INVESTIGATING THE PERCEIVED SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF SCIENTISTS, ENGINEERS AND HEALTH PROFESSIONALS

By Joshua A. Ettinger and Jessica M. Wyndham

Joshua A. Ettinger is the Program Assistant of the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program

Jessica M. Wyndham is the Associate Director of the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program

"At a time when science plays such a powerful role in the life of society, when the destiny of the whole of mankind may hinge on the results of scientific research, it is incumbent on all scientists to be fully conscious of that role, and conduct themselves accordingly. I appeal to my fellow scientists to remember their responsibility to humanity." –Physicist Joseph Rotblat, upon receiving the 1995 Nobel Peace Prize [1].

From personal genetics to wireless communication technology, the impacts of scientific and technological innovations on society can be immense. Certain modern innovations with potentially significant harmful effects on society, including atomic power and

research into dangerous pathogens, have sparked renewed interest in the question of the responsibilities of scientists to society. In the growing dialogue and literature on the social responsibilities of scientists, however, there is a distinct lack of data on how scientists regard their own responsibilities.

To fill this gap, in 2012, the Science and Human Rights Coalition of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) and the AAAS Scientific Responsibility, Human Rights and Law Program embarked on project aimed at eliciting the perspectives of scientists, engineers and health professionals on their social responsibilities. A preliminary step was the development of a questionnaire, the findings from which would be used to inform a more robust global survey. On March 4, 2015, AAAS published a report on the findings arising from the questionnaire.

A Brief Overview of Social Responsibility

The report identifies two categories of scientific responsibilities. First, there are responsibilities internal to the practice of science, typically encompassed by professional ethics, including data management, protection of human/animal subjects and academic integrity. Second are external responsibilities to society, such as mitigating risks of one's research, participating in public policy, and communicating science to the public. While separate, there is certainly a link between these responsibilities.

Many scientific, engineering and health societies incorporate notions of social responsibility into their codes of ethics. For example, the World Federation of Engineering Organizations (WFEO) declared in 2013 that "Engineers of the 21st century are called upon to play a critical role in contributing to peace and security in an increasingly challenged world. Engineers have an obligation to

protect cultural and natural diversity, and they are central to the … systems and infrastructure networks that underpin civil society, economic activity, protect human health and welfare" [2].

Funding organizations also consider social impact in their grant deliberations. The U.S. National Science Foundation, for example, states that all proposals must address "the broader impacts of the proposed activity," defining broader impacts as "the potential to benefit society and contribute to the achievement of specific, desired societal outcomes" [3]. Private funders highlight similar ideas, such as the United Kingdom's Wellcome Trust, which supports "opportunities to engage diverse audiences with medical science and the questions that science raises for society" [4].

Additionally, there are a variety of statements pointing out the close ties between social responsibility and scientific freedom. For example, the seminal 1975 AAAS Report on *Scientific Freedom and Responsibility* "concluded, early in its deliberations, that the issues of scientific freedom and responsibility are basically inseparable. Scientific freedom, like academic freedom, is an acquired right, generally approved by society as necessary for the advancement of knowledge from which society may benefit" [5]. In 2011, the International Council for Science (ICSU) reaffirmed the relationship between scientific freedom and responsibility in a statement on the Principle of the Universality of Science [6].

Despite the flurry of activity regarding the responsibilities of scientists over the last several decades, there remains a strong need for data. First and foremost, data concerning how scientists perceive their social responsibilities is vital. For example, do engineers view their social

responsibilities in the same way as health professionals? Is there a generational divide on these issues? How might cultural contexts, whether institutional or geographic, impact scientists' views about their responsibilities? The AAAS questionnaire provided an opportunity to explore these questions.

Questionnaire Methodology

The questionnaire included several demographic questions, collecting information on participants' discipline, gender, age, country of highest degree and career, sector and primary funding source. Participants were then asked to note the importance of ten specific responsibilities on a Likert-type scale ranging from "critically important" to "not at all important." Finally, respondents were invited to note "any other important responsibilities of scientists and engineers."

Findings

In response to the Likert-type question, the percentage of respondents answering 'important' compared to 'not important' for any given responsibility ranged from 82.5% to 95.9% (for the analysis, response categories "critically important," "very important" and "important" were combined and labeled "important," while "not very important" and "not at all important" were combined under the heading "not important").

Table 1 below lists the ten responsibilities in the questionnaire in descending order of importance as reflected by the percentage of respondents answering 'important' according to the combined data.

Table 1: Ten Listed Social Responsibilities of the Questionnaire

Responsibility	Percentage response
Take steps to minimize anticipated risks associated with their work	95.8%
Consider the risks of adverse consequences associated with their work	95.6%
Report suspected misconduct they observe by scientists or engineers	94.1%
Explain their work to the public	93.7%
Serve in advisory roles in the public arena in their area of expertise	92%
Publicly disclose risks associated with their work	90.4%
Consider the potential of each research or development project to contribute to societal well-being	88.8%
Participate in public policy deliberations in their area of expertise	88.8%
Engage in public service activities	82.6%
Take steps so that their research, findings or products are not used inappropriately by others	82.4%

Gender: Notable differences emerged between various demographic groups, though there were no significant differences by gender.

Age: Younger respondents were more concerned with public communication, while older respondents were more concerned with reporting misconduct by colleagues.

Sector: Government employees were the most concerned with issues of the conduct of research.

Discipline: Respondents from the health and social/behavioral sciences were most likely to consider a responsibility to be

'important' while engineers were least likely. In addition, the pattern of responses to the scaled questions was generally similar among those in the health sciences and social/behavioral sciences relative to responses for any of the other disciplines.

Region: Participants from Africa, Arab States, Asia and Latin America prioritized consideration of societal well-being, while respondents from Europe, North America and the Pacific prioritized mitigating risks and adverse consequences of their work.

The 509 responses to the open-ended question addressed a range of issues. The comments generally fit six categories, which are listed below in order of frequency of responses.

- Best Research/Work Practices (17%)
- Education (13%)
- Societal Impacts (10%)
- Communication (7%)
- Policy (3%)
- International cooperation (1%)

There were a number of findings resulting from the open-ended responses. In contrast to the Likert-scale results, there was a difference according to gender. Females over 50 years old cited 'best research/work practices' and 'societal impacts' significantly fewer times than male respondents over age 50. In addition, engineers had a high response rate in every category other than "education" and "communication," and physical scientists most frequently discussed "communication" while social scientists most frequently discussed "social impacts" and "policy." Respondents receiving government funding submitted 90% of comments concerning fiscal responsibility, a subcategory of "Best Research/Work Practices."

Outstanding Questions and Next Steps

Dissemination of the questionnaire relied on convenience sampling. As a result, the findings cannot be said to be representative of the scientific community. However, the findings of this pilot study suggest several areas for

further exploration. For instance, what influences—cultural, institutional, legal or otherwise—account for scientists' varying perspectives on their social responsibilities? Which responsibilities do scientists prioritize? What training might scientists receive to enhance their consideration and understanding of their social responsibilities?

The questionnaire served as an initial step towards developing a rigorous global survey, which will provide a broader picture of the perspectives of scientists and engineers on their social responsibilities and explore differences across demographics.

Read the full report here. Please address all questions and inquiries to srhrl@aaas.org.

Sources
1. Rotblat, Joseph, Nobel Lecture, 1995. "Remember Your Humanity"; http://www.nobelprize.org/nobel_prizes/peace/laureates/1995/rotblat-lecture.html; Accessed January 8, 2014
2. The preamble of the 2010 Singapore Statement on Research Integrity; http://www.singaporestatement.org/statement.html; Accessed January 31, 2015.
3. 9 NSF Grant Proposal Guide, NSF 15-1, 26 December 2014, "NSF Proposal Processing and Review"; http://www.nsf.gov/pubs/policydocs/pappguide/nsf15001/gpg_3.jsp#IIIA2b; Accessed January 9, 2014.
4. Wellcome Trust, Strategic Plan, 2010-2010; http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/stellent/groups/corporatesite/@policy_communications/documents/web_document/WTDV027438.pdf; Accessed January 9, 2015.
5. Edsall, John T. 1975. Scientific Freedom and Responsibility (AAAS: Washington, DC 1975), p. 5; http://archives.aaas.org/docs/1975-ScientificFreedomResponsibility.pdf; Accessed January 8, 2015
6. ICSU, 2011. Principle of the Universality: responsibilities of scientists; http://wattsupwiththat.com/2011/09/30/principle-of-the-universality-responsibilities-of-scientists/; Accessed January 8, 2015.

Satellite Imaging of Cultural Sites in Conflict: A Cautionary Note

By **Dr. Susan Wolfinbarger**

Director, AAAS Geospatial Technologies Project

The current conflict in Iraq and Syria endangers sites of cultural significance to humanity. Multiple organizations, including the Geospatial Technologies Project of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS), have documented the intentional damage to- and often complete destruction of- sites of great historical importance using high-resolution satellite imagery. While satellite imagery and the release of resulting analyses may help pierce the "fog of war" and provide those outside the conflict zone understanding of what is happening on the ground in near real-time, it may also unintentionally place sites at risk of further destruction and put nearby civilian populations in harm's way.

A statement, "Satellite Imaging of Cultural Sites in Conflict: A Cautionary Note," was created with the input of multiple organizations and individuals engaged in cultural heritage research in the conflict zone. The statement highlights questions created by the humanitarian response community to guide decision-making surrounding the public release of information while operating in sensitive environments. The statement also provides a discussion of the caveats surrounding the use high-resolution imagery to confirm or discount reports of damage to sites.

Statement

Visual data about cultural heritage sites within conflict zones in near real-time has become possible with new technology, particularly satellite imagery. Sensitive information can result from analysis of publically accessible high-resolution commercial products. Researchers and others using this type of information-gathering in sensitive and volatile situations, such as the current conflict in Iraq, face ethical questions related to the public disclosure of such information.

They must also consider the technical limitations of satellite technology in analysis.

In order to address these concerns in other sensitive settings, the humanitarian community has established a number of ethical guidelines for action in conflict environments. Foremost among these standards is the Sphere Project's *Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response*. Following these guidelines, all parties should consider the following questions at a minimum, particularly concerning cultural site analysis in Iraq, and when weighing the impact of disclosing research findings:

- "What does the affected population gain by our activities?"
- "What might be the unintended negative consequences of our activities for people's security, and how can we avoid or minimise these consequences?"
- "Do the activities take into consideration possible protection threats facing the affected population? Might they undermine people's own efforts to protect themselves?"
- "Could the activities inadvertently empower or strengthen the position of armed groups or other actors?"

The International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) has also noted that:
- "Protection actors … must analyse the different potential risks linked to the collection, sharing or public display of the information and adapt the way they collect, manage and publicly release the information accordingly."
- "Protection actors should be explicit as to the level of reliability and accuracy of information they use or share."

For these reasons, the limitations of the technology must be communicated clearly. High-resolution satellite imagery has a maximum resolution of 30cm per pixel, thus the smallest object visible must be 30cm by 30cm; to be

recognizable it must be significantly larger. Objects that do not meet this size requirement may appear undamaged in satellite imagery.

Moreover, portions of sites may be under cover, rendering them invisible to satellites. Consequently, reports of damage may be unverifiable using satellite technology alone.
Taking into account these considerations, extreme caution is urged when using satellite imagery to corroborate on-the-ground or media-reported damage to cultural heritage sites.

For further reading:
- ICRC. 2013. Professional Standards for Protection Work Carried Out by Humanitarian and Human Rights Actors in Armed Conflict and Other Situations of Violence. https://www.icrc.org/eng/resources/documents/publication/p0999.htm
- Sphere Project. 2010. Humanitarian Charter and Minimum Standards in Humanitarian Response. http://www.spherehandbook.org

In the News

Universities, Science Council in Japan Issue Statement on Research Integrity

*By **Priyanka P. Patel***

Presidents of the Japan Association of National Universities, Japan Association of Public Universities, Federation of Japanese Private Colleges and Universities Associations, and the Science Council of Japan released a statement on December 11, 2014 on the need to improve research methods and scientific integrity [1].

Citing "increasing numbers of research misconduct cases," the Joint Statement for Enhancing the Integrity of Scientific Research outlines new mandated initiatives to support Japan's goal of raising the level of research integrity and

encourage other scientific societies throughout the world to do the same [1]. The organizations specifically advocated for the need to maintain integrity in the daily practice of research, especially in research institutions and universities [1].

The group proposed several commitments to achieving this goal in Japan. One of these mandates required all research institutions and universities in Japan to create and establish mandatory training programs devoted to appropriate research conduct and practice for all researchers [1].

The second of these commitments required all universities and research institutions to improve upon existing guidelines for research scientists, support the use of basic research ethics, and ensure the completion of all compulsory educational programs related to the subject [1]. Their ultimate objective is to "increase the reliability of scientific research" in Japan's universities and research institutions [1].

Additionally, these four organizations are reported to be in the process of developing a manual of research integrity and appropriate conduct for all government-funded scientists [2]. Researchers receiving funding will be expected to have read this manuscript, and research institutions must demonstrate their adoption of the outlined initiatives [2].

In September of 2014, Japan's Society for the Promotion of Science, in coordination with the National Science Foundation, sponsored a meeting on research integrity and scientific misconduct at the University of Tokyo [3]. Speakers made presentations on ethical considerations in research practice, the importance of responsible conduct, and developing training for scientists, among several other topics.

Sources
[1] http://www.scj.go.jp/en/pdf/kohyo-23-261211e.pdf
[2] http://news.sciencemag.org/asiapacific/2014/09/japans-researchers-face-increased-ethics-oversight
[3] http://www.nsf.gov/od/iia/ise/tokyo/perspectives/cosponsored_workshop_research_ethics.jsp

Scientist Pleads Guilty to Fraud in Falsification of HIV Vaccine Test Results

*By **Priyanka P. Patel***

A former researcher and lab manager at the Iowa State University of Science and Technology (ISU) has been charged with research misconduct for falsifying experimental results in an HIV vaccine trial [1]. Dong-Pyou Han, Ph. D., was forced to resign from his position after the fraudulent data were discovered in 2013 [1].

By spiking rabbit sera with human sera containing HIV antibodies, Han made it appear as though the HIV/AIDS vaccine, gp41, in the experimental trial was successful in combating the HIV/AIDS virus in rabbits [2]. These "striking" results secured approximately $10 million in federal grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) [3, 4]. This money was part of a $19 million package of multi-year grants for researchers engaged in associated research [3]. In reality, however, vaccine gp41 did not have any effect similar to the reported magnitude [5].

In addition to research misconduct and misuse of funds, officials were also concerned that these results had been circulated in laboratory, national, and international meetings, in addition to their reporting in applications and progress reports for grants [6].

In his punishment by the Office of Research Integrity of the Department of Health and Human Services, Han voluntarily agreed to a three-year prohibition from participating in or contributing to federally-funded research [4, 6]. Additionally, ISU returned almost $500,000 of grant money and the federal government withdrew $1.4 million in planned funding [1].

Concerned with the misuse of taxpayer dollars and government oversight of fraud, Senator Chuck Grassley of Iowa contacted the US Attorney General's office, which brought the case forward to a grand jury [3]. This was unusual - scientists charged with research misconduct typically have to pay

a fine and are prohibited from receiving federal grant money for some time [1]. However, Han was indicted by the U.S. District Attorney on four counts of making false statements under federal law [1].

Han pled guilty to two of the four felony charges; prosecutors dropped the other two [1, 5]. He now faces up to 10 years in prison [1, 2]. His final sentencing will take place in May 2015 [1].

Sources
[1] http://www.the-scientist.com/?articles.view/articleNo/42285/title/HIV-Scientist-Pleads-Guilty-to-Fraud/

[2]http://www.justice.gov/usao/ias/news/2014/Han%20-%20arraignment%207-1-2014.html

[3]http://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/news/2015/02/25/dong-pyou-han-iowa-state-university-guilty-plea/23996449/

[4]http://www.usatoday.com/story/news/nation/2013/12/23/aids-vaccine-test-results-faked/4184137/

[5]http://www.desmoinesregister.com/story/news/crime-and-courts/2014/06/20/former-iowa-state-researcher-indicted/11033633/

[6] http://ori.hhs.gov/print/content/case-summary-han-dong-pyou

Bioethics Commission Releases Second Report on Ethics in Neuroscience

*By **Joshua A. Ettinger***

On March 26, 2015, the Presidential Commission for the Study of Bioethical Issues (Bioethics Commission) released the second volume of its report "Gray Matters: Topics at the Intersection of Neuroscience, Ethics, and Society" [1]. The first volume focused on the integration of ethics into neuroscience research; the second volume covers several specific issues related to the ethical conduct of neuroscience.

In a webinar held in conjunction with the report's publication, Lisa Lee, Executive Director of the Commission, noted that the first volume emphasized the need to integrate ethics early and explicitly throughout all stages of neuroscience research [2]. For the second volume, the Bioethics Commission focused on three topics: cognitive enhancement, consent capacity, and neuroscience and the legal system. Nita Farahany, a co-author of the report, explained that while there are many ethical issues related to neuroscience, these three were chosen due to their high level of controversy and the fact that "these issues have already arrived."

Cognitive enhancement: There is much hype about new technologies that can purportedly improve one's neurological abilities and treat cognitive impairments. In order to broaden the conversation about cognitive enhancement, the Commission instead uses the term "neural modification," which includes emerging technologies, as well as daily conditions and behaviors that impact brain performance.

The Commission makes five recommendations regarding neural modification: first, to prioritize existing strategies to maintain or improve neural health, such as diet, and adequate exercise and sleep; to prioritize the treatment of neurological disorders; to study neural modifiers and examine their prevalence, benefits and risks; to ensure equitable access so individuals of all socioeconomic levels can access the benefits of these advancements; and fifth, to create guidance on the use of neural modifiers.

Capacity and consent: The protection of human subjects is a vital aspect of scientific responsibility and obtaining informed consent is a key ethical laboratory practice. But how can scientists be sure they have obtained adequate consent from participants with neurological disabilities? The Commission makes four recommendations on this topic. First, scientists should responsibly include participants with impaired consent capacity. It is important that individuals not be excluded from research due to their cognitive problems. Second, to conduct further research on consent capacity and ethical protections. Third, to engage stakeholders to address the stigma associated with impaired consent capacity. And fourth, to establish clear requirements for legally authorized representatives of individuals with cognitive problems for research participation.

Neuroscience and the law: Increasingly, the findings of contemporary neuroscience are reverberating in courtrooms. New insights about the brain are changing the way the law handles cases related to adolescent decision making, the effects of drugs on the brain, memory and lie detection, and states of consciousness, among others.

To this end, the report makes four recommendations on the growing intersection of neuroscience with the law. First, the scientific community should expand and promote educational tools to aid the understanding and use of neuroscience in the legal system. The report commends programs such as the AAAS Judicial Seminars on Emerging Issues in Neuroscience, which help educate judges on contemporary neuroscience relevant to cases they may encounter in the courtroom. Second, that BRAIN Initiative funders support research on this intersection. Third, to avoid hype, overstatement and unfounded conclusions, all of which could undermine the science. And last, that scientists participate more in legal decision-making processes and policy development.

The fourteenth and final overarching recommendation of the report calls for BRAIN Initiative funders to establish and fund multi-disciplinary efforts to support neuroscience and ethics research and education. Moreover, the Commission hopes to "clarify the scientific landscape, identify common ground, and recommend ethical paths forward to stimulate and continue critical, well-informed conversations at the intersection of neuroscience and ethics as the field continues to advance" [1, p.10].

Sources:
[1] Gray Matters: Topics at the Intersection of Neuroscience, Ethics, and Society, Vol. 2.
http://bioethics.gov/node/4704
[2]https://cc.readytalk.com/cc/playback/Playback.do?id=boapcy

In the Societies

APSA Releases Statement on Research Integrity

The American Political Science Association (APSA) recently published a Statement on Field Experiments and Research Integrity in Political Science.

"The American Political Science Association supports and fosters the highest standards of research integrity across the full range of research approaches used by political scientists. Field experiments are a powerful tool for understanding and explaining political activity. Research using field experiments advances our ability to systematically analyze politically and substantively important topics regarding the inner workings of democracy, including whether and how individual attitudes and behaviors vary when people are provided different information.

"The discipline of political science, the US federal government, and institutions of higher education employ procedures and practices to protect research subjects and ensure the integrity of research. Careful attention to all such procedures and practices is imperative; this includes recognition that standards for "acceptable" or "sensitive" questions may depend in part on the specific context, substantive focus, and methodology of the research. Researchers whose projects might affect political behavior as a result of research design or implementation are and should be diligent in the formulation and execution of their studies. As both political scientists and citizens, we respect the fundamental importance of voting, elections, and democratic processes, and our research undertakings do and should reflect this commitment.

"We affirm our support for field experiments as an important and valuable method for studying politics, and assert our obligation to the highest ethical standards for all political science research. As a discipline, an association, and citizens, we encourage the discussion and assessment of all issues relevant to the integrity of political science inquiry" [1].

[1]http://www.apsanet.org/files/Hero.Hochschild%20Statement%20on%20Field%20Exp%20and%20Res%20Integrity.pdf

Resources

Canadian Research Agencies Publish Revised Research Ethics Policy

*By **Priyanka P. Patel***

The three federal research agencies of Canada – the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada – recently published a revision of their official human research ethics policy [1]. The Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans [TCPS 2 (2014)] was released in December 2014[1].

Changes were made in Chapters 2 through 12. The TCPS 2 (2014) created a definition for disciplined inquiry, highlighted identifying factors for studies that require Research Ethics Board (REB) review, and clarified the process related to the potential alterations to consent requirements [2]. The statement also clarified the option to withdraw information, the obligation to disclose material incidental findings, and consent by decision-making capacity, rather than age [2]. The TCPS 2 (2014) also revised the definition of identifiability as context-specific and clarified that consent is not required for secondary use of non-identifiable information used in research [2].

Numerous clarifications were made to definitions of the methods and cases of the Research Ethics Board [2]. The three agencies added items institutions should consider when establishing an REB [2]. They also made it compulsory for all student research projects, such as theses, to be reviewed through an REB [2].

The document also described the process of delegation for annual renewals of more than minimal risk research [2]. For observational research, the revised version described appropriate examples of public spaces for this use [2]. Several changes were made for researchers engaged in clinical trials: TCPS 2 (2014) suggested that data from these trials be made available and provided modified methods of data access in multi-site clinical trials for both Principal and Site Investigators [2].

The Interagency Advisory Panel on Research Ethics of the three agencies modified the policy, partly in response to communications with the larger community of researchers throughout Canada [1]. Additional amendments are currently under review [1].

[1]http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/eng/resources-ressources/news-nouvelles/nr-cp/2014-12-18/
[2]http://www.pre.ethics.gc.ca/pdf/eng/tcps-2014/Highlights_of_Changes_EN.pdf

Announcements

CALL FOR ABSTRACTS

The Collaboration Conundrum: Special Interests and Scientific Research
November 5-6, 2015 at the University of Notre Dame

Historical scandals involving industry-funded research, together with empirical evidence of correlations in some areas of science between industry funding and research results favorable to industry have undermined trust in industry-funded science. And yet, it is unrealistic and wasteful to dismiss industry-funded research across the board as unreliable and unconcerned with the public good.

What to do? Government reports and scholarly publications are currently extolling the value of public participation in scientific research, and a number of funding agencies are now encouraging initiatives such as community-based participatory research (CBPR). Could the participation of citizen groups in *industry*-funded research also prove valuable—to increase the relevance, reliability, and acceptability of industry research?

Announcements continued on page 7

Papers are invited from scholars working in any area relevant to the conference topic, including the private sector, government, and non-profit organizations as well as academic disciplines within the sciences and humanities. Sample topics include (but are not limited to):

- Historical and philosophical perspectives on collaborative research
- Case studies of collaborative research efforts
- Public perceptions of scientific research produced in a collaborative manner
- Legal guidelines and regulations for handling research collaborations
- Ethical principles for managing research collaborations
- Empirical research on the results of research collaborations
- Barriers and opportunities associated with collaborative research efforts

Abstract Submission
The abstract submission deadline is Monday, June 1, 2015. Please submit an abstract of no more than 250 words. Abstracts will be refereed and results communicated to authors by June 30, 2015. Abstract submission is electronic: https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=c3. If you do not have an EasyChair account, you can create one. After logging in, click the 'New Submission' link. Add your abstract to the field provided. You can revise your submission any number of times before the deadline.

JOHNS HOPKINS BIOETHICS SUMMER COURSES

Join faculty from the Johns Hopkins Berman Institute of Bioethics this summer for weeklong
courses in Bioethics, offered through the Berman Institute Bioethics Intensives (BI2) program. BI2 provides an engaging bioethics educational opportunity for current students; researchers; scholars; medical, legal, and policy professionals; and others. For more information and to register visit www.bioethicsinstitute.org/intensives or contact bioethics@jhu.edu.

Annual Meeting of the Society for Social Studies of Science Denver, Colorado. Deadline: Sunday, March 29, 2015

The Society for Social Studies of Science (4S) invites submissions for its 2015 conference in Denver, Colorado, November 11-14. There is no predetermined theme for the 4S conference. Individual abstracts and proposals for sessions should emphasize how they will make original and timely contributions to any theme relevant to science and technology studies (STS). It welcomes papers, session proposals, events, and video or film presentations that are innovative in their delivery, organization, range of topics, and type of public.

In addition to paper and session submissions, the 4Sinvites proposed presentations for a new meeting format and related award scalled "STS Making and Doing." The STS Making and Doing initiative aims to encourage 4S members to share scholarly practices of participation, engagement, and intervention in their fields of study. It highlights scholarly practices for producing and expressing STS knowledge and expertise that extend beyond the academic paper or book. Read the full call here.

Individual submission abstracts should be up to 250 words. They should include the main arguments, methodology, and their contribution to the STS literature. Paper titles should not exceed 10 words. Please list five key words to assist the program chair to group individual papers into a session. You may choose to submit your paper abstract to an open panel where you would prefer your paper to be included, or you can leave panel selection to the program chairs. You can find the descriptions presented here.

Session proposal abstracts should have a maximum of 250 words. Each session proposal should contain a summary and rationale, including a brief discussion of its contribution to STS. Session proposals should be designed to fit two-hour time slots. A typical session will contain six papers or five papers with a discussant.

A minimum of three paper abstracts conforming to the above criteria for abstracts must be submitted for a proposed session. The program chair may assign additional papers to proposed sessions to meet the typical session composition. Each presenter in the session must have a user account in the submission system that includes name, affiliation, and contact information. Submit paper, session, and making and doing proposals here.
Meeting home page: http://www.4sonline.org/meeting

CEPE-IACAP 2015 Joint Conference June 22-25, 2015, University of Delaware

Philosophical and ethical enquiries about information technologies, computing, and artificial intelligence have acquired a focal place in the academic and societal debate on the design, development and deployment of technological artefacts. As the issues to be addressed are increasingly complex and interwoven, the need to consider different stakeholders and to endorse both multi- and inter-disciplinary approaches in addressing such problems become more pressing. For this reason, in 2015 INSEIT and IACAP will hold a joint meeting to offer the opportunity to members of both communities to exchange ideas and discuss issues of common interest.

The conference will be held on June 22-25, 2015 at the University of Delaware and will be hosted by Professor Tom Powers, Department of Philosophy, School of Public Policy and Administration and Delaware Biotechnology Institute, and Director of the Center for Science, Ethics & Public Policy, University of Delaware.

They invite abstract submissions (up to 3000 words) as well as proposals for symposia focusing on ethical and philosophical problems related to information technologies and computing. A selection of the papers presented during the meeting will be published in a volume of the 'Synthese Library' (Springer).

The conference theme is open to the following topics:

- Artificial Intelligence
- Artificial Life
- Automated Warfare
- Cognitive Science, Computation & Cognition
- Computational Modeling in Science and Social Science
- Computer-Mediated Communication
- Ethical Problems and Societal Impact of Computation and Information
- Ethics of Big Data
- History of Computing
- Information Culture and Society
- Metaphysics of Computing
- Philosophy of Information
- Philosophy of Information Technology
- Robotics
- Virtual Reality

Extended Abstract submission: 15 February 2015
Notification of acceptance: 27 February 2015
Submission full paper for the conference proceedings: 1 August 2015

Symposia submission: 15 February 2015
Notification of acceptance: 2 March 2015

Submissions should be sent via EasyChair using the following link
https://easychair.org/conferences/?conf=cepeiacap2015

Relevant websites
IACAP: http://www.iacap.org
INSEIT: http://inseit.net