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Section 1: Preface

The University of Texas Institute for Geophysics (UTIG) is a vibrant community of intellectual pursuits involving staff researchers, administrative professionals, technical experts, students, postdoctoral fellows, and visitors. UTIG emphasizes expeditionary-scale research on land, at sea, and in the air as well as computationally- and experimentally-enabled discovery to solve problems ranging from natural hazards and natural resource utilization to climate change and planetary habitability. Our diverse ideas, scientific approaches, backgrounds, priorities, and interests will, on occasion, lead to conflicts that distract from a constructive research, educational, and workplace climate. UTIG strives to minimize and resolve conflict, at home or abroad, by employing transparent and equitable procedures that are described in this code of conduct.

The code of conduct offers guidance to assist in preventing behavior that is damaging to our community; however, conflict is unfortunately inevitable in any organization. Thus, the code of conduct also provides guidance toward addressing problems in ways that strengthen our community and complement the University-wide processes for conflict resolution. The purpose of such an intervention is not to seek punishment, but is in place to sustain civility, collegiality, and, if possible, collaboration.

The code of conduct is tailored to meet the needs of the UTIG community in its effort to grow more cohesive and robust against challenges; however, it is not intended to be an all-inclusive document. All members of the Jackson School of Geosciences (JSG) are expected to be familiar with, and abide by, guidelines and policies described in the Guidelines for Faculty, Research Scientists, Students, and Staff of the Jackson School of Geosciences and Jackson School of Geosciences Workplace Issues as well as those of The University of Texas at Austin described in the UT Handbook of Operating Procedures and the UT Compliance and Ethics Guide. Where applicable, references to specific sections of those and other resources will be provided in the sections that follow.

Section 2 outlines conduct expectations for UTIG personnel and visitors that maintain a positive culture and climate. Section 3 presents active engagement techniques intended to eliminate problems before they arise, or to respond effectively in the moment. Section 4 discusses reporting mechanisms, Section 5 describes mechanisms for informal constructive feedback, and Section 6 details formal reactions for scenarios where law or University policy requires formal reporting, or where informal reactions are otherwise determined not sufficient. Appendix A describes the UTIG Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Inclusion (DEAI) Committee. Appendix B addresses power imbalances, Appendix C addresses ability and accessibility in the geosciences, Appendix D provides recommendations for forming inclusive committees, Appendix E provides recommendations for hosting conferences, Appendix F provides guidelines for seminars, Appendix G provides guidelines for authorship, and Appendix H provides recommendations for fieldwork.

All members of the UTIG community, including visitors and contractors, are responsible for creating a safe and professional working environment, with an expectation of integrity, respect, and transparency across all organizational levels and endeavors, whether they be on a UT Campus, in the field, laboratory, or virtual space, or while attending professional meetings. Individual conduct that does not meet these expectations is contrary to the Institute’s commitment to professional interactions among colleagues.

This code of conduct should be reviewed at least every two years. The next review is scheduled to take place by November 2023.
Section 2: Conduct Expectations

At UTIG, we aim to conduct rigorous and impactful research, while treating everyone with respect, fairness, and dignity. In pursuing our activities, we make the following commitments that apply in both physical and virtual spaces:

- We strive to maintain at all times a collegial, professional, inclusive, and equitable environment.
- We treat everyone with dignity, courtesy, respect, and compassion, independent of their career path, career stage, or personal attributes that include but are not limited to: age, disability, ethnicity, gender, gender expression, gender identity, lactation, nationality, physical appearance, political affiliation, socioeconomic class, pregnancy, race, religion, sexual orientation, and status as a caregiver.
- We listen to diverse viewpoints and are respectful of others’ right to express their own points of view.
- When conflicts arise, we commit to acknowledging them and addressing them respectfully and directly, with the specific aim of strengthening our community.
- We encourage UTIG community members to explore their implicit biases to create a fairer, more just organization.
- We adopt policies and practices that promote equity and accessibility.
- We pledge to help the entire community follow the code of conduct, and to not remain silent when we see violations of the code.
- We will not tolerate intimidation or retaliation against anyone for raising a concern or making a report in good faith, or for cooperating in an investigation.

UTIG strives to foster a collaborative and inclusive environment, with research teams within and outside the Institute. Each team member will have their own goals, visions, and approaches to thinking and problem solving that should be considered respectfully. The time of others should be respected by being on time, following a meeting agenda, and actively participating. Team members should receive the credit they deserve for their contributions, independent of their status. Feedback and discussion are an essential part of team work, and we encourage a climate that embraces constructive criticism. We strive to maintain a civil discourse when discussing contentious issues.

Toxic behaviors can significantly interfere with civil discourse of co-workers, which impacts workplace satisfaction and productivity. As a community, we do not accept behaviors targeting individuals or groups, such as harassment, discrimination, racism, sexism, bullying, aggression, violence, stereotyping (including assumptions about classical gender roles), misogyny, misandry, exclusionary or offensive comments, bias, or other harmful behavior that is intended to intimidate, belittle, humiliate, or threaten others. Inappropriate sharing of other people’s confidential or private information is similarly unacceptable. These commitments hold in both physical and virtual spaces.

---

2 Text modified from the ASKAP POSSUM Code of Conduct
Section 3: Active engagement

In the following, we offer tools to actively foster a collegial culture and climate while also addressing complicating factors and consequences of inaction (Figure 1).

![Enabling Active Engagement](image)

**Figure 1**: Creating an environment that promotes active engagement requires a shift in conventional academic culture (left-to-right arrow). A combination of simple communication practices, combined with training opportunities and development of codes of conduct within the academy (right hand box) are central to enabling this shift. It is critical to acknowledge factors that complicate this process (center box) and to keep in mind the many costs of doing nothing (left hand box).

### 3.1 Bystander intervention

A proven effective method of reducing workplace toxicity in complex social systems such as ours is through bystander intervention training (BIT) and “train the trainer” instruction on how to present the information in a concise and engaging way to others. Bystander Intervention is recognizing a potentially harmful situation or interaction between other individuals and choosing to respond in a way that could positively influence the outcome. The value of bystander intervention training is well described by Helena Cawley, President of H.A.B.I.T. Advisors LLC: “The principles taught in bystander intervention trainings can be effective in both the field and office environments. Individuals that apply effective intervention techniques are often able to foresee and avoid problems from developing in the first place and are also effective at addressing them in the moment. However, a coordinated group of trained individuals is the most effective at monitoring and correcting toxic behavior.”

BIT is offered as standalone workshops, at scientific conferences (such as AGU), and abbreviated versions are also available online (see, e.g., the BeVocal initiative at UT Austin as well as a compilation of trainings by the ADVANCEGeo Partnership). The USGS offers a thorough training called “STEPUP! Employee Empowerment Strategies (SEES): A Bystander Intervention Program Designed for Scientific Workplaces” which typically requires four hours of active instruction (one or two-day formats). While no summary is an adequate substitute for actual training, several concepts are highlighted below because they can be applied to many situations prone to interpersonal conflict.

**Leader and First Follower** - The first person to confront an individual or group behaving in a toxic manner is called a Leader and the next person to speak up is considered the First Follower. When only a Leader confronts the offender, the toxic behavior is not likely to change; however, when a First Follower also confronts the offender, the behavior is corrected a majority of the time. The predictability of this
concept motivates an important implication: given that toxic behaviors often follow patterns, it is possible to anticipate if, and perhaps when, they will occur. Therefore, at least two, but preferably more, individuals in a group should prepare by agreeing who will be the Leader and who will be the First (and subsequent) Follower(s). However, this proactive approach can also be applied to less predictable situations. For example, a field team could anticipate when and where they are most likely to encounter toxic behavior while traveling and, through discussion, determine who is more comfortable in the Leader and First Follower roles.

**Calling people in** - For those untrained, understanding of bystander intervention is often limited to confronting strangers, whereas toxic behaviors in the workplace are often exhibited by those we may know well and interact with frequently. As a result, confronting toxic behaviors has the potential to disrupt or damage relationships and the community if communication is conducted in a way that is alienating to the offender. We therefore recommend adopting an approach of “calling people in” (see, e.g., UTIG Seminar by Dr. Skyller Walkes). There are a multitude of approaches to this; however, the goal is to communicate to the offender that they did something that was damaging to the community with the assumption that their conduct was not ill-intentioned, and that the community desires their inclusion but their behavior must be improved. Since these situations may cause emotional responses, it is important to use language that does not feel challenging (“You never”, “You always”) but to speak from questions rather than accusations (“can you please explain what you meant by… I don’t think I understood;” or “I feel like you said …, is that what you meant?”).

### 3.2 Complicating factors

Several general factors make active bystander intervention difficult, especially in the absence of formal training, such as: 1) fear of embarrassment and/or ostracization, 2) general conflict aversion, 3) a real or perceived lack of interpersonal and/or verbal skills deemed necessary to handle the situation, and 4) general or specific social anxiety. In addition, 5) if the initial reaction includes anger, one may choose not to speak up, believing it is best to wait until the anger passes for fear of making the situation worse or alienating potential First Followers. Each of these examples can be addressed through training and proactive Leader-First Follower agreements.

Real or perceived power imbalances are perhaps the most severe factors complicating bystander intervention. For various academic environments such as teaching departments, research laboratories, or field teams, this problem can be amplified when “informal” cultures are instituted (intentionally or otherwise) due to their tendency to make those in positions of authority less cognizant of the still-present power imbalances in the system. Clear definitions of expectations for behavior and boundaries for participation in activities should be considered for any organization, but especially where informal cultures persist. Otherwise, negative behavior is more likely to go unchecked as those in lower positions of the power structure remain hesitant to speak up due to fear of retaliation or fear of denial of opportunity (e.g., fieldwork, reference letters, promotions), among others. Early career professionals (junior staff, students, postdocs, and others within six years of completing their Ph.D.) are especially vulnerable to the risk of such denial of opportunity and are therefore structurally disincentivized from reporting problems with their supervisors/mentors. This committee has not identified clear solutions to this problem but wish to describe the issue here for future consideration.

In some situations, bystander apathy plays a role. Bystanders can be less likely to take action in a situation where others are present because each individual may feel that someone else is in a better position to say or do something. This is a well-studied phenomenon and several factors are known to contribute, including the difficulty of interpreting a confusing situation, the perceived or real consequences of acting,
the immediate and unpredictable nature of situations precluding preparation or a plan to act, and the fact that situations requiring intervention are not common enough for us to have adequate practice in the required skills.

3.3 Thresholds: When to say (or do) something?

At UTIG, all employees should feel that their workplace is safe and free from toxic behaviors. Taking action in the moment is valuable because toxic behaviors that are left unaddressed or unrecognized may escalate over time (“threshold creep”). Someone who feels their behavior is tacitly tolerated by the community may become emboldened and others may be led to believe that the culture accepts this type of behavior. Moreover, a continuation or escalation of negative behaviors may lead the recipients to feel that their safety (physical and/or mental health) is threatened. This can be particularly acute in the field, where individuals are disconnected from supportive resources, but is certainly not limited to field work.

3.4 Trainings available at UT Austin

The University of Texas at Austin provides additional resources through the UTLearn system. Topics include “Managing Bias”, “Strategies for an Equitable Workplace”, “Be Vocal”, and “Managing Difficult Situations with External Constituents”, among many others. We stress that all members of our community should try facilitating relationships with others at UTIG who are available to discuss lived experiences and challenges (e.g. research staff members are encouraged to utilize the UTIG Mentoring Program for this purpose).

Section 4: Reporting Mechanisms

Depending on the nature and severity of a conflict, the decision of whether and how to raise a complaint can be one of the most difficult steps to resolution. In certain cases, reporting is mandated by law or University policy. This section can serve as a guide to help victims and witnesses identify when reporting is mandatory, and for situations that do not require mandatory reporting, to decide who to approach to resolve conflict and seek advice. When conflict occurs, those involved can decide to file either an internal report to the UTIG DEAI Committee or an external report to University services as defined below and summarized in Figure 2.

External report - Conflicts involving violations of Title IX or University nondiscrimination or ethics policies (see formal reactions) require mandatory reporting to the University. Victims and witnesses may submit external reports directly to services including, but not limited to, the University of Texas Title IX Office, UTIG Human Resources, or University Compliance and Ethics Hotline where they will be investigated. External reports are not confidential by nature and may require participation of witnesses. Formal reactions will occur if wrongdoing is found. If it is determined that no violation occurred or the investigation is inconclusive, the conflict may be left unresolved. In this case, victims and witnesses may seek conflict mediation with the UTIG DEAI Committee or University services.

Internal report - An internal report is appropriate when the parties desire to resolve the situation cooperatively and an external report is not mandated. Internal reports can be submitted confidentially (provided they do not fall under mandatory reporting requirements - see above) to any current member of the UTIG DEAI Committee (via an online form or email to deai@utexas.edu), with written statements preferred, although any mechanism is accepted. Unless wishing to remain anonymous, please include your name and position (e.g., student, postdoc, researcher, administrator, technical staff), the date and location of the incident, and a detailed description of the incident or concern. Include names of other persons or witnesses involved and supporting documentation, if possible. A description of the desired resolution would also be of assistance. The committee members commit to keep all reports confidential,
and will only disclose outside of the committee with the expressed permission of the reporter or as required by law or University policy (see formal reactions). The committee’s records retention guidelines can be made available to complainants upon request.

The DEAI Committee will evaluate all internal reports for mandatory reporting requirements and recommend a course of action for reports that may require informal reactions (e.g., mediation). To avoid conflicts of interest, any DEAI Committee member mentioned in a report will be automatically recused from the internal review process. Internal reports subject to mandatory reporting will be raised to the UTIG Director as external reports.

If you are unsure whether the incident is a violation of the code of conduct, or whether the code applies to the space where the incident happened, you are encouraged to make a report. It is far better to receive reports that ultimately do not require action than to have a violation go unreported. The committee does not look negatively on a reporter if we find the incident reported in good faith is not a violation. Additionally, knowing about incidents that are not violations, or happen outside covered spaces, can also help to improve the code of conduct.

Confidential External Support - Sometimes a person may be reluctant to report a violation due to discomfort, violence, or fear of retribution. For any conflict, victims and witnesses can seek confidential external support through UT services including but not limited to the University Ombuds Office, UT Health, and counseling services (see Figures 3 and 4). Using these resources will not result in a formal or informal reaction, but can help parties decide how to proceed. The Title IX Office provides a full list of campus, community, and reporting resources; see also Figures 3 and 4.

Figure 2: Flow chart for conflict resolution; note that internal reports remain strictly confidential unless the content of the report demands a formal report to University offices (e.g., Title IX). See also Appendix H: in the field, internal or external reports can be submitted through the Field Safety Coordinators.
Figure 3: University resources for students.
Figure 4: University resources for employees.
Section 5: Informal Reactions

Informal reactions are intended to resolve concerns at the earliest stage possible. Use of the informal reaction process serves the dual purpose of educating the UTIG Community about negative behaviors while working directly and confidentially with the parties involved. The informal reaction can provide a victim of minor incidents with the necessary support to address such problems. Informal reaction resolutions may include discussions with the parties, recommendations from the DEAI Committee for the respondent and complainant, and a follow-up review to assure that the resolution has been implemented effectively.

5.1 Why internal reports and informal reactions?

People may be less likely to report negative behavior if their only options would involve the UTIG Director or Human Resources; an internal report and informal reaction process can facilitate a resolution without escalating to those levels. Similarly, investigations can be time consuming depending on the complexity of the situation or the seriousness of the issues, and an informal process for reconciliation can be less disruptive to the working or educational environment, involve fewer people, and generally preserve or strengthen working or advising/mentoring relationships. Informal reactions can be a quick and useful tool to settle misunderstandings or get clarification for a given situation. A victim may fear that making a formal complaint would lead to a painful, adversarial investigation, or that the accused could face disciplinary measures harsher than the victim might desire. A process that allows for anonymity also reduces a victim’s fears of gossip or retaliation: “If you file a formal complaint, and the person you filed it against finds out about it, you’re going to be dealing with a lot of people in addition to all of the stress you’re under from the incident and from the process,” says Victoria Sanchez, an undergraduate student at Yale University, in an interview about informal complaints. “I could see cases where people are bullied. I wouldn’t want to deal with that. That takes a lot of courage.”

However, complainants must be aware that internal reports will be elevated to external reports by the DEAI Committee when they involve a violation of Title IX, University non-discrimination policy, or serious fraud or scientific misconduct (see formal reactions). Whereas the DEAI Committee facilitates the resolution of misconduct and is obligated to report severe violations to the above named official resources at UT, we are also committed to improving the climate within the UTIG community in other informal ways. This means that we are prepared to facilitate communication between individuals or within groups that have experienced tension, check in with individuals/groups following the resolution of misconduct (if desired), facilitate or give advice on how to approach difficult or anxiety-inducing conversations (e.g., between supervisor and student), and provide guidance and introduce practices on how to make a research group diverse, inclusive, and responsive to each member’s accessibility needs. Therefore, the DEAI Committee welcomes all matters concerning our community and is looking forward to equipping UTIG with tools to become a more fair and welcoming environment.

Because UTIG scientists and students conduct expeditionary research and attend professional meetings, a personal conflict may arise between someone affiliated with the University of Texas and a colleague at a different institution, either in the United States or abroad. A reportable incident may also happen between a person visiting UTIG and an employee or student of the University of Texas. In such circumstances, a respectful work environment is essential. The DEAI Committee therefore also accepts informal reports of misconduct if the respondent is not affiliated with the University of Texas. The DEAI Committee will provide guidance and invite all persons involved in the incident to participate in mediation.
5.2 Multiple approaches to mediation and conflict resolution are needed

It is difficult to judge the efficacy of the current process for conflict resolution due to the lack of reporting metrics and the usual confidentiality of the process. However, it is the opinion of this DEAI Committee that the (low) number of reports to the UTIG Human Resources (HR) coordinator do not reflect the number of incidents that warrant some kind of mediation. The current process favors either a punitive justice approach to toxic behavior or a hierarchical mediation approach for conflict resolution. For the former to work, it must be proven that the initial offense violates institutional policy, which is often not the case either for lack of evidence, reticence by the complainant to pursue the issue, or because the behavior is not quite bad enough. This is problematic because behavioral patterns that are not considered egregious enough to warrant punitive action can still create divisions in the workplace. Conventional mediation is either organized in a top-down process through the HR structure (e.g., a complaint to the Dean initiates a dialog) or through the Ombuds office. For conventional mediation to work, both parties must agree to participate, which is not guaranteed. We believe that one reason this approach sometimes breaks down is because the process is considered too formal: A potential complainant prefers not to involve the HR structure or the Ombuds office and/or the respondent does not want to engage, perhaps believing that participation is an admission of guilt that they would rather avoid. Accordingly, this committee offers the following general recommendations:

1) Multiple models for mediation and conflict resolution should be described to the UTIG community;
2) The DEAI Committee should have a standing subcommittee composed of individuals with mediation training, available to counsel complainants on options and to assist with mediation, if requested;
3) UTIG should encourage its community members to think about conflict resolution as a restorative justice process rather than a punitive justice process.

The first two practical recommendations can be adopted by UTIG through the DEAI Committee; however the third is a recommendation to the entire UTIG community. We propose that when our community perceives toxic behavior as opportunities for growth, rather than punishment, we will have initiated a community convergent approach to conflict resolution. There will always be a place for punitive justice; however, when such an approach is pursued for offenses that do not meet the standard for formal punishment, the process is both community divergent and lacks any benefit whatsoever.

5.3 Restorative justice model for conflict resolution

A restorative justice approach to conflict resolution emphasizes the reparation of harm through a cooperative process that includes all stakeholders who collectively develop a plan to both heal the inflicted harm and reintroduce the offender into the community. The restorative justice model seeks to 1) ensure that the offender understands the harm they caused; 2) offer the offender an opportunity for personal development (moral, behavioral, etc.); 3) help the offender believe the plan for reconciliation is fair and legitimate; and 4) avoid stigmatizing the offender. The process typically (but not necessarily) involves direct encounters between the reporting and responding parties. Confidentiality agreements are typically signed to promote open and honest communication throughout the process. Restorative justice is an alternative to the more conventional retributive approach to justice, which considers only the offense and related circumstances to determine a punishment commensurate to the offense, with no explicit consideration of the community. The restorative justice model can be applied at UTIG to address complex interpersonal dynamics and problematic behavior in an informal way (e.g., not necessarily requiring involvement of the Director or Human Resources staff).
**Hypothetical example** - A junior staff member of the community feels belittled, bullied, or otherwise uncomfortable in their relationship with a more senior staff member. The junior member submits a report to the DEAI Committee, indicating a preference for an informal report. After confirming that there is no need to file a formal complaint, the DEAI Committee informs the reporting party that restorative justice mediation is recommended. If the complainant consents, the DEAI Committee informs the offending party that an informal complaint was filed and that confidential group mediation is requested. The notice explains that both parties (complainant and respondent) should be joined by a trusted member of the community who they feel will have their interests in mind; members of the DEAI Committee are available for this process and regular mediation with a neutral third party could also be applied. The participants sign confidentiality agreements and agree on a time and place to meet. The meetings begin with a statement explaining that the objectives of the meeting are to explain the offense, repair harm, and strengthen community. The complainant provides additional detail on the offense, if needed, and explains what they desire to resolve the issue. The respondent is given the space to respond to better understand the offense. The process continues until all participants understand the claim and commit to reconciliation. In some cases, an agreement will be written down. All parties will also agree if the contents of the agreement will be disclosed to anyone else and the appropriateness of follow-up arrangements with the mediators. If agreement cannot be reached, the mediators will assist all parties with identifying the next steps.

**5.4 Confidentiality**

The process of mediation is confidential except as noted below. Any notes made by the mediator during the process will be destroyed after the process concludes unless both parties request all or some of the notes to be retained. The mediator will not divulge any confidences that are shared unless the parties consent or the mediator reasonably believes that he or she is required by law or University policy to report the incident. Should this happen, the mediation process will be stopped and mediators will alert the appropriate University services, who will inform both parties.

Reports generated from the mediation process will be redacted to remove the identities of the parties involved. These anonymous reports will be helpful in tracking the types of behaviors that are being reported to the committee.

**5.5 Stalled mediation**

The mediation process is intended to be constructive and can expediently reach outcomes acceptable to both the complainant and respondent parties. In the event that the process stalls due to apathy or an unwillingness on the part of the respondent to cooperate, the mediators may seek advice from other resources on campus or at UTIG (including the Director).

**Section 6: Formal Reactions**

Formal reactions to conflict and misconduct rise beyond the scope of issues that can be addressed by the Institute for Geophysics and mediation. Laws and University policies mandate these reactions to address misconduct that may be deemed unlawful or severe. External reports, which may result in formal reactions, are investigated by offices of the University of Texas (e.g., Title IX). External complaints cannot be rescinded and will remain on record regardless of their outcome. The ramifications of external reports can be significant, including termination, loss of advising ability, and legal action. Pending the result of a formation reaction, witnesses, survivors, and respondents may use University conflict mediation resources to seek further resolution (see informal reactions).
6.1 Discrimination, Harassment, and Mandatory Reporting

Federal law, state law, and University policies prohibit discrimination, including harassment, on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin, sex, pregnancy, age, disability, citizenship, veteran status, and genetic information. Any person who believes that they have been subjected to prohibited discrimination should report the incident to any University official, administrator, supervisor, or the UT Title IX Office. In addition, certain supervisory and administrative employees are responsible for promptly reporting incidents of discrimination or harassment that come to their attention. These policies are detailed in the Handbook of Operating Procedures sections 3-3020 and 3-3031.

Further, under state law, most UT employees are required to promptly report incidents of sexual harassment, sexual assault, interpersonal violence, or stalking directly to the UT Title IX office, as detailed in the Handbook of Operating Procedures section 3-3031. If the incident occurs during field work and communications are limited, a report should be made promptly after adequate communications are reestablished. UT policy and state law prohibit providing false information, making a false complaint, or interfering with the grievance process. Reports can be made online via https://titleix.utexas.edu/, by email to titleix@austin.utexas.edu; by phone to 512-471-0419; via the behavior concerns advice line; in person at the Title IX office; or to the UTIG Title IX coordinator (Susanne Morrison). The website is the preferred means of reporting, but email can be valuable for joint reports so long as all reporters are named and cc’d.

Title IX complaints cannot be made anonymously. Anonymity of the survivor can be requested but may not necessarily be granted. However, confidential resources do exist. The Counseling and Mental Health Center outlines supportive resources for survivors. Students can meet with a confidential advocate through Student Emergency Services. Employees may receive confidential counseling and support through the Employee Assistance Program. The University of Texas Ombuds Offices offer confidential listening and discussions for issues of any nature. See also Figures 2 and 3.

Note that survivors or injured parties are not mandated to file a Title IX complaint. Also, survivors are not required to cooperate with an investigation if a Title IX complaint involving them is made. If the survivor does not cooperate, the investigation will likely be closed.

6.2 Fraud and Scientific Misconduct

As a public research institution, UTIG is dedicated to advancing science and making discoveries that have the potential to affect public policy. This mission requires an unwavering commitment to transparency and academic integrity. Unacceptable activities include but are not limited to intentional falsification of data, willful and unauthorized destruction of records, bribery, and financial fraud. UTIG employees have a duty to notify University officials or call the Ethics and Compliance Hotline (English: 1-877-507-7321 or Español: 1-800-216-1288) to report ethics violations. Confidentiality of the reporter will be maintained except when the reporter is required to serve as a witness in legal proceedings. Reporters must cooperate fully with an investigation and may not knowingly make false accusations.

For more information on dishonest or fraudulent activities, see the Handbook of Operating Procedures section 3-1021.

For information regarding the Ethics and Compliance Hotline: https://compliance.utexas.edu/compliance-and-ethics-hotline
Appendix A. UTIG DEAI Committee

The UTIG Diversity, Equity, Accessibility, and Inclusion (DEAI) Committee is a UTIG standing committee that works to promote equality for all people in our institution regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, age, sexual identity, religion, national origin, and ability. The committee addresses general questions or concerns from all employees regarding the equality, safety, and well-being of people that visit or work at UTIG, or who participate in fieldwork or meetings with UTIG staff or students. When appropriate, the committee will advocate for underrepresented groups, and it can provide advice to UTIG leadership on matters that concern equality. The committee has two specific formal responsibilities: 1) Review and update the UTIG code of conduct every two years; 2) elect a sub-committee, consisting of at least three of its members, to handle complaints at UTIG. This sub-committee can re-direct complaints that require mandatory reporting, or it can start a mediation (either a restorative justice or conventional model) process for informal complaints.

The DEAI Committee will consist nominally of eight members and should be no fewer than six members at any given time. In order to represent an array of viewpoints and experiences, the committee should include at least one each of the following employment categories: administrative, technical, graduate student, postdoctoral fellow, early career researcher, and senior researcher, and nominally span other axes of diversity as well (see also Appendix D on Inclusive Committees). Permanent employees will serve 2-year terms, while students and postdocs will either have 1-year or 2-year terms, depending on their circumstances. Overlap in membership is encouraged as new members transition onto the committee, including no fewer than two committee meetings with overlapping members.

**Membership:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Krista Soderlund</td>
<td>Research Scientist</td>
<td>2020-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dillon Buhl</td>
<td>Research Engineering/Scientist Associate</td>
<td>2020-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bhargav Boddupalli</td>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>2021-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susanne Morrison</td>
<td>Senior Human Resource Coordinator</td>
<td>2020-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelia Rasmussen</td>
<td>Research Associate</td>
<td>2020-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Reyes</td>
<td>Senior Administrative Associate</td>
<td>2020-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevin Shionalyn</td>
<td>Graduate Research Assistant</td>
<td>2021-Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harm Van Avendonk</td>
<td>Senior Research Scientist</td>
<td>2020-Present</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Past Membership:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jamin Greenbaum</td>
<td>Assistant Research Scientist</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Gase</td>
<td>Graduate Research Assistant</td>
<td>2020-2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B. Power Imbalances

At their best, scientific academies are where discovery and learning occur through a combination of diligent work and collaboration. However, the highly competitive and hierarchical structures of academia also create susceptibilities for abuse of power and bullying. The traditional graduate student model of working in a research specialty under the close supervision of a graduate advisor depends on good faith. Qualifications, such as seniority and supervisory capacity, endow certain individuals with greater authority to affect the career outcomes of their colleagues and students. The mission of the Institute requires that senior employees be invested in the learning and development of early career scientists and students. This requires diligence to avoid actions that may be perceived as bribery, coercion, malice, or indifference. Personal favors should never be proposed in exchange for advice, collaboration, or recommendation. Institute employees should act to prevent abuse of power with regards to:

1. Letters of support and recommendation. The contents of letters of recommendation are often subjective and subject to bias. For example, one analysis of letters of recommendation for postdoctoral researchers showed that female scientists were significantly less likely to receive an excellent letter than a good letter compared to their male colleagues\(^3\). Letter writers must be diligent to prevent biases in their letters.
2. Graduate student and postdoctoral advising. Practices such as co-advising may help limit the potential for abusive advising relationships.
3. Performance review committees, including doctoral defenses and promotion reviews.
4. Scientific collaborations.

Appendix C. Ability and Accessibility in the Geosciences

Geosciences have a long history of practices that exclude people with disabilities, perhaps more than any other field in science. The often physically isolated, prolonged, and hazardous nature of expeditionary field work creates barriers to participation for many. This issue is compounded by ableist practices and sentiments that are common in the field. To further our goal to recruit and retain talented scientists and to foster knowledge and appreciation for the natural world, we must commit to expanding participation to include people with disabilities.

Laws, such as the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990, have made great improvements in the accessibility of academic spaces. These laws require accommodations “not imposing a disproportionate or undue burden”. However, there is no restriction that ability accommodations be limited to a minimum legal requirement and that is not the standard to which UTIG aspires. Access to accommodations in office and classroom environments (e.g., mobility infrastructure, elevators, automated doors) is necessary, generally understood, and usually established. Field and lab work introduce accessibility issues not yet as well resolved. For example: a student with a visual impairment has a right to equal access to academic content and educational opportunities, but what accommodation is necessary to enable participation in a field course or lab research?

To resolve accommodations, students, faculty, and staff should consult the Disability Resources Guide and/or Services of Students with Disabilities for guidance on disability accommodations. Communication between supervisors, mentors, peers, and people with disabilities should be direct and avoid patronizing behavior, while also respecting privacy rights. Incidents of misconduct or bias related to a disability should be reported. Unfortunately, the above resources may not resolve all barriers to participation, especially in many field settings. UTIG staff should be prepared to recognize potential barriers to participation when planning field work and other activities, such as conferences and workshops, so that necessary accommodations can be anticipated and adopted for participants. Finally, accessibility in geoscience endeavors remains an open problem which the UTIG community is encouraged to investigate and contribute to developing solutions.

---

Appendix D. Inclusive Committees Guide

Committees serve the Institute by advising on hiring, research, and policy decisions, which often have important consequences for our workplace climate. As representatives of the Institute, committee members have a duty to participate to the best of their ability and should strive for the best outcome for the Institute as a whole, rather than their individual employment unit or specialty. To promote institutional trust and understanding, committees should represent all members of the UTIG community for which the committee’s advice has consequences. All committees should intentionally reflect a diversity of ideas, experiences, and identities. Specifically, when forming a committee, the Institute should keep in mind diversity in terms of:

1. Employment unit, seniority, and student status. Committees for Institute-wide issues should include scientists from all seniority, administrative staff, technical staff, postdoctoral researchers, and graduate students.
2. Scientific, technical, and administrative area of expertise.
3. Experience with past committees. In order to represent the entire UTIG community as a whole and respect the time commitments of participants, committees should balance the past committee experiences of participants.
Appendix E. Conference Guide

Professional conferences allow us to not only present our research but also to represent UTIG to the scientific community. By definition, these events thrive based on their welcoming, respectful, inclusive, and collaborative environment that is created by all its attendees and conveners.

We, as members of the UTIG community, not only seek to uphold this code of conduct at professional meetings but also to respect other conduct codes provided by conference organizers that may apply to the hotel, meeting contracted facilities, and events surrounding the meeting such as dinners, bar visits, and professional evening events. A helpful reference resource is AGU’s meetings code of conduct.

Comprehensive guidelines for organizing inclusive scientific meetings have also been developed by 500 Women Scientists.
UTIG encourages the open exchange of scientific ideas. Seminars and Discussion Hours are forums for the speaker(s) to present their ideas and to allow other attendees to learn, as well as contribute questions or comments. To this end, we want to create an inclusive environment where all participants feel that their presence is welcome and their contributions are valued.

- **Speakers and all attendees should behave professionally**: treating speakers and other attendees with respect and consideration. Professional conduct includes thoughtful appreciation of the ways in which power and status affect how people express themselves and how they interpret what is said. This is especially important to consider when speakers are early career scientists, job candidates, or being considered for promotion. Objectifying and otherwise unwelcomed comments about an individual’s physical appearance or ability are contrary to our community values.

- **Constructive interaction** between the speaker and the audience is encouraged. Speakers should try to present their material in an understandable way, taking into account the diverse levels of expertise in the audience. All audience members should feel free to respectfully ask constructive questions that lead to a broader and deeper understanding of the speaker’s points. If an attendee is not satisfied with the speaker’s response to their question or comment, then they should reserve follow-up for later discussion to allow the speaker to present their ideas and to allow other attendees to contribute questions or comments. We appreciate the efforts by the speaker to present their work, and this should be reflected by refraining from aggressive or otherwise disrespectful behavior.

- **Discussion between attendees during a seminar** should be kept to a minimum. The seminar is primarily a vehicle for the speaker to communicate with the audience.

- **The host of the seminar** speaker is formally in charge of the seminar. This includes reminding audience members of UTIG’s expectations concerning their conduct. However, given that the host may not be a senior member of the staff, all senior staff members present should be mindful of this code of conduct and should help to ensure that it is followed.

---

6 Adapted from Washington University in St. Louis, Department of Physics, Code of Conduct for Seminars, [https://physics.wustl.edu/code-conduct-seminars](https://physics.wustl.edu/code-conduct-seminars)
Appendix G. A guide to scientific authorship

The rate at which scientists publish papers, and whether their name is first, second, or last on the author list, is an important factor in hiring and promotions. Publication metrics are also used at UTIG to track the performance of scientists. This practice can be fair and objective if co-authorships and the order of author names on science papers are determined carefully, with the intent to credit the individuals that conceived the project, gathered the relevant data, performed the analyses, and wrote the paper. Unfortunately, power imbalances can influence authorship decisions in different ways. For example, a senior collaborator might request a prominent position on a co-author list, which may not reflect their contribution to the paper, or a well-known scientist may be invited to be a co-author on a publication even if they were not involved in the study. Such cases of coercive and honorary co-authorship distort publication statistics, can lead to strained working relationships, and are strongly discouraged.

Some institutional promotion and yearly evaluation practices perpetuate conflicts over authorship order. For example, in many academic circles, if a graduate student is the first author of a publication, the advisor receives equal credit if he/she is listed in the second position. However, a co-author other than the student’s advisor may merit the second author position based on relative contributions, and the author list should not be influenced by a power imbalance between the three authors. Scientists can also develop different perspectives on the relative importance of their contributions to a paper over the course of a project.

To avoid discord over authorships we encourage that scientists and students have a proactive discussion of the expectations of first-author and co-authorship of a science paper at the very early stages of a collaboration. The person that makes the greatest contributions to the analyses and writing of the paper naturally deserves to be the first author. Being the first author is also a great responsibility towards the rest of the research team. Co-authorship on a science paper not only requires some contribution to the presented work, it is also important that co-authors review and agree with the publication. An author who is willing to take credit for a paper must also bear responsibility for its errors or explain why they had no professional responsibility for the material in question. If the lead-author does not consider co-PIs for co-authorship, it would be courteous to inform these collaborators that a new manuscript is in progress.

Much of the research conducted at UTIG relies on the excellent technical staff. It may be appropriate to include members of the technical staff on the co-author list if they play a significant role in the development of the project, and/or if they contributed to the scientific conclusions. Under other circumstances it is strongly recommended to mention the work delivered by our technical staff in the acknowledgments of a paper.

Conflicts over authorship can occur for different reasons, and it is not always the case that the abuse of a power imbalance is the root cause of a disagreement between co-authors. Nonetheless, the DEAI Committee of UTIG is in a good position to mediate such a conflict. As in the case of an informal complaint, members of the DEAI Committee can help by reporting the merits of the viewpoints that the

---

two parties have in this disagreement. When all the facts are established, there is a basis to heal the working relationship, and to construct an author list that represents the efforts that all collaborators have made towards the paper. The UTIG Mentorship Program may also be used to solicit advice.

In addition to the contributions referenced above, there is substantial literature describing best practices for scientific co-authorship. For example, S. Heard’s *The Scientist’s Guide to Writing* provides several useful guidelines summarized below:

- Intellectual contributions are more important than financial or administrative support.
- The practice of Principal Investigators taking routine authorship on every paper from their lab group regardless of their actual contributions is discouraged.
- Each author should have participated sufficiently to take public responsibility for appropriate portions of the work.
- To eliminate misunderstandings, authorship should be decided early in the collaboration process (e.g., at project inception) and not during the writing process. Ideally, discussions over coauthorship should result in a written agreement of who should do which portions of the work. Any awkwardness with the approach can be mitigated by explaining that the discussion is not motivated by the individual collaborator but by the overall difficulty of making unambiguous rules on co-authorship. Pointing out that you have read best practices for authorship decisions could help as well.

---

10 Heard SB. *The scientist’s guide to writing: how to write more easily and effectively throughout your scientific career*. Princeton University Press; 2016 Apr 12.
Appendix H. Fieldwork Guide

Preface

Fieldwork often offers defining moments in geoscience careers. Positive experiences can represent exceptional recruiting opportunities to spark and maintain interest in the geosciences; unfortunately, negative experiences occur far too often. Fieldwork is also frequently isolated and often austere. This creates safety concerns of all types including harassment, bullying, and cliques. In an austere field setting it may not be possible for a person to effectively remove themselves from the situation. Environmental stress and isolation can lead to poor judgement. These concerns all require special vigilance by every person involved. Efforts have been made to clarify and improve policies by platform operators and field stations to address problematic behavior in the field; however, problems persist. In addition, some locations have safety concerns relating to race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, disability, gender identity and/or religion. Such problems can be avoided altogether, or handled optimally, by an appropriately trained and coordinated field team. This document seeks to detail expectations for behavior, team member training and organization, and procedures and recommendations for dealing with and reporting misconduct.

UTIG conduct expectations

<Reproduce Section 2 of the UTIG code of conduct here when provided as a standalone document>

In-field reporting

For each field deployment, a field team member will be designated as the On-site Field Safety Coordinator, responsible for developing and maintaining the list of contacts and resources that may be specific to the site, ensuring that all participants are aware of the presence and capacity of the On-site Field Safety Coordinator, and making best efforts to maintain a direct line of communication to UTIG’s Title IX Coordinator.

The On-site Field Safety coordinator should work to create a climate within the field team where relatively minor misconduct and conflicts are addressed in a constructive manner before being allowed to escalate to the point where they may undermine individuals’ safety or the ability of the team to accomplish their objectives effectively. In the field it is imperative to address any problems, real or perceived, early to prevent increasingly bad situations. Often an issue is a misunderstanding. Often there is not a "bad person" involved, just a personality conflict or unconscious action which can be resolved if brought to the proper attention. Team members should not "suffer in silence".

---

11 Partially adapted from Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences (EPS) at Johns Hopkins University (JHU) “Code of Conduct for Field Experiences”, unpublished to date.
14 Reproduced from UTIG code of conduct
A permanent employee at UTIG will be designated to serve as the **UTIG Field Safety Coordinator**, a point of contact to help ensure quick communication of incidents that occur in the field. A field team may designate a responsible and available person to serve as the coordinator for a specific project, or else this position will fall to the chairperson of the UTIG Field Safety Committee. The UTIG coordinator will be responsible for communicating relevant information regarding reporting procedures to the On-Site Field Safety Coordinator before the field experience, maintaining contact with the On-Site Field Safety Coordinator in the event of an incident, and contacting the appropriate office(s) in the event of an incident. Students and other team members will be made aware of the UTIG Field Safety Coordinator’s identity and contact information here on this form, during their pre-departure meetings and any updated communications in the field. Team members are free to report misconduct or Title IX violations that occur in the field directly to the UTIG Coordinator if they prefer or if it is the On-site Field Coordinator who is responsible for the misconduct. A third option is to file a Title IX report directly with UTIG’s Title IX Coordinator.

In addition, UTIG’s internal reporting system (see Section 5: Informal Reactions of this code of conduct) is another tool that field team members can use to report incidents or address conflicts that occur in the field. If the incident does not fall under Title IX, University non-discrimination policy, or serious fraud or scientific misconduct, this option allows a team member to file an anonymous complaint and potentially resolve the conflict by mediation within a restorative justice framework.

A special reporting responsibility for field personnel which is not present in the office environment is each team member's responsibility to alert the Safety Coordinator if a personal problem or health issue arises which may endanger the safety of other persons or the success of the field project. For example, a health problem should not be allowed to deteriorate to the point of a medivac which endangers everyone involved. These and other issues with such an impact should be dealt with early and a non-emergency extraction plan developed if appropriate.

**On-site Field Safety Coordinator:**

This person is with you in the field and should already be known to you.

*Name:* ____________________________________________

*USA phone:* ________________________________________

*Local or satellite phone:* __________________________

*Email:* __________________________________________

**UTIG Field Safety Coordinator:**

This person is at UTIG but prepared to respond to reports from the field.

*Name:* ____________________________________________

*USA phone:* ________________________________________

*Email:* __________________________________________
Bystander intervention

All UTIG field workers are strongly encouraged to participate in a bystander intervention training session before their first trip to the field and repeat the training every two years. Additionally, individuals designated as On-site Field Safety Coordinators are encouraged to seek more involved training, such as participating in a bystander intervention “train the trainer” course.

As discussed in the main body of UTIG’s code of conduct, bystander intervention techniques are powerful for recognizing and addressing problematic or dangerous conduct when it is happening. Quick use of interventions such as the “5-D’s” (see Figure 5) and effectively recruiting other bystanders to aid in a situation can allow conflicts to be addressed constructively in the moment.

**Figure 5:** When you witness an incident of misconduct, choose one of the 5-D’s of bystander intervention.

Post-field survey

All UTIG field workers are encouraged to fill out a survey after returning from their field program. The survey will be provided by the UTIG administrative staff when you request reimbursement for travel expenses and serves as another tool for reporting unsafe conditions or incidents of harassment in the field as well as suggestions to improve the experience of future field workers.
**Coordination with collaborating institutions**

When UTIG collaborates with another institution for a field program, UTIG will coordinate with the partner institution(s) before deployment to confirm that policies, guidelines, and accommodations will be in place that ensure the physical and psychological safety of all participants.

Specifically, well in advance of the field deployment, a UTIG person involved in the field program (PI or similar) will transmit a copy of this fieldwork appendix section and a reference to the complete UTIG code of conduct to the collaborators and will request similar documentation from their institution. UTIG’s front office administrators will help facilitate this handoff by confirming this has been done when field team members submit travel authorization requests.

These prior contacts between UTIG and the collaborating institution provide one or more opportunities for UTIG to communicate any special safety requirements or accommodations required by the field team (e.g., disability or dietary accommodation). If significant issues arise or the partner institution is not able to provide a code of conduct or similar guidance documents, UTIG should call a remote meeting attended by UTIG’s Field Safety Committee chair and a representative of the field program to resolve these issues and ensure the partner institution has adequate policies or guidelines in place to ensure the safety of UTIG field workers.

If inadequate anti-harassment guidelines or unsafe conditions arise once the team is already in the field, a meeting should be held in person with UTIG’s on-site field safety coordinator and the station leader, chief scientist, or equivalent representative to attempt to resolve the discrepancy between the guidelines in place and the UTIG code of conduct and/or this fieldwork guide.