
Lamont Code of Conduct

February 2019

Office of the Director

Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory

Columbia University

Table of Contents

Lamont Code of Conduct	2
Annex 1: Guidelines for Professional Conduct during Fieldwork and Cruises	4
Annex 2: Columbia University’s process for reporting and investigating misconduct.....	6
Annex 3: Advisor-Advisee Discussion for Graduate Students	8
Annex 4: Mentor-Mentee Discussion for Postdoctoral Scientists.....	11
Annex 5: Select Policies for the Lamont and Columbia Community	13
Annex 6: A Glossary of Terms Pertaining to Misconduct in the Workplace.....	14
Annex 7: Committee on Professional Conduct	16

Lamont Code of Conduct

The Lamont-Doherty Earth Observatory of Columbia University is committed to upholding a safe and professional environment, and to fostering a nurturing and vibrant community founded upon the fundamental dignity and worth of all of its members. This Code of Conduct outlines principles that should guide interactions among members of the Lamont community.

Workplace misconduct such as harassment, bullying, incivility, hostility, or micro aggressions can have a profound impact on the well-being, productivity, and career expectations of individuals, and is inconsistent with our values. This institution is committed to fostering a supportive environment in which all members of the Lamont community can fulfill their obligations and aspirations. At the same time, Lamont acknowledges the rights of individuals to free expression that adheres to the principles of a professional and collegial workplace.

All members of the Lamont community are responsible for creating a safe and professional working environment, with an expectation of integrity, respect, fairness, trustworthiness, and transparency across all organizational levels and endeavors, whether they be on the Lamont Campus or in the field, aboard ship, or while attending professional meetings. Individual conduct that does not meet these expectations is contrary to Lamont's commitment to professional interactions among colleagues.

Supervisors, managers, principal investigators, and academic advisors need to be especially proactive in fostering an environment of support and cooperation, especially, but not exclusively, as it concerns the careers of junior colleagues. All members of the Lamont community are expected to recognize the importance and complementary nature of the roles and responsibilities of individuals who work at different levels and job types across the institution.

Annexes to this Code of Conduct offer guidelines, resources, and additional information to the Lamont community.

Annexes to the Code of Conduct:

Annex 1: Guidelines for Professional Conduct During Fieldwork and Cruises;

Annex 2: Columbia University's Processes for Reporting and Investigating Misconduct;

Annex 3: Mentor-Mentee Discussions for Postdoctoral Scientists and Fellows;

Annex 4: Advisor-Advisee Discussions for Graduate Students;

Annex 5: Policies for the Lamont and Columbia Community;

Annex 6: A Glossary of Terms Pertaining to Misconduct in the Workplace.

Annex 7: Charge and Members of the Committee on Professional Conduct;

Annex 1: Guidelines for Professional Conduct during Fieldwork and Cruises

Fieldwork and research cruises are an important part of professional learning and advancement in the geosciences. Harassment and misconduct during these trips has a profound impact on victims, who experience both professional and psychological damage. In addition to using the formal CU policies and procedures for reporting harassment, outlined in a subsequent section of this document, members of the Lamont community should actively foster a supportive environment, and promote best practices that impact the mental and physical wellbeing of participants in field trips and research cruises. Some guidelines include (but are not limited to) the following:

- To the extent possible, Principal Investigators (PIs) will try to ensure that there are at least three (3) people on any field trip, including the PI.
- Prior to departure, it is important to ensure that everyone is aware of his or her expected roles and responsibilities during the trip. The PI will hold a pre-trip meeting to outline all expectations. The PI would also give each participant a roster with roles and responsibilities outlined for all individuals. Tasks should be assigned or rotated in a way that avoids gendered divisions of labor. All logistics, including sleeping arrangements, bathroom arrangements, cooking and cleaning turns, and responsibilities for carrying luggage/equipment should be clearly spelled out. If a participant is uncomfortable about a sleeping arrangement or chore, s/he should raise the topic with the PI and other members of the group.
- In the field, while plans can sometimes change unexpectedly, PIs should make every effort to inform group members in advance of long hikes or any other expected strenuous physical activity.

- For research cruises, harassment awareness should be included as a part of the routine safety briefing with the ship's crew and scientists, with information on who someone can turn to if they have been harassed.
- Command structure: The PI is expected to outline the command structure and hierarchies within the group so that people know to whom they can report any incidents of harassment or any other problem. In the event that the PI is perceived as the harasser, the participant should have an option to leave the trip immediately and/or report it to any fellow participant(s). To the extent feasible, everyone on a field trip should have constant access to a satellite phone; and participants should regularly check in with someone external (i.e. not on the field trip).
- Pre-trip training: Field trip participants (including PIs) are expected to take pre-trip training on safety and Title IX. During these trainings, it is important for participants to ask the trainer what they should do in the event of a problem.
- Following every field trip, when participants return to Lamont, they will be expected to take a survey where they provide feedback on their experience during the trip. These surveys will allow Lamont to track field experiences and identify any persistent patterns.

Annex 2: Columbia University's process for reporting and investigating misconduct

Lamont is expected to follow CU policies, channels, and procedures for investigating and adjudicating matters pertaining to discrimination, harassment, and any other form of misconduct. Scientists, faculty, staff, students, and administrators, who believe they have been subjected to discrimination, harassment, or any other form of misconduct, including gender-based misconduct, should avail of the channels and procedures listed below:

Reporting Obligations:

- All faculty/ staff/ employees are under obligation to report any instance of harassment/ discrimination/ misconduct brought to their attention by any member of the Columbia community
- Students are not mandatory reporters unless they are Teaching Assistants (TAs) or Orientation Leaders, but reporting is highly encouraged

Where to File a Complaint:

The following offices are available to the Lamont community

- Office of Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action (EOAA): For complaints about any kind of discrimination, misconduct, and/or harassment in the workplace
Visit: <http://EOAA.Columbia.edu> for more details
- Gender Based Misconduct (GBM) Office: For gender-based misconduct involving students. Visit: <http://studentconduct.columbia.edu/gbm.html> for more details
- Title IX Coordinator: To report any gender misconduct (assault, harassment, discrimination, etc.). Visit <https://sexualrespect.columbia.edu/columbias-title-ix-coordinator> for more details.
- Columbia Compliance Hotline: To report any kind of unethical, illegal, or suspicious behavior, including harassment and discrimination. Reports can be made

anonymously. Visit <http://www.compliance.columbia.edu/hotline.html> for more details

- Ombuds Office: For any workplace concerns or grievances. Note that the Ombuds Office has no authority to enforce any action. Visit: <http://ombuds.columbia.edu/> for more details

How to File a Report:

For Students: If you are a student, you can file a report with the Gender Based Misconduct (GBM) Office at: <https://sexualrespect.columbia.edu/university-policy>
Note that GBM is not a confidential resource. If you would like a *confidential resource*, you can avail of the following:

- Sexual Violence Response: <https://health.columbia.edu/sexual-violence-response>
- Counseling Services: <https://health.columbia.edu/counseling-and-psychological-services>
- Ombuds Office: <http://ombuds.columbia.edu/>

For faculty, researchers, and staff: If you would like to file a report, you can file one on the EOAA website: <http://EOAA.Columbia.edu> . Note that if your student or any other member of the Lamont/Columbia community shares any incident(s) of harassment you are required to report it. The reporting guidelines are listed on the EOAA website.

In addition, on the Lamont Campus, you can also report an incident to Lamont's Title IX liaisons:

- Kuheli Dutt (Lamont Directorate) – kdutt@ldeo.columbia.edu
- Victoria Nazario (Lamont Finance & Administration) – vicky@admin.ldeo.columbia.edu

Note: These are not confidential resources - Lamont is required to follow CU Title IX policies and procedures.

Annex 3: Advisor-Advisee Discussion for Graduate Students

A graduate student's professional relationship with their advisor is critical for their learning and development as a new scientist. In addition, maintaining a productive and supportive student-advisor relationship is critical to students' future success in their academic career. Open communication is required for a mutually beneficial and productive learning environment for both advisee and advisor. Mentorship of students is a part of a research scientist's job description; as such, advisors should be expected to take advantage of the resources available to them and seek out training opportunities to ensure that they are performing this aspect of their job adequately. Beginning the advisor-advisee relationship with a conversation to set up clear expectations and goals is necessary to the success of this relationship. In general, the following list of questions should be addressed. Please note that guidelines and procedures for some of these topics are provided in the DEES graduate student handbook, which both advisor and advisee should familiarize themselves with.

- What are the student's career goals, and what do they expect and want to get out of their PhD?
- What are the advisor's goals, and what are they looking for in a PhD student?
- Has a specific project been outlined (and/or funded) for the student already? If so, what is the timeframe that the student is expected to finish the project?
- How much flexibility will the student have in designing their own research projects? What avenues of funding are available for the student to explore these ideas?
- What first-authored publications will a student be expected to produce on a given project, vs. how much work will go into non-first-author publications?
- Has the student written a paper for a peer reviewed publication before? If not, how does the advisor expect to guide the student through the writing process?
- If the advisor has collaborators with students, which student will be doing which part of the work, and which student will be expected to produce first-author publications?

- How much time does the advisor expect for the student to spend on grad-school related activities during a given week? While the balance may shift over the course of the program, how much total time is expected, including coursework, TAing, and research?
- How much vacation time does the advisor think is reasonable for the student to take/does the student feel they need to stay happy and healthy?
- How often do the student and advisor feel they should meet? Is it okay to hold meetings outside of working hours/weekends?
- Does the advisor expect for the student to be at Lamont every day (with the exception of days during which the student has class), or is working from home okay? Does the advisor need to know when the student plans to stay in the city for the day?
- What's the expected response time of emails on general topics (for both sides)? What about draft revisions?
- How much time/notice should the student give the professor to provide letters of recommendation, comments on a draft, etc. before a given deadline?
- What lab techniques does the student need to learn from the advisor before they feel comfortable in the lab unsupervised? What specific laboratory training is necessary to ensure that the student is safe in the lab and does not incur any health effects from e.g. working with hazardous chemicals?
- If there is a disagreement in the lab (e.g. between students, between student and lab tech, etc.), how does the advisor plan to address such disagreements?
- Is the student expected to fund meeting attendance on their own (e.g. Green money and student grants), or does the advisor have money to send them?
- How familiar is the advisor with the requirements of the DEES program? If they are not familiar, who should the student address their questions to?
- If the student feels that they must switch advisors, what is the appropriate course of action that the student should take and who would be the first contact to negotiate such a switch?

As the answers to these questions may change over time (e.g. at the beginning of the PhD it may be necessary for the student and advisor to meet weekly, while closer to the end fewer meetings may be necessary), these questions should be re-considered at least once per semester. It is recommended that, outside of the formal committee meetings, advisor and advisee meet at least once per semester to evaluate the student's progress, determine if they are meeting expectations, and discuss what is and what is not working about the advisor/advisee relationship.

These guidelines are adapted from resources provided by Dr. Katherine Huntington (UW) at <http://faculty.washington.edu/kate1/resources.html>.

Annex 4: Mentor-Mentee Discussion for Postdoctoral Scientists

For postdoctoral scientists (regardless of the source of funding), the relationship with one's advisor can play a critical role in advancing or hindering one's career. At the very outset of the postdoc-advisor relationship, the following topics should be addressed wherever applicable:

- How much time should the postdoc spend on publishing PhD work versus pursuing new projects?
- Is the postdoc expected to mentor anyone else, such as a student or an intern? If so, is there a formal agreement or is it ad hoc? If this interferes with the postdoc's research time and productivity, what can she or he do about it?
- How long would the advisor take to give feedback to the postdoc, especially for time-sensitive things such as proposals and publications?
- Would the advisor inform the postdoc about various opportunities, such as workshops, fieldwork, teaching, etc. or is the postdoc expected to find out about these on his or her own?
- Does the seniority of the advisor play a role in any way, be it positive or negative?
- Where can a postdoc get funds from if they want to attend a conference or submit a publication, if the advisor doesn't have funding for it?
- Should advisors spend time showing postdocs how to write a proposal, instead of giving very general guidelines and expecting the postdoc to figure it out?
- Postdocs on external fellowships (such as NSF or NASA) typically develop a mentoring plan as part of their fellowship application. How should this be incorporated once they receive the fellowship and come to Lamont?
- Should the advisor and postdoc have formally agreed upon time schedules? For example, if a postdoc lives in the city, is she or he expected to come in everyday (outside of urgent or exceptional situations) when some portion of the work could be done remotely?
- What skills does the postdoc currently have, and what skills does she or he need to develop?

- How can an advisor provide a postdoc with teaching opportunities? Even if it is not a regular class, can a postdoc have an opportunity to give a lecture sometimes?
- Given time and resource constraints, what can a postdoc reasonably be expected to do in order to receive an excellent performance review?
- If the postdoc did not receive a satisfactory score (or as good a score as she or he had hoped for) in the annual merit review, what could she or he have done better, and were these conveyed to the postdoc at the outset?

Annex 5: Select Policies for the Lamont and Columbia Community

Essential Policies for the Columbia Community:

<http://www.essential-policies.columbia.edu/>

Gender Based Misconduct Policy for Students:

<http://www.columbia.edu/cu/studentconduct/documents/GBMPolicyandProceduresforStudents.pdf>

Non-Discrimination Statement and Policy:

<http://eoaa.columbia.edu/columbia-university-non-discrimination-statement-and-policy>

Employee Policy on Discrimination, Harassment, Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence, Dating Violence, and Stalking

<http://www.essential-policies.columbia.edu/policies-and-procedures-discrimination-and-harassment>

Anti-Retaliation Policy:

<http://policylibrary.columbia.edu/columbia-university-nonretaliation-policy>

Consensual Romantic and Sexual Relationship Policy:

<http://eoaa.columbia.edu/eoaa-policies-and-procedures/consensual-romantic-and-sexual-relationship>

Annex 6: A Glossary of Terms Pertaining to Misconduct in the Workplace

Discrimination: Unequal or unfair treatment in professional opportunities, education, benefits, evaluation, and employment (such as hiring, termination, promotion, compensation) as well as retaliation and various types of harassment. Discriminatory practices can be explicit or implicit, intentional or unconscious. Under federal discrimination laws, protected classes include age, race, ethnicity, gender, national origin, disability, pregnancy, and veteran status. In addition, New York State laws prohibit discrimination on additional attributes, including sexual orientation, gender identity, marital status, and familial status.

Harassment: A type of discrimination that consists of an act or acts that are unwanted, unwelcome, demeaning, abusive, or offensive. Offensive conduct constitutes harassment when 1) it becomes a condition of an opportunity, education, benefit, evaluation, or employment; or 2) the conduct is severe or pervasive enough to create a work or educational environment that most people would consider intimidating, hostile, or abusive. These acts may include epithets, slurs, or negative stereotyping based on gender, race, sexual identity, or other categories, as protected by U.S. federal law. Also included are threatening, intimidating, or hostile acts; denigrating jokes and displays; or circulation of written or graphic material that denigrates or shows hostility or aversion toward an individual or a group.

Sexual Harassment: This includes any unwanted and/or unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors or contact, and other verbal, physical, visual conduct of a sexual nature. Lamont follows the Columbia University Policy on Sexual Respect: <https://sexualrespect.columbia.edu/university-policy>

Gender-Based Harassment: This includes acts of aggression, intimidation, stalking, or hostility based on gender or gender stereotyping, threats or non-consensual disclosure of a person's gender identity (i.e. "outing").

Bullying: This is the use of force, threat, or coercion to abuse, intimidate, or aggressively dominate others in the professional environment that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. These actions can include abusive criticism, humiliation, physical and verbal attacks, isolation, undermining, and professional exclusion of individuals through any means.

Incivility: This is a form of behavior that is rude, discourteous, and/or insensitive towards others. Defined as low-intensity deviant behavior with ambiguous intent to harm the target¹, what separates incivility from other forms of mistreatment of others is the notion of ambiguous intent. Examples of incivility include disrupting meetings, not giving someone credit for their work, losing one's temper, giving someone the "silent treatment," and having side conversations during a meeting or presentation. Research shows that women are more likely than men to experience workplace incivility and its associated harmful consequences.

*Microaggressions*²: These are everyday verbal, nonverbal, and environmental slights, snubs, or insults, whether intentional or unintentional, which communicate hostile, derogatory, or negative messages to target persons based solely upon their marginalized group membership. In many cases, these hidden messages may invalidate the group identity, demean them on a personal or group level, threaten and intimidate, or relegate them to inferior status and treatment.

¹ Andersson, Lynne M.; Pearson, Christine M.: *Tit for Tat*

² Derald Wing Sue: *Microaggressions in Everyday Life: Race, Gender and Sexual Orientation*

Annex 7: Committee on Professional Conduct

Following the large number of harassment incidents in STEM academic disciplines (including geosciences) that have been brought to light in recent months, members of the Lamont community expressed a need to set up a committee to raise awareness on such topics within Lamont. This would formalize the efforts of a group at Lamont that has already been working informally towards raising awareness on these issues, including meeting regularly to discuss gender and diversity issues. The Committee will serve as a platform for the continued discussion of these issues at Lamont. Accordingly, the charge for the new committee is to:

- Raise awareness within the Lamont community on topics such as harassment and misconduct (including sexual harassment and gender misconduct)
- Promote best practices and stimulate a cultural change with the community
- Provide a forum for discussion
- Share examples of best practices
- Identify particular issues pertaining to the Lamont community
- Advise the Lamont Directorate on issues to address
- Assess / follow-up on activities and their outcomes within the Lamont community

Note: This committee does **not** have the authority to adjudicate any incidents of harassment or misconduct. The focus of this committee is on raising awareness.

Membership:

- Michela Biasutti (co-chair, OCP)
- Kuheli Dutt (co-chair, Directorate)
- Einat Lev – Lamont Assistant Research Professor (SGT)
- Robert Newton – Senior Research Scientist (Geochem)
- Sidney Hemming – Professor (Geochem)
- Maayan Yehudai – Graduate Student (Geochem)
- Lorelei Curtin – Graduate Student (BPE)

- Laura Haynes – Graduate Student (Geochem)
- Lucy Tweed – Graduate Student (Geochem)
- Elizabeth Hillary Case – Graduate Student (MG&G)
- Yuxin Zhou – Graduate student (Geochem)
- Frankie Pavia – Graduate student (Geochem)
- Jonathan Nichols – Lamont Assistant Research Professor (BPE)
- Dannie Dinh – IRI Rep (IRI)
- Jean Economos – Divisional admin rep (OCP)
- Mercedes Paulino – Divisional admin rep (BPE)
- James Spencer – Divisional admin rep (MLP)
- Cathy Troutman – Admin rep (Admin)
- Jennifer Middleton – Postdoc rep (Geochem)
- Sophie Hines – Postdoc rep (Geochem)
- Laura Stevens – Postdoc rep (MG&G)
- Toby Koffman – Staff Associate rep (Geochem)

(Note: CIESIN did not participate in this effort)

Committee Structure: For manageability and better effectiveness, this group has been divided into a core committee and three working groups.

Core Committee: Sophie Hines, Bob Newton, Lucy Tweed, Lorelei Curtin, Maayan Yehudai, Jean Economos, Mercedes Paulino, Jonathan Nichols, Laura Haynes, Michela Biasutti (co-chair), Kuheli Dutt (co-chair)

Working Groups:

- Gender and diversity coffee hour, and other programming & events (e.g., Harassment Awareness Month): Maayan Yehudai, Jenny Middleton, Lucy Tweed, Lorelei Curtin, Sophie Hines, Yuxin Zhou, Laura Haynes, Einat Lev, Kuheli Dutt
- Code of conduct, best practices, including mentoring activities: Laura Stevens, Yuxin Zhou, Toby Koffman, Lorelei Curtin, Cathy Troutman, Maayan Yehudai,

James Spencer, Mercedes Paulino, Jon Nichols, Elizabeth Hillary Case, Frankie Pavia, Kuheli Dutt

- Campus Life survey data, recommendations for next steps, gathering anecdotes/experiences anonymously: Michela Biasutti, Jenny Middleton, Jon Nichols, Bob Newton, Jean Economos, Cathy Troutman, Lucy Tweed, Elizabeth Hillary Case