International Thwaites Glacier Collaboration
Community Values and Norms of Behavior

Date: July 22, 2020

Please provide feedback and comments to the Science Coordination Office at sco@thwaitesglacier.org

Team Objectives:

- Produce high quality peer-reviewed science
- Synthesize that science towards the questions "how much and how fast"
- Mentor students, post docs, and other early career scientists toward career success
- Communicate the issues and the results to the public
- Engage the public in the process of science
- Foster improved collaboration between UK and US research communities
- Help build a sustainably inclusive and diverse community of scientists.

Community Norms of Behavior

Across the whole collaboration; on a daily basis, in the field, and at workshops:

1. **Respect** each other
    a. Acknowledge contributions from others.
    b. Respect everyone's time (be prompt for deadlines, to meetings, at responding to collaborators, etc.).
    c. Harassment and bullying are prohibited by US Federal law and UK law. The National Science Foundation's (NSF) Office of Polar Programs (OPP), National Environment Research Council (NERC), NSF US Antarctic Program (USAP), and our home institutions have policies and consequences for harassment. NSF OPP Policies and Codes of Conduct; NERC Policies.
2. **Provide space** in discussions and encourage feedback from everyone, especially those who are less vocal. Ensure that all team members participate in discussions.
3. **Listen to input** from all collaboration members, even when you don't agree. Where disagreements arise, deal with this in a constructive, non-personal, and respectful manner.
4. Create an **inclusive environment** that is welcoming of all ethnicities, national origins, genders, sexuality, physical abilities, lifestyles, levels of education, etc.
5. **Acknowledge the value of diversity** in science, such as described in the article How Diversity Makes Us Smarter.
6. **Be considerate** of the perceptions and needs of others.
7. **Share data** as requested to others on the team (with understanding that data may be restricted to use in limited/specific ways).
8. **Share ideas and be inclusive towards writing papers** (be open to contributions on papers from others).
9. **Define authorship criteria/expectations**. For example, a person deserves co-authorship if they satisfy two of the following, and a person deserves first authorship if they contribute to all of the following (possibly with exception b)

a. conceiving an original research idea, conducting background research independently, and developing the idea independently into a viable research plan (or viable paper outline),
b. conducting field work, initial data processing, doing image interpretation and GIS analysis, analyzing samples and thin sections, etc.,
c. synthesizing data and interpreting results with significant initiative, creativity, and independence,
d. getting a manuscript/poster into final, publishable form (*e.g.*, written, edited, made figures),
e. contributing a key data set, with description of methods, and analysis of the significance of the data.

10. **Follow ethical standards on scientific conduct**, such as, but not limited to, the guidelines set by NSF found at NSF's guidance on Training in Responsible Conduct of Research, and those agreed in the UK under The Concordat to Support Research Integrity.

Among specific field teams

1. Create an inclusive environment that is welcoming of all ethnicities, national origins, genders, sexuality, physical abilities, lifestyles, age groups, levels of education, etc., and be aware and sensitive of cultural expectations during field work, for example. Avoid alienation or exclusion.
    a. **No harassment.** Be mindful of jokes, comments, and other behavior that could be construed as micro/macroaggressions. A recent study of researchers in the field highlighted positive and negative examples of behavior during field work. Examples of sexual harassment from this paper included but were not limited to: unwanted flirtation or verbal sexual advances, propositions, and jokes about physical appearance or intelligence that were sexually motivated or gendered. Examples of sexual assault include cases of unwanted physical contact, including physical intimidation, forced kissing, pressing genitalia on the respondent's body, attempted rape, and rape. See paper entitled Signaling Safety: Characterizing Fieldwork Experiences and Their Implications for Career Trajectories.
    b. **No alienation:** Be aware that the use of alcohol can alienate some population groups, including women, people who culturally or medically don't drink, or people from religious backgrounds. Crude language and rowdiness, often associated with alcohol, can also isolate members of the team. See paper entitled Signaling Safety: Characterizing Fieldwork Experiences and Their Implications for Career Trajectories.
    c. Be willing to (respectfully) point out inappropriate behavior of others.
    d. Be mindful of pronouns to avoid mis-gendering or de-gendering anyone – if you're unsure, ask!
    e. Give support and encouragement, and leadership roles (with guidance), to students and postdocs.
2. Be aware of, and sensitive to, cultural expectations for field work. Be considerate of needs for personal space, sharing camp responsibilities equally, the need to discuss medical and bodily functions ahead of time, and more. Erin Pettit's field team leadership document provides good examples.
3. Listen to input from all team members, even when you don't agree. When challenging ideas, or behaviors, in whatever context, be constructive, non-personal and respectful.
4. Safety is our highest priority in the field. Respond to all team members' concerns. Allow people to opt out of or to veto situations in which they feel unsafe – discuss risk assessments and risk mitigation activities ahead of time with the group.

5. Consider how “field team culture” is important for helping those from under-represented groups feel included, which is described in the paper Tacit knowledge and girls’ notions about a field science community of practice.
6. Violations of these values and norms will be reported to NSF, NERC, and/or the appropriate institution. Possible actions may include immediate removal of the harasser from the field site or environment.

Guiding notes on good practice when work is published in peer-reviewed journals

It is good practice to carefully consider everyone who may be deserving of authorships when work is submitted for publication in peer-reviewed journals. It is not always easy to draw the line between individuals deserving authorship and those whose contribution is acknowledged at the end of the publication. It is good practice for PIs and senior staff to mentor graduate students and early career researchers in this matter.

The following points provide guidance on good practice when publishing:

1. Openness is key. Before writing, group members should discuss how each paper is best produced. No one should write and submit papers without the knowledge of others who have made significant contributions to the collection of data, interpretations of those data, or model developments. This includes PIs. In this case, “group” refers to all researchers in each project, both in the UK and the US.
2. When a paper is written, everyone who made significant contributions to the collection of data or their analysis, or the development of models, should be offered co-authorship or acknowledgement (their choice). If co-authorship is agreed to, it should be at a stage that allows them to make a contribution to the writing of the manuscript.
3. All authors should fulfill the requirements of authorship:
    a. The Council of Science Editors (CSE): “Authors are individuals identified by the research group to have made substantial contributions to the reported work and agree to be accountable for these contributions. In addition to being accountable for the parts of the work he or she has done, an author should be able to identify which of their coauthors are responsible for specific other parts of the work. In addition, an author should have confidence in the integrity of the contributions of their co-authors. All authors should review and approve the final manuscript.” [Committee of Publication Ethics - COPE, Council, 2014].
    b. The American Physical Society: “Authorship should be limited to those who have made a significant contribution to the concept, design, execution or interpretation of the research study. All those who have made significant contributions should be offered the opportunity to be listed as authors. Other individuals who have contributed to the study should be acknowledged, but not identified as authors.” [Committee of Publication Ethics - COPE, Council, 2014].

4. Contributions by individuals who do not meet the authorship criteria should be acknowledged.
5. Authors and those whose contributions are acknowledged, and anyone who is cited for personal communications, should be consulted in advance of submission of a manuscript in order to avoid misunderstandings and potential authorship issues. If such issues arise, the PI should provide guidance in the decision making process, especially if the lead author is a graduate student or early career scientist.
6. All authors have a responsibility to ensure that no one deserving of authorship have been omitted. This responsibility does not solely fall on the lead author, especially if the lead author is a graduate student or early career researcher.

7. All authors take responsibility for the integrity of work presented in the paper. This is again very important when the lead author is a graduate student or early career scientist.
8. For more information, see Authorship and contributorship on the COPE website.

Guiding notes on good practice when work is promoted on social media

While social media reflects the views and opinions of individuals, it important to make sure that the collective work by a group or a team is accurately portrayed. When posting views and opinions as a group, the following is considered to be good practice:

1. Make sure all posts are accurate and justified. Cite sources by including URLs when referring to scientific work and separate facts from opinions. Embed graphics and information to support your post, if you can. Posts should generally have a clear purpose. If you are unsure, consult with a team member or the PI before making a post public.
2. If teams use shared social media, it may be helpful to review or proofread posts before they are made public. The proofing need not necessarily be the responsibility of the PI, but simply another member of the group. Free software, e.g. Hootsuite, can be used to manage shared social media.
3. All posts should reflect positively and constructively on the program.
4. Posts should never be aggressive or harassing in tone, neither directly nor indirectly.
5. Social media posting from a team or a group should ideally be balanced and reflect facts and figures arising from the work carried out with a specific purpose. Balanced posting may include a combination of the following:
    a. science as the pursuit of knowledge
    b. science as a facilitator of new discoveries
    c. science as a career path
    d. science as a way of experiencing unique environments on Earth
    e. views and opinion supported by science, e.g. notes on climate change
6. Social media postings by individuals may reflect personal views and opinions. Be considerate of the group as a whole when you post your personal view or opinion.

7. It is important that all ITGC activities are presented in a way that acknowledges our commitment to safety. Images, that show, or appear to show, unsafe practices can, if posted, damage individual and institutional reputations, and encourage poor practice by others. Check images before you share them from a safety perspective. Make sure, for example, that individuals are dressed appropriately and are they using appropriate safety equipment. Additionally, consider posting photos of lab work and work happening not in the field. A great amount of Antarctic research is carried out in our labs and offices far from the ice. Posting images of research done while NOT in the field will give a more representative perspective of the breadth of Antarctic science.

Note that ITGC is on social media. Please tag it on Twitter, follow it on Facebook, and use the hashtag:

Twitter: @GlacierThwaites
Facebook: https://www.facebook.com/thwaitesglaciercollaboration/
Hashtag: #thwaitesglacier