**Case Study Orientation Tool – furthering the Societies Consortium's mission to advance professional, ethical and inclusive conduct for excellence and integrity in STEMM**

Objective: A "case study library" is being developed by the Societies Consortium as a tool to advance expected professional, ethical and inclusive conduct at society meetings and in fieldwork, as well as ways to facilitate expected conduct and to guide societies, faculty, researchers, fellows, and students on how to address undesirable conduct. Attention will be given to identifying and countering the effects of power differentials.

Audiences: While intended to elevate the understanding of all participants (including senior and mid-career faculty and researchers), the focus is on how to protect students, fellows, early career professionals, and other vulnerable populations in navigating difficulties when there is a failure to meet conduct expectations by others with more seniority or power.

Application: The case studies and their accompanying discussion guides are intended to be useful to those planning meetings and field work—as well as those supervising these activities and participating in them.

Design: A template format is to be developed (see attached initial outline). Case studies will be adaptable for the different audiences. Case studies will be designed to be useful as stand-alone resources, or in workshops or curricula.

- Discussion guides will accompany the case studies. The guides will highlight policy, operational and legal issues that are likely to arise when case studies are used, as well as guiding discussion to advance solutions.

- To develop the case studies, we will collect real-world incidents from media reports, outreach to students, fellows, societies and institutions of higher education. Individuals' identities will not be disclosed. Factual situations that have occurred, some common and others not, will be genericized to provide useful guidance in the fields.

Process: An ad hoc working group comprised of the Consortium Advisory Council subgroup on students/education and some volunteer society representatives (including some students identified by the societies and/or Advisory Council) will work with EducationCounsel on development of this resource.

- The Consortium Leadership Council and Executive Committee will have their regular input and oversight roles, respectively. They will have regular opportunities to review direction and progress.

- The Executive Committee will have their normal approval role.

Current Status:  A survey has been developed and initially gone out to identified students/post-docs/residents with a list of possible topics seeking their input to prioritize list to select for pilot case study; identify missing topics; identify if they have experience/information to share for a case study.

Topical areas to cover include:
- Incident(s) at conferences, including panel composition
- Incident(s) during conferences, but off site, including that involve use of alcohol
- Incident(s) occurring in field work or lab, including in remote and isolated sites
- Incident(s) in the medical field where "rough" speech has been allowed to become what is considered "normal"
- Incident(s) involving people who bring money and prestige to an institution, e.g., a person that becomes "too big to fail"
- Incident(s) involving structural inequity, e.g., a case study whose locus is not a "bad actor" but instead looks at structural/cultural/institutional barriers that create the inequity and what needs to change.
- Included some "success stories" as case studies, showing what you *can* do and what works

**Rough Draft Case Study Template Outline**

I. **Title Indicating Topical Focus**
II. **Objective:** What are the key principles to be learned.
III. **Facts and Scope of Issues** (individual case studies may focus a subset of facts/issues)**:**
   a. What are the facts—the basic story?
   b. What were the conduct expectations—and were they clearly established in policy and understood broadly?   What are the mission and goals of the conduct policy? Are they only legal compliance?
   c. What challenges are present (e.g., power differentials, remote or sensitive locale, inadequate policy, inadequate process, anonymous or attributed manner of raising concerns, confidentiality or publicity, reputational impacts, opportunity impacts, etc.)?
   d. What roles are involved (e.g., harassing actor, target, bystanders, leaders, support/response functions)?  What level of experience do they have?
   e. Were there a clear process and criteria/standards, broadly understood, for raising concerns, determining credible questions about misconduct, and responding to and resolving concerns? Factually, what was applied and what was the outcome?
   f. What supports/protections were available and who had access to them? Factually, was anything done to avoid re-traumatizing identified targets and prejudging/affecting reputations of identified targets and accused?
   g. Factually, were anonymity and confidentiality available—what were the parameters/limitations?
   h. Factually, was there an assessment of breadth of immediate impacts on the community and was any action taken to address them?
IV. **Analysis of Issues:** From effective policy and legal sustainability perspectives, consider—
   a. What constitutes sexual/racial-other intersecting forms of harassment—in fact (under law and according to research) and under the policy?  Is there a difference? Is the policy adequate?
   b. Are there differences in conduct expectations for various roles, and were those expectations met?
   c. Where does the misconduct fit on a continuum, and why (e.g., nature, frequency, potential and actual type and breadth of harm to individuals and the field, age of incident, experience level/prominence of the accused, evidence of "lessons learned" or not, etc.)?

    **d.** How does the place of the misconduct on a continuum affect the kind of review/investigation/response/consequences?

    **e.** What worked well and what didn't?  Were actions effective:

      **i.** to advance inclusiveness, integrity and excellence in the field?

      **ii.** to fairly respond to the directly involved individuals (accused, identified target, witnesses)?

    **f.** Were interests of the field and of individuals balanced in a manner that is rationale and understood by the community?  If "fairness" to everyone isn't possible, or if there is not agreement on what is "fair," how is the rationale for what is done in these circumstances generally communicated (e.g., the interests of the field in removing longstanding barriers of harassment take precedence over individual interests when the two interests need to be weighed)—how is judgment without facts avoided and communicated as not occurring? What if any communications about the particular case were made and how were these issues addressed?

    **g.** Why did certain actions work well or not?   What were the key levers for desirable and un- or less-desirable outcomes, in view of the mission and goals of the policy?

    **h.** In the circumstances, did the orientation of review and resolution advance the mission and goals of the policy? Does a formal finding of fault satisfy the policy's mission/goals and needs of involved parties and the community? Would community-building/restorative practices or remedies be more effective—on their own or in addition to formal findings and punishment?

**V.**     **Key Takeaways:**  Principles, effective policy and practice, pitfalls to avoid.