. Also responsible for money

- So it will be a process. **Also, this document hasn't been tested.** Plan was to expect suggestions
- Before impending field trips, would be good to just at least add a note that there is an extra layer - this would be an immediate improvement to the current document.
- Who is making sure that once someone signs this document, that it means **something**. So at least having those names there gave an avenue there that shows there is someone behind this document to back it up.
- Once concern about the names on the document is the accountability. Was hoping to get some sense of protection for students going into the field. Who are the names on the document accountable to? Not a clear chain of accountability - if a right has been violated, then what? And what teeth are there to make sure a right will not be violated in the first place? (like not violating rights should go without saying, but still rights get violated all the time)

April 9: additional information for Lab code of conduct

Lab code of conduct

- Q for podlets: do any lab groups in GEO/AOS have codes of conduct? If not, have any PI's considered creating a lab code of conduct? What are the barriers to PI's creating codes of conduct for their labs?
- The current draft focuses on what the advisors expect from incoming students but it should include some information on what the students should expect from their advisor, in terms of how often they can expect feedback, estimations of turnaround times on manuscripts, vacation policies, working on weekends, and a general sense of the lab's culture.

Example Lab Codes of Conduct:

- https://docs.google.com/document/d/10y7TP48ik1rcQBPA5Do8mZM7DJ5EbF0hyWP-cs_gb1QE/edit?usp=sharing
- "Lab culture" section of this website: <http://www.sanchezlaboratory.com/join>
The PI very clearly sets out expectations for students with regard to vacations, # of hours per week, working on weekends, collaborations with others, etc.
- "Lab Manuals" examples from Christine Chen's [Growing Healthy Labs workshop](#) (held @ Princeton Geosciences in 2019)
- Not an example but an idea: I think a better lab environment would be fostered if the PI makes it clear that mental health is just as valued as physical health --- e.g. validating the need to visit a therapist or rest due to mental health concerns. I imagine addressing mental health concerns, especially if the PI never mentions them, is more intimidating than physical health concerns like illness due to stigma behind mental illness.
- Tamara Pico's (UC Santa Cruz) group manual:

April 7: comments on dept field code of conduct:

Field code of conduct recommendations:

- [Current field code of conduct](#) reads more as a liability release form than a code of conduct. It's entirely focused on what is expected of the participant rather than outlining the responsibilities of all parties. Such a code should be a document that speaks to all participants and is worded more as a mutual agreement.
 - Onus of safety is on employer not employee (OSHA guidelines)
 - Should do two things (or be two documents): detail rights of students on trip and detail responsibilities of trip leaders. Currently does neither.
- It is true that field work is a privilege but it is also often a service, particularly for research purposes. Junior scientists are often asked to participate in these efforts for the benefit of a lab or group. This language only recognizing field work as a privilege enforces the one-sided tone of the document.
- Should distinguish between research and pedagogical field work.
 - Pedagogical field work should draw from an inclusive list of sites, not exclusive.
- In the current field code of conduct, the outlined categories are a good foundation to build off. However language needs to be re-evaluated to recognize that responsibilities and expectations are placed on all parties. For example in the point on **adequate nourishment**, while it is the participant's responsibility to provide their dietary restrictions, who is responsible for collecting that information and ensuring all dietary restrictions are observed in the field? Consider rephrasing: '**Adequate nourishment** will be provided for all participants. [Appropriate role or title] is responsible for collecting participants' dietary requirements...'
- Additional categories which should be included:
 - Traditions: shipwork and fieldwork may have traditions that junior scientists are not aware of. While we acknowledge that the participation in such traditions may promote a sense of belonging in a community, it may also do the opposite and alienate individuals, putting them in uncomfortable (or even unsafe) situations. Adequate information about traditions should be given before the fieldwork and if the individual is uncomfortable in participating, a mechanism to abstain should be provided.
 - Dangers and issues should be broadened outside of the context of "cultural issues" -- e.g. the physical dangers of the location of study -- the trip organizer should explicitly outline all of the dangers involved with the fieldwork to all participants

- Suggest making “consumption of alcohol” as a separate bullet point, outside of nourishment.
- There is little in this code of conduct to inform how the participants will be provided necessary information (for instance, training options). Should this information be included (if only in template form) in a Field Code of Conduct for expedition leaders?
 - The section on personal hygiene specifically says “I am comfortable with the field-site specific constraints as communicated to me.” Where is the documentation that describes how these constraints will be communicated?
- In order to run a field trip, a document should first be provided detailing obvious safety concerns (area records of hate crimes, weather conditions, terrain) proposed hygienic accommodations (especially those pertaining to menstrual needs) and dietary options.
 - There should also be a plan for a) how to increase accessibility of the trip as necessary and b) how students who wish to opt out of the trip can learn the material.
- In my opinion, the Code of Conduct document is lacking on the side of accountability (in case of a violation or a concern) and the recommended procedures on reporting violations. It encourages victims to report violations to the Department Chair, Associate Chair, The Director of Graduate/Undergraduate Studies. If the previous cases (in other universities) are any lessons, there should be every effort made to reduce the chance of violations, but in case that something terrible happens, the reporting procedure could preferably be anonymous through the university offices (outside the department) designed for this purpose. I guess people can argue whether anonymous reporting should be the default or the encouraged procedure in the first place.
- Is “Bystander Intervention Training” and Reporting Process part of the training for undergraduate/graduate researchers/students? If it is not, then a similar training and reporting program will be necessary for field trip/work/conference-travel participants. The resources for those trainings should be provided alongside the code of conduct document. [training should not be an option; it must be part of the code of conduct agreement]

While acknowledging that this field code of conduct and this URGE session is geared towards protecting the comfort, safety, and rights of students and scientists of color, sometimes field visits can go sour if visiting students/faculty/staff are not fully prepared to recognize the potential impact of their visit to special places that hold unique cultural and traditional meaning for local populations. The requirement to be respectful (in terms of appropriate dress code, behavior, formal and informal permissions, leave no trace etc) can be added to this bullet point so that field workers are reminded explicitly that they are representing their lab and institution and science in general as a visitor to places of (sometimes) immense value to other cultures “• I have been given and have reviewed the itinerary. I have been made aware of country- and culture-specific issues which may affect my personal comfort and safety, as well as the important considerations of appropriate permission/dress/customs/behavior etc required to

show respect the places and people I am visiting. Judging them to be reasonable before departure, I assume the risks inherent in field work conducted in remote locations.”

Example Field Codes of Conduct:

- References from SERC-Carleton:
https://serc.carleton.edu/advancegeo/resources/field_work.html#codes
- The [Wasatch-Uinta Field Camp Standards of Conduct](#), which applies to pedagogical field work, makes the responsibilities of the instructors clear in the first sentence. Much of the remaining document concerns the student but in general this code makes it clear that this is not a one-sided code. It also outlines reporting procedures though does not provide participants multiple options for reporting in the event that violations are perpetuated by more senior participants.
- Example of a sea-going Code of Conduct (JOIDES Resolution):
https://iodp.tamu.edu/participants/policies/JRSO_Code_of_Conduct.pdf
 - While this is largely focused on sexual harassment, the clarity on resources available to participants may be a good blueprint

Additional comments/discussion:

I also agree and second the comment that the current code of conduct reads like a liability release signed by the student/researcher in a PI's lab.

Anonymous

8:35 PM Apr 8

There are significant concerns about power dynamics in such a situation.

Anonymous

8:36 PM Apr 8

Beside that, the current document lacks other necessary information that must be included already in this one document.

Anonymous

8:37 PM Apr 8

I think, the document should be signed by both the PI/ Field-Trip-Leader and the participant (student in the department, student/researcher in a PI's lab).

Anonymous

8:39 PM Apr 8

PI/Department must confirm (by signing) that they have provided the aforementioned conditions and abide by the codes. The student/researcher agrees that the conditions mentioned are provided and confirms that they abide by the code.

Anonymous

8:41 PM Apr 8

I think that was a long way of saying (repeating in more detail, since it is also mentioned here) that must be a mutual agreement (with the appropriate language used in such an agreement) signed by both sides.

Anonymous

8:50 PM Apr 8

"that it was a long way of"*

Anonymous

8:50 PM Apr 8

"that the document must be a mutual agreement"*

Re. use of word privilege: I know there are good intentions behind the use of this word, and the complete sentence in the Code of Conduct decreases the overall privilege tone (and related it to the privilege provided by the university, not the PI/department), but I find its place in the document to cause a "condescending-like" feeling.

Other:

I would advocate for a single document that applies to all participants and clearly outlines the different roles and responsibilities. This would ensure consistency and remove the need to update multiple documents in the event that a responsibility is moved from one role to another. [Show less](#)

Anonymous

8:16 PM Apr 8

I second this.

Anonymous

8:17 PM Apr 8

I also argue that there should not be a separate document for faculty/PI (this issue came up in our pod). Everything should be in a single document that both sides see and sign.

More:

Many international destinations (outside the US for US students/colleagues), especially for pedagogical field trips, may not be easily accessible for foreign students/researchers who are enrolled/work in the department/university.

Choosing international destinations, especially for pedagogical field trips, may increase the costs (both money and time for visa things) substantially for international students/researchers, and bring in concerns about equality and inclusion. It may also expose hidden barriers -- possibly in front of other classmates, coworkers and colleagues, thus embarrassing or other uncomfortable feelings (unintentionally) -- that might not have otherwise affected or been revealed during a person's course of studies/work.

[Show less](#)

Anonymous

10:38 AM Apr 9

Still, very relevant to accessibility, is the situation of students with apparent or hidden significant or lower-level (but still important) disabilities. This concern should also be a part of discussion for selecting a field-trip location, level of difficulty, and the kind of activities expected, for pedagogical purposes. The kind of expected activities and the level of difficulty must be discussed for each field trip, well in advance of the trip.

[Show less](#)

Anonymous

5:39 PM Apr 10

A big concern that I have is that different parts of the world have very different cultural safeties than the United States - a class trip in this department went to Morocco a few years ago, and homosexuality is criminal in that country. I think that such a trip is entirely inappropriate for a class.

[Show less](#) More:

This training should not be only focused on sexual harassment and violations. It should also include training for other forms of aggression based on gender, race, nationality, etc., in settings particular to field trips.

Anonymous

10:24 PM Apr 8 field trips

and field work

Anonymous

10:26 PM Apr 8

I just remembered that this document appears to be for conference travel and meetings too. so, the training should include all those possible situations in the general sense.

More:

suggested edit to second bullet point of current field code of conduct (or something like it)