

UNC Global Hydrology Lab
Statement of Values and Code of Conduct
Last Updated: January 2024

1. Statement on Anti-Racism*

The UNC Global Hydrology Lab recognizes that racism, especially but not limited to that against Black people and Indigenous people, has been and continues to be pervasive in the [Earth Sciences](#). We unequivocally denounce racism in every form, and we recognize that mere words are insufficient to counter centuries of entrenched racism, particularly at an institution like UNC that has a long and complex racist heritage. As such, we will take the following actions, to be revisited in the first lab seminar meeting of each semester, in an attempt to make our learning environment more supportive to Black, Indigenous, and other minoritized members of the research community:

- We will support and advocate for anti-racist policies and activities in our lab, in the Department of Earth, Marine, and Environmental Sciences, at UNC, and in the Earth Sciences broadly.
- We will conduct a monthly anti-racist study group, at which we will work on lab-selected actions that advance inclusion, justice, and equity, and discuss materials selected by the group to discuss the complex history and current state of racism in academia and America and how to best address it. This group will not be strictly required, but lab members are encouraged to attend. The summary of the discussions, actions, and material will be documented and accessible to all lab members.
- We will conduct regular (yearly) training focused on becoming a more just, equitable, and inclusive lab (e.g., bystander intervention, mental health first aid), to be facilitated by a group outside of the lab, in order to help lab members to effectively and appropriately address racist incidents.
- Before every field campaign in which the lab participates, the participating members of the lab will conduct a meeting solely devoted to promoting equity for minoritized groups in the region where we will be working and will draft a short document summarizing our agreed-upon strategy. See Section 6 for more details on fieldwork protocols. We will identify ways in which we can benefit, include, and avoid harming these groups. The results of this discussion will be documented in a shared project folder to be revisited throughout planning and field activities. It is the responsibility of the internal science lead of the field campaign to set up this meeting.
- When formulating every paper and grant proposal that is centered in a particular place or place(s), it is the responsibility of the first author or grant PI to conduct a meeting of all coauthors/investigators in the lab solely devoted to addressing potential actions to promote anti-racism, such as inviting a new coauthor or investigator, changing the wording of the paper or proposal, or altering the experiment plans in ways that promote justice, broadly defined. It is the responsibility of the lead author of the paper (in collaboration with Tamlin) or the PI/FI of the grant to set up this meeting. This could include adding specific activities to the plan, including collaboration or consultation with relevant communities. We will conduct these activities as early as possible in the process so as to maximize the range of possible opportunities for action. The results of this discussion will be documented in a shared project folder and revisited regularly.

- We recognize that there is a long history of minoritized academics being marginalized in the physical spaces in which we work (e.g. a student of color being questioned for being in a building, which would be unlikely to happen to a white lab member). We will do everything we can to make sure that all members of the lab are welcome in the physical space that we occupy. This will include making sure that everyone's name is on the door of the appropriate lab room in which they have their office, and, if any lab member would prefer, providing specific documentation that they have permission to access our lab space. If any lab members are impacted by racist incidents in or near our space, Tamlin will expeditiously take the relevant concerns to the departmental administration if authorized to do so by the affected lab member(s).
- New lab members will receive this document and have an opportunity to discuss it with Tamlin prior to engaging in lab activities to ensure a common understanding of lab values and expectations. Note that state and federal law do not require lab members to agree with everything in this document in order to fully participate in the lab.

*This portion of the document, as well as section 2.5, inspired by and adapted from the anti-racism statement from the Humphries Lab at the University of Rhode Island, available here: http://ahumphrieslab.com/s/HumphriesLab_CodeOfConduct_June82020.pdf

2. Statement of Values

2.1 Aims & Objectives

The primary aim of the Global Hydrology Lab is to foster a creative, just, inclusive, and inspiring environment that allows all members to contribute to a greater understanding of the global water cycle and related research topics. Our science is important, but people are more important than science. We are explicitly and intentionally collaborative, both within and outside of the lab. We work together to address important research questions, and we aim to have fun doing it. We recognize that everyone does their best work when they feel safe and supported. At the same time, we remain open to constructive feedback.

2.2 Discrimination and Harassment

We will not tolerate discrimination or harassment based on characteristics that include, but are not limited to, gender identity and expression, sexual orientation, disability, physical appearance, body size, citizenship, nationality, race, ethnic or social origin, pregnancy, familial status, veteran status, genetic information, religion or belief (or lack thereof), membership of a national minority, property, age, education, socio-economic status, and experience level.

Should you experience an incident of discrimination or harassment, your first stop is to talk to Tamlin if you feel comfortable doing so. He commits to take any problems seriously and will work with whoever brings the issue to his attention, and possibly other members of the lab, to come to a just resolution. Recognize, though, that he is a “responsible employee” at UNC and may not legally be able to keep your conversation entirely private from UNC authorities. Other resources include the department chair, director of graduate studies, other faculty in the department, [the UNC Equal Opportunity and Compliance Office](#) , [campus mental health facilities](#) the [UNC Diversity and Student Success office](#) , and [campus police](#).

2.3 Collaboration & Attribution

As new members spend more time in the lab, they will learn things that, along with their previous experience/background, will allow them to help other members with their research. Because the success of our lab is founded on collaboration, we agree that we will help each other to the best of our abilities in achieving our research aims. We will seek to work together rather than be competitive. If research projects within the lab appear to overlap, we will work together to make sure that everyone involved has a pathway forward that allows them to pursue research that they find intellectually fulfilling.

Because we are a highly collaborative lab, it is essential that we correctly attribute ideas and labor, both formally and informally. We agree to include all those who contributed in a meaningful way as co-authors on every study. We have developed a guide for authorship, described below in Section 4. Informally, in verbal and electronic conversation, we agree to give credit for ideas where they originated. We also recognize the racial and gender norms that may result in some people being more easily included than others, and we will actively seek to form the best research teams rather than just the most expedient. This effort includes making sure that collaborations within the lab are based on research interests and domain knowledge rather than race, sexual orientation, gender identity, technical skill, or social dynamics.

2.4 Mental & Physical Health and Personal-Professional Balance

Academia suffers from a long history of placing the importance of research results above mental and physical wellbeing. We aim to consciously affirm the greater importance of health and wellbeing over academic achievement. Any lab member who is physically ill with a communicable disease is expected to stay at home for their own benefit and that of the group. [Add note on PPE in lab] All lab members are expected to take vacation during the calendar year (more on vacation policies in Section 2.6), during which time they will not be available for work. Although some of us choose to work on weekend days, no one is expected to work weekends except for a few very specific circumstances (e.g., during field campaigns). We recognize that not everyone works well at the same time or in the same ways, so we support working from home and support flexible work hours. That said, we also recognize the importance of sharing space (physical and/or electronic) in the success of our science, and we will all strive to spend time together in these shared spaces.

If mental and/or physical health concerns are affecting a lab member's ability to work, attend meetings, etc., please tell Tamlin (if you are comfortable doing so) so that expectations can be adjusted and resources/support can be shared. UNC provides several free resources for promoting health and well-being, including [Counseling and Psychological Services](#), [Campus Health](#), and the [Employee Assistance Program](#). Off-campus in-network mental health providers can be found using the [Blue Cross Blue Shield](#) provider locator.

When any member of the lab requests us to do so, we will all wear masks in lab meetings.

*2.5 Inclusion, Equity, & Accessibility**

In the long run, we are at our best when everyone can be fully themselves within the lab environment. We will consciously aim to celebrate both our differences and our commonalities,

and we will be broadly inclusive in both research-related and social activities. We will plan social activities as a group and will strive to make them inclusive of everyone in the lab (Section 5).

By definition, working towards equity in our research group means being attuned to the different social, economic, cultural, and political positions of individuals and working to transform the power relations that lead to unevenness in opportunities, resources, and outcomes. We work to address this unevenness and work towards equity by listening for and identifying moments of bias, oppression, and other subconscious, identity-based assumptions and ideas during fieldwork, in our offices, and within our research group as a whole.

2.6 Vacation Policy

Everyone in the lab needs to take vacation during the calendar year in order to maintain their overall wellbeing and also because taking breaks is important for long-term intellectual success. While there is no formal tracking of vacation time in the lab, students, postdocs, and Tamlin should aim for something like three weeks of vacation time off each year, plus a few major holidays. Vacation can be scheduled at any convenient time, but it should generally not coincide with classes (for students who are still taking classes), during the AGU Fall Meeting in December (which most of the lab attends), or at a time that overlaps with fieldwork that is time-constrained (e.g. large field campaigns related to your research). Please update the lab calendar and tell Tamlin in advance (preferably by a month or two) when you are planning to take vacation, so that he can work it into any lab activities as necessary.

2.7 Remote Work Policy

We recognize that people work best in different environments at different times, and that it is important to have flexibility in work location. At the same time, we also recognize the benefits that come from working and interacting in shared spaces at the same time. Our general policy is to encourage lab members to be present in the lab at least three days per week when in North Carolina. This is not a requirement but it is an expectation unless there are barriers that make doing so untenable (e.g. a long commute, a need to care for family members, etc). For shorter periods of time (e.g. a few weeks) it is reasonable to work remotely, but this should generally be run by Tamlin beforehand.

3. Expectations of and Support for Lab Members

3.1 Expectations of all lab members (including staff)

- To attend most formal lab activities, including lab meetings and seminars, as well as departmental colloquia.
- To proactively and regularly update the lab about research progress and any challenges associated with it. This progress may include new results, figures, presentation of relevant literature, discussion of writing process and goals, etc.
- To attribute work honestly in publications and presentations.
- To complete specific work associated with the project(s) on which they are funded, especially if that project is a grant or contract.
- To communicate the process and achievements of their work and be open to discuss it with other lab members.

- To be timely in their responses to inquiries regarding coding, domain knowledge, and general assistance from other lab members.
- To document and archive collected and generated datasets and code so that they are available to other members of the lab and the wider scientific community.
- To publish research in scientific journals and present that research to the science community at meetings.
- After leaving the lab, to complete work on papers that have already been submitted for publication (e.g. respond to reviews).
- If lab members wish to apply for external fellowships, the lab (including Tamlin) will support them in doing so.
- To ask for help when hitting a dead end or when expertise of another lab member is necessary.

3.2 *Additional Expectations of the PI (Tamlin)*

- To meet with all lab members on a regular basis. This may occur either through specifically set meetings or through regular availability for ad hoc meetings. These regular meetings may be interrupted from time to time due to personal or professional travel.
- To support the research projects of lab members. This includes thesis research for graduate and undergraduate students and research projects associated with funding sources for postdocs. Where a conflict exists between Tamlin's broader research program and the research project of a particular student or postdoc, the student or postdoc will meet with Tamlin to ensure that both priorities are adequately fulfilled. How Tamlin supports research projects will be worked out on an individual basis, acknowledging the different needs and working styles of different people.
- When lab members' research interests go beyond his expertise, Tamlin will help them navigate the best options for going forward, often by identifying experts outside the lab to help fill knowledge gaps.
- To help members of the lab choose their research projects. Tamlin will work with individual lab members or groups of lab members to identify one or more research projects that fit with their research interests and career goals.
- To provide timely feedback on research work, including papers and presentations. This generally means within about two weeks, but it depends on the time sensitivity of the project and may be longer during summer (due to fieldwork) or over the winter break.
- To represent and advocate for lab members in situations within the department or UNC more generally where power dynamics may limit the role of students or postdocs.
- To encourage intellectual pursuits that have merit but are outside of lab expertise and to connect lab members with other researchers who can provide guidance on those projects.
- To assist in growing the research, academic, and professional networks of lab members.
- To write letters of reference when asked; those needing a letter should generally give Tamlin 2 weeks of notice.
- To respect cases where students or postdocs are receiving funding through non-lab mechanisms (e.g. TAs) and to ensure that lab duties are commensurate with available time.
- To hold an annual review meeting, generally in May or June, with each lab member to discuss activities in the prior year, goals for the future, and provide an opportunity for

feedback going both ways. We will also review how well we upheld the principles in this lab values statement. This meeting will result in a formal or informal plan for the following year.

- To hold a conversation early on with each lab member about publication expectations for their position.

3.3 Additional Expectations of Postdocs

- To provide guidance and expertise to assist grad students and undergrads.
- To finish up work from previous research projects (e.g. a PhD dissertation) that is still ongoing. For example, postdocs are expected to complete work to respond to reviews on papers from an earlier project that are working their way through review.
- To submit applications to other jobs in academia, industry, or government if they are interested in doing so.
- To contribute research ideas that will lead to publishable work and/or grant proposals. This means that postdocs are not merely expected to do work assigned by the PI, but to come up with new ideas that can contribute to the overall project they are working on (or future projects).

3.4 Additional Expectations of Graduate Students

- To meet deadlines set by the department and the graduate school or, if this is not possible, to inform Tamlin as soon as possible so that he can work on accommodations.
- To work towards publishable research that is part of their thesis or dissertation.
- To fulfill responsibilities as a teaching assistant if funded through that mechanism, and to balance those responsibilities against other responsibilities (e.g. research).

3.5 Additional Expectations of Undergraduate Students

- Undergrads working in the lab will either be compensated via pay or via course credit since many students cannot afford to volunteer without compensation.
- To participate in group meetings when appropriate and provide updates regarding their research activities, including interim and final results, but also including questions, roadblocks, and methods learned.
- To fulfill the work obligations agreed to upon entering the lab, and to promptly inform lab members if this becomes infeasible due to unexpected workloads outside of lab responsibilities.

4. Guide for Authorship

We will include as coauthors on research papers, abstracts, and presentations everyone who has made a significant intellectual contribution to the research presented. Such contributions should be construed broadly, including formulating the study, developing software, collecting field data, processing or analyzing data, making figures, developing the paper or presentation, etc.

Undergraduate students employed for pay will be included as coauthors if they have made contributions to the development of the methods or results. Lab members who have employed existing methods without contributing significant improvements or modifications, and who have produced a small portion of the data used in the study (<10%), will more appropriately be

included in the acknowledgments. These criteria apply to collaborators inside and outside the research group. In general, we take a broad and inclusive view of authorship.

As early as possible in each project, all contributors will explicitly discuss authorship responsibilities and order of coauthors. It is good practice to obtain written and explicit authorship commitments early on and repeatedly throughout the project. Authorship worksheets (e.g. [Authorship Agreement Worksheet](#)) are particularly useful in determining what kind of work warrants co-authorship and this differentiation is often required by academic journals.

In general, the first author of a paper or presentation will be the person who drafted the paper text and did most of the research analysis work. In cases where two or more people contributed approximately equally, we will pursue co-first authorship and draw lots for author order. Except when there is a good reason not to do so, per his preference, Tamlin should be listed as second author on papers, abstracts, or presentations to which he has contributed and that are primarily the product of our lab. Order of coauthors should otherwise generally follow the degree of effort. In cases where the paper represents a substantial collaboration with another lab or researcher, we will figure out author order on a case-by-case basis. For papers with many coauthors, it may make sense to list the principal authors first, in order of effort, then list all other authors alphabetically. The first author will generally be the corresponding author, unless the first author prefers for someone else (e.g. Tamlin) to serve as corresponding author.

If you are interested in pursuing a collaboration outside the lab, it is generally best practice to talk with Tamlin first to make sure it fits well with other work going on in the lab. These kinds of collaborations are usually encouraged, and they can either include Tamlin or other lab members or not on a case-by-case basis.

Tamlin should be contacted about funding sources being used for any paper, and these should be listed in the acknowledgements section (or elsewhere as appropriate) in the paper. If you think you or another coauthor may have a conflict of interest on a particular paper, you should talk to Tamlin about it as early as possible. Such conflicts of interest are rare and would relate to things like having a position at a company that produces data you are evaluating.

When submitting a paper for publication, lab members should seek to consider a diverse set of recommended reviewers, including people at various career levels, with different identities, and from different countries.

5. Guidelines for off-campus/after work-hours lab gatherings

These are generally gatherings that are social in nature; however, in recognition of the importance of social cohesion to the functioning of the lab group and of the likelihood of professional collaborations arising from social events, these guidelines provide direction to ensure these gatherings are inclusive of the entire lab group. These guidelines are not meant to limit the activities of the lab outside of work more broadly in cases where, for example, lab members maintain separate friendships with each other; however, it is expected that lab members act in good faith with respect to whether or not an activity is a de facto lab gathering. A friendship outside of lab gatherings does not justify behavior at a lab gathering that would otherwise go against these guidelines.

For the purposes of this section “work-hours” are defined as 8am - 6pm, Monday through Friday. Off-campus events exclude fieldwork, but may include social activities while on professional travel to e.g. a conference.

- All efforts should be made to make decisions about timing, activity, and/or location by consensus. Lab meetings are the preferred time for these decisions.
- Attendance at any lab social event outside of work hours is completely voluntary and will not impact an individual's success within the lab.
- Alcohol: in recognition that drinking culture has been and continues to be a barrier to inclusion of members of the community who cannot or prefer not to drink, alcohol
 - Should only be served or allowed if equivalent non-alcoholic options are equally available
 - Only be served to or allowed if all participants are 21 or older, excluding young children of lab members.
 - All applicable laws and rules with respect to its usage are followed (e.g., no drinking at state parks)
- Potential considerations when planning gatherings:
 - Physical abilities of the group
 - Potential conflicts with family responsibilities (e.g., caring for children)
 - Cultural barriers to or preferences for certain activities
 - Accessibility of the gathering location
 - Transportation to and from the gathering location (e.g., carpooling)
 - Safety of proposed event (e.g. ability to social distance, mask indoors, etc. when appropriate).

6. Guidelines for Lab Values for Fieldwork

(Adapted from 2018 PAD Fieldwork Guide, by C. Gleason, C. Kuhn, et al.)

Fieldwork is often an essential part of science, and we head into the field to further our careers, gather irreplaceable data, support one another's science, and exercise our bodies and minds in pursuit of our objectives. Fieldwork can involve long hours, sometimes harsh conditions, and close proximity between different people, sometimes for many consecutive weeks--all precursors for potential unwanted behavior. This section states our position on all forms of harassment and discrimination in field environments, which will hopefully provide meaningful guidance on interpersonal relationships and other aspects of working in the field.

Core conduct statement: *if something is not ok in the lab, it is not ok in the field.* Fieldwork changes absolutely nothing about standards of behavior between human beings.

Please note that not all field participants are able to perform all field tasks due to physical strength/flexibility/ability limitations: this is a normal outcome encountered in our highly physical fieldwork. While it is acceptable to decide whether a particular activity is appropriate for a particular person, considering the ability and safety of field participants (not considered discrimination), it is unacceptable to do so without a dialogue between all involved parties (it is discrimination without such dialogue). In these dialogues we will first aim to creatively

overcome any limitations that might restrict any team members from participating in a desired activity.

Before any field campaign, we will have multiple conversations about how the work will proceed so that everyone has a good idea of what our plan is. For long field campaigns, we will design a plan that includes days off. We will agree on a format that allows all participants to maintain adequate rest while completing field goals. We will have an open door policy about any concerns regarding the plan and the safety and comfort of lab members while executing it. Under no circumstance will a lab member be penalized in any way for bringing up any concerns. Lab members will be expected to take some additional time off after challenging field campaigns.

We recognize that due to cultural, religious, or personal reasons, lab members may have different needs and accommodations in terms of food, personal space, cleanliness, etc. While we cannot always accommodate all preferences (e.g. food must often be pretty basic in the field), we will work to accommodate all needs (e.g. equivalent vegetarian options will be available for those who don't eat meat). We will discuss any necessary accommodations before departing for fieldwork and will agree on acceptable solutions.

6.1 Field personnel expectations

All field personnel are expected to:

- Use welcoming and inclusive language
- Respect different views and experiences
- Accept constructive criticism gracefully
- Focus on what is most beneficial to the field team as a whole
- Show courtesy and respect towards all field team members (including limiting personal activities to designated periods)
- Accept the predetermined structure of the field team (e.g. safety lead, science lead, medical lead, etc.)
- Communicate honestly with the medical and safety leads in case of any concern
- Participate in our shared co-authorship model
- Understand the harassment report structure of their university (see Discrimination and Harassment section below)
- Prepare for international fieldwork by fulfilling all UNC requirements, with help as necessary, which are described here:
<https://global.unc.edu/travel-operations/preparing-for-international-travel/travel-outside-u-s/>

6.2 Field personnel rights (adapted from UAF)

- To be informed about the plans, nature of work, and risks of the remote fieldwork in which they will be participating.
- To express concerns about their safety and comfort, and that of the team, with the safety lead. (e.g. Dangerous camping sites, inadequate rest or sleep, inadequate bear-safe practices, etc.).
- To refuse to do activities that they consider unsafe or significantly uncomfortable. (e.g. flying in bad weather, driving a boat without training, etc).
- To have furnished safe accommodations with whom they are comfortable. For example, lab members should not be expected to share accommodations (like a tent or a hotel room) with a person with whom they are not comfortable.

- To have regular contact with members of the lab, which may or may not include Tamlin, to help with decision-making in the field.
- To a social environment that would be acceptable in a classroom setting. (e.g. jokes, language, and behavior that are not acceptable on campus are not acceptable off campus).
- To reasonable attempts to provide adequate shelter, equipment, and food. (e.g. lab members should not be required to go without meals and sleep in leaky tents for budgetary reasons).
- To not be left alone in remote field settings. For example, lab members should not be required to spend time working out of line of sight of others. As a general policy, all fieldwork should be conducted in teams of at least two unless there is a very good reason to do otherwise and the fieldwork is safe to be done solo (e.g. low-risk activities in highly populated areas).
- To carry and use remote field safety equipment, including communication devices such as InReaches or Satellite Phones when out of areas of cell phone reception. These will be provided by the lab or another source.
- When working in remote areas without regular emergency services, or internationally, to be provided with evacuation insurance obtained through the University at no cost to the lab member.
- To be given identifiable clothing to wear in the field that distinguishes the person as a researcher when desired or appropriate (e.g. blaze orange safety vests). If additional material is needed it will be provided.
- To request and obtain training for field safety issues and tasks from Tamlin when relevant to the fieldwork in question (e.g. Bear safety training, wilderness first aid, scientific equipment use, etc.).
- To be evacuated at no cost, if the lab member feels a Title VII or Title IX violation has occurred and wants to return to town or to UNC for safety reasons and/or to file a complaint. (e.g. Harassed because of gender, belittled because of religious background or nationality, sexual harassment, etc.).
- To be evacuated at no cost, if the lab member feels they are experiencing a medical emergency.
- All of these field safety rights shall be exercised without retaliation or adverse effect on the student's academic progress or future participation in fieldwork.

Below we offer examples of common enough behavior that will not be tolerated. This list is by no means comprehensive.

- written or verbal comments that have the effect of excluding people on the basis of membership of any specific group
- causing someone to fear for their safety, such as through intimidation, bravado, or questioning of safety lead decisions.
- violent threats or language directed against another person
- dirty jokes or the display of sexual, obscene, or violent materials
- sexist, racist, homophobic, transphobic, ableist, or exclusionary jokes
- offensive personal language/acts (name calling, sexual conversations, overt obscene material, obscene gestures, hazing/bullying).
- unwelcome sexual attention

- nonconsensual or unwelcome physical contact
- sustained disruption of talks, events, or communications
- insults or put downs
- excessive swearing
- incitement to violence, suicide, or self-harm
- publication of private communication without consent

6.3 Roles & Decision-making in the Field

When working in the field, safety is the most important consideration, followed by other priorities like obtaining data and maintaining equipment. It is important to have a structure in place to facilitate making decisions prior to starting fieldwork. This structure may differ depending on the size of the field team. When two people are working together in the field, decisions should be made by consensus. Both people have full veto power to not engage in any activities they feel are unsafe.

In larger groups, we propose that at least three roles will always be assigned: science lead, safety lead, and medical lead. The science lead is in charge of thinking through the data collection plan. The safety lead has veto power over any activities they deem unsafe. The medical lead will take charge if any medical situation arises. Other assigned roles may be added for large teams (e.g. comms lead, data recording lead, inclusion lead, etc), but these will be decided on based on the needs and size of the particular team. These roles can either rotate from day to day or stay the same, depending on the size of the team. The science lead and safety lead can never be the same person on a given day; however, the medical lead must be at least Wilderness First Aid (and preferably Wilderness First Responder) certified. In general, every evening in the field we will do a check-in meeting regarding safety and science goals and generally how everyone is feeling physically and mentally. If doing fieldwork solo, there should always be a check-in with Tamlin or another lab member (or another responsible party as appropriate), and this can be done at that time. We will agree on plans for the next day's activities at this meeting.

The medical lead will be in charge of collecting pertinent medical history from all participants prior to fieldwork, unless this process is being handled by another authority. This information will be kept confidential by the medical lead unless they conclude that it must be revealed to help the pertinent team member (e.g. in order to facilitate treatment of an injury or illness in the field).

6.4 Finances in the Field

Fieldwork can be an expensive proposition, and UNC is not always tremendously fast in processing reimbursements. As such, for students it is often possible to request a travel advance prior to traveling to the field. In general, an advance can be requested if expected out of pocket costs are greater than \$1500. This process should be started *well* in advance of the field activities (at least 8 weeks). Please talk to Tamlin and/or the Department Manager (currently Jennifer Parker) about the process. If anticipated field costs are too small to warrant a formal travel advance but would nevertheless cause hardship, please talk to Tamlin about possible options. As part of pre-fieldwork planning, we will also discuss needed field gear. Any non-clothing gear should generally be purchased using lab resources (grants, etc). Personal clothing generally cannot be purchased using these resources unless it is something well out of the scope of

ordinary (e.g. chest waders, rubber boots), but it may be possible to find other resources to do so (or to borrow necessary gear).

6.5 Reporting guidelines in the field should an incident occur

Our reporting follows an escalating structure, designed to facilitate confidential reporting. Field personnel may report at any of these levels at any time they wish--there is no need to move through the progression if the aggrieved feels it necessary to move to a higher level immediately. If fieldwork is being conducted in a remote location with limited access to communication devices, all personnel will be granted private access to whatever communication devices exist upon request and within reason (e.g. once or twice per day). These requests will not be subject to censorship by field leads.

1st level: Camp Manager (if different from PI)

The camp manager will field complaints about interpersonal concerns and address the issue with the offending parties in cases where the aggrieved feels comfortable discussing the issue ‘in the field’ with another team member. The camp manager will treat this information confidentially if legally allowed to do so, and ask the offending parties to change their behavior as appropriate. If the behavior is rectified, the issue is considered closed.

2nd level: PI

Any PI-level personnel on the project (e.g. Tamlin) can be contacted in person or via email/phone/text about unacceptable behavior if they are in the field or not. The PI will consult with the aggrieved to determine if rectification is possible, and if so, the PI will initiate this discussion. If not, the aggrieved has the right to a no-cost trip home, or, the PI may send the offending party home at no-cost. Note that, in some cases, Tamlin, as a university responsible employee, may have to report incidents to appropriate university personnel (e.g. the Equal Opportunity Compliance Office). This caveat may also apply to other personnel in the field who are also responsible employees at UNC or another institution.

3rd level: University title IX officer/other reporters

Field personnel are expected to know the reporting structure at their university (e.g. Title IX officers, EOC office, other confidential reporters). Field personnel are empowered to contact these reporters directly to initiate procedures in place at their university, in cases where the PI level personnel are involved in acts of unwelcome behavior or if the aggrieved feels uncomfortable talking with the PI or camp manager. Field personnel are also able to request a no-cost trip home without a specified reason in such cases.

6.6 Interactions with Local Communities During Fieldwork

We often do fieldwork in locations where we interact with members of local communities who are not professional scientists. This section contains guidelines for these interactions. The first and most important principle is one of respect—we are nearly always working on land that belongs, legally and/or culturally, to people other than us. As such, it is incumbent on us to behave respectfully towards members of the local community. The ramifications of this principle are wide-ranging, but some examples include:

- We should generally seek local permission before working in a particular area that is culturally significant, even if we have formal legal permission from a governmental body.

This generally means reaching out to local community members before starting fieldwork.

- Before fieldwork begins, we should learn some basics about the culture(s) of communities in the area in which we will be working and avoid any overtly problematic behaviors (e.g. bringing alcohol into or near a dry community).
- We should be prepared to offer an explanation of the work we plan to do and listen respectfully to feedback, even if it is negative (note that this does not apply to harassment, bullying, etc.). In cases where it is appropriate to do so, we should proactively offer information about our research activities to the community, either formally or informally.
- We should be open to engaging with members of the local community if and when it is appropriate to do so. This can be engagement in research activities or in other community activities. We should also be open to the possibility that a local community does not want to engage with us, or wants to engage only in specific ways (e.g. they're happy to have us spend our money in town but don't want to engage with our research).
- We should be open to the fact that we are not experts in the specific perspectives and politics of local communities. Be prepared to apologize if you inadvertently offend a member of the community, and to learn about why your behavior may have been seen as problematic.
- Where feasible, we should be open to changing our research questions based on feedback from local communities. Such changes could come in at least two ways: we could get feedback suggesting that our existing questions are poorly posed, or a member of the local community could pose a question to us that we could feasibly answer. In both cases, we should aim to respond constructively to this feedback.
- While we can agree on standards for our behavior in the field, we cannot control how members of local communities behave. If a member of the lab experiences harassment, violence, or other negative behavior from a member of a local community, this should immediately be brought to the attention of the camp manager/PI (e.g. Tamlin). We will immediately work to address the situation, which could involve changing field activities (e.g. avoiding further interactions), contacting local authorities, and/or providing a fully paid trip home for the affected lab member(s) if they would prefer.
- In places we have repeatedly visited and continue to visit (such as the Peace-Athabasca Delta), we encourage lab members who have previously worked there to share knowledge with others traveling to those locations. For example, we should keep track of who we have contacted and met, what the responses and interactions were, questions of interest to local communities, and any personal or professional contacts in the area.