

PSG draft Code of Conduct Survey  
Version 5  
Member comments – August 2018  
From Survey Monkey

**[Q1] Behave with courtesy, honesty, integrity, and respect in all professional relationships and interactions so as to encourage responsible engagement and communication**

1. remove "engagement" - unclear meaning. "behaviour" and communication?
2. "replace 'to encourage' with 'to promote'; add 'effective' before 'communication'"
3. Often industry & government players (fisheries, mining) deliberately tell lies and it's always best to challenge these at the time, openly. Kick-back can be expected. "Integrity" rather than "honesty" is the best word to use here. "Honesty" can be abrasive. PSG is not a neutral party when it comes to seabird conservation (see Constitution). I don't think anyone expects it to be! It's a composite of many scientists with differing views supported by differing data. Very healthy, but no Government agency!
4. delete "so as to encourage responsible engagement and communication" these are undefined
5. Behave with courtesy, honesty, integrity, and respect in all professional relationships and interactions to encourage responsible engagement and communication

**[Q2] Help create and maintain a professional environment free from harassment and discrimination.**

1. Any kind of discrimination (providing some examples would be fine).
2. It should be stated/defined somewhere what constitutes harassment. This should include both sexual and non-sexual harassment.
3. I think the sentence is fine, but maybe needs a sentence below it that explains what PSG describes as harassment and discrimination. Those two terms have definitions that vary based on a person's perception, so it might be important here to specify what PSG sees as harassment and discrimination in order to hold a member accountable if they do not comply with code of conduct.
4. "harassment, discrimination and aggression"
5. Delete "professional", make it simple and straight forward.
6. "I agree with harassment. Discrimination is in the eye of the beholder. "

**[Q3] Never intentionally damage a person's reputation by making misleading or malicious statements about their conduct or work.**

1. Hopefully this is not intended to squelch honest, factual criticism of the work of others.
2. consider reworking so the expected behavior (not making misleading or malicious statements) comes first
3. What if you review a paper full of errors? And the Editor won't withdraw/amend it. It happens all the time! I'd prefer that the concept of "constructive dialogue" was promoted rather than a UN veto of openly calling it 'rubbish'. It's a question of style rather than substance & certainly involves editors who may not have an informed, impartial neutral view. After all, most journals are today profit-making enterprises. So if it pays them to publish a lie, then they may well do so. Sad but true. There are plenty of examples in the scientific literature.
4. Is 'intentionally' needed?
5. almost impossible to prove "intentionally"
6. "I prefer no opinion on this, an option not provided. This seems a "snowflake " exercise. "

**[Q4] Comment with respect and full consideration of the facts when expressing opinions.**

1. I may not know all of the facts - how about consideration of the "available facts" or something like that?
2. Who decides what are facts? No one knows all the facts.
3. We can't all be experts on everything (well, most of us can't). I worry that "full consideration of the facts" may be construed as fully researching and digesting prior to opining. While that is ideal, it is also a bit stifling. Perhaps delete "full"?
4. "facts" is a poor word since it has a component of personal choice or personal criteria for what is a "fact." I would propose "best available scientific information" instead.
5. I think this is asking too much. Does anyone ever know all the "facts"? Opinions of course can be selective also - the whole point of science is to disprove existing "facts". I completely agree with the need for respect
6. Comment with respect and demonstrate full consideration of the facts when expressing opinions.
7. This one seems to lack context. How does full consideration of the facts lead to opinions? This statement might be somewhat redundant with the first and third statement.

**[Q5] Conduct work with skill, care, diligence, and due regard for animal welfare, human health, safety, and technical and professional standards.**

1. Conduct work with skill, care, diligence, and due regard for animal welfare, human health, safety, environmental stewardship, and technical and professional standards.
2. seems like human health should come before animal welfare
3. This sentence should include the term "ethical"
4. While I'm not against this at all, I don't believe membership to PSG carries any authority to actively enforce something like this - it is up to the individual countries where this work is done, and the institutions for which the researcher works. Further, these standards vary from country to country (and will vary in interpretation and application from person to person), so I expect you will have disagreement within the ranks about how well this is applied. The only way I could see something like this being effective or genuine is for PSG to add a caveat at the beginning "Seek to conduct..." and at the end "...professional standards within both the country of residence and where research is being undertaken, and the institution/s supporting this work."
5. "Due regard" is a word that brings out swarms of lawyers! Surely 'care' will do?
6. The university-imposed animal welfare standards are bunk. Otherwise I agree with the sentiment.

**[Q6] Conduct research and outreach efforts in a way that minimizes adverse effects on wildlife and the environment, meets all legal and institutional requirements for conducting the research (for example, animal use and care permits), and complies with best practices for scientific research and animal welfare.**

1. insert "populations" after wildlife in first line.
2. Y
3. ...all legal and institutional requirements for conducting the research... (this text should include the explicit mention to "corresponding authorities where research is conducted")
4. This is more of a maybe, but some institutional requirements are arbitrary, but helpful to the animals they are supposed to protect, and designed by biologists who have no experience with wild animals
5. I'm not sure if "outreach" belongs in this statement. Perhaps on it's own statement with other qualifiers?
6. In general, I do agree, but this statement could lead to discouraging or sanctioning researchers or managers who may want to work with people, communities, or groups (such as fishermen or development companies) to understand the impacts certain activities are having on seabirds. I don't think we'd want to go after a PSG member who is trying to get something positive out of a negative situation. They may not be able to do anything about the animal handling practices (e.g., sampling shearwaters killed for food by the Maori?), but discouraging cooperation with some of these borderline animal welfare situations may not benefit our field in either understanding biology or in engaging communities to reduce their impacts. I'd rather have someone looking into impacts of illegal fishing on seabirds in Mexico or southeast Asia, or using samples from human consumption of seabirds (that may not be approved under IACUC) to understand plastics or contaminants rather than say they should not be allowed to be a member of PSG because they are working with people who are not acting legally or meeting US university IACUC standards.
7. Similar general comment with above: these are good, but vague and can have individual interpretation. During an era of social media, some people might think it is in good practice and fine animal welfare to hold animals for extensive time and post selfies with their respective animal. But I do not feel that would be in the best welfare for the animal. Does PSG want to include specific examples of what would not be regarded as care for animal welfare/human health, professional standards?
8. I approve of this sentence whole-heartedly, but wanted to comment only to say that I think it could be expanded or emphasized more. Researchers should consider how they can minimize adverse effects to both individual animals and populations, as well as the environment. When significant adverse effects are unavoidable in order to accomplish the research, researchers should carefully consider whether the research is really worthwhile, including considering whether the adverse effects have a good likelihood of leading directly to long-term benefits to the species and/or environment being studied. Hopefully most researchers are already doing this, and I'm not suggesting all of these words be added, but a little more emphasis along these lines would be good.
9. My concern is that sometimes there are no best practices for a particular experiment because it is novel or the defined best practice is based on the way someone did it the first time and everyone else used the same methods. Maybe there is a better way and we should be able to do some experimenting to find the better way. Maybe 'best practices' needs to be defined here so it's not too narrow.
10. included in the above? "Conduct work with skill...."

11. Reverse 'animal use and care' to 'animal care and use' as many NA institutions use the language in that order
12. As above - while I'm not against this at all, I don't believe membership to PSG carries any authority to actively enforce something like this - it is up to the individual countries where this work is done, and the institutions for which the researcher works. Further, 'best practice' vary from country to country (and will vary in interpretation and application from person to person), so I expect you will have disagreement within the ranks about how well this is applied. The only way I could see something like this being effective or genuine is for PSG to add the same caveats at the beginning "Seek to conduct..." and at the end "...animal welfare within both the country of residence and where research is being undertaken, and the institution/s supporting this work."
13. The word "minimize" is problematic. The way to minimize is to avoid research on animals altogether. What we want to do is reduce adverse effect or manage adverse effects to a given standard of care.
14. YES: but how is this different from the previous point? (I want to say YES, but system won't let me unless I answer No!
15. Outreach doesn't belong in this sentence and needs its own statement. All the examples seem more relevant to research. Outreach could be characterized by clarity (and some other things that I can't think of at the moment).
16. Same response as above.

**[Q7] Only be included as an author of a professional publication if have played a significant role in designing and conducting the research, writing the manuscript, and/or providing extensive guidance on the execution of the project. Provide all co-authors with the opportunity to approve the final version of a manuscript to be published.**

1. I don't think PSG needs to go here and I recommend deleting this one from the Code. The tendency nowadays is to be more inclusive in terms of authorship on papers and I don't think PSG needs to dictate to its members the criteria for author inclusion. I once included someone on a paper I wrote to honor an individual that knew far more about the species I was writing about but contributed nothing to that paper. They felt honored and accepted authorship. Perhaps I shouldn't have done that, but I did and I would do it again. The second sentence I can agree with.
2. Authorship on publications is an area fraught with differing opinions, attitudes, and practices. Does it really need to be in our code of conduct? I agree that too many papers have way too many authors, and it is hard sometimes to see how some authors have contributed, but this item needs much further discussion. I recommend you leave out of the 1st generation code of conduct and tackle this problem later.
3. I am in support of maintaining the integrity and credibility of publications, but I don't agree that it is the place of the PSG to judge the contribution of authorship. I think that authorship (and the number of authors) is entirely up to the authors to determine amongst themselves, based on what contributions have been considered and agreed upon as significant to the work.
4. I suggest adding "analyzing data"
5. Do we really need to police this? Isn't this an issue for journals? I believe we should add 'for Marine Ornithology' as caveat.
6. "designing, supporting, or conducting the research By ""support"" I mean to include those who provide logistics support without which the research being presented would not be possible. "
7. Often people (especially students or new staff) end up taking over a project that someone else has designed, but that didn't get funded right away or the person who designed the project moved up or on from the organization. Therefore, I'd suggest one small word change suggestion: "Only be included as an author of a professional publication if have played a significant role in designing OR conducting the research, writing the manuscript, and/or providing extensive guidance on the execution of the project. Provide all co-authors with the opportunity to approve the final version of a manuscript to be published."
8. "Problem with language: ""Only ACCEPT TO be included..." and ""...publication if YOU have..."
9. I also think this is a bit naive and exclusionary. It excludes the people who do all the broad conceptual work of applying for and obtaining large grants and then provide those funds for sub-projects for which they may not quite meet the above criteria for authorship in each sub-project. These people deserve authorship, often recognized by placing them last on the authorship list." I think that if you have had an novel idea then being added to someone else's publication in acknowledgement of that thinking is ok. There are a lot of slightly sneaky adjectives in this statement also - what is "significant" (in this non statistical context) and what is "extensive"?
10. need to insert the word "you" between if and have.
11. Consider reworking the first line to read: "Encourage inclusion of an author of a professional publication only when they have played..."
12. add the word you to the first sentence? "a professional publication if you have played"



13. I don't necessarily disagree with this statement, but I'm curious as to why this would not be up to the authors of the publication to decide. I don't have much experience in the realm (am a student still), but recently was asked to provide data for a meta analysis, and the lead author decided to include everyone who provided data as a coauthor (which I don't necessarily agree with either!) We did all get to review and comment on the manuscript. I'm providing this simply as an example of a publication that would not follow this guideline, and am wondering if PSG needs to have a stance on this (but I'm also sure the committee has much more experience than I do, and there is probably a very good reason this has been written down in the code of conduct!)
14. Needs rewriting because it isn't clear how many of the points qualify for co-authorship. Suggest: "" Be included as an author of a professional publication only if have played a significant role in designing and/or conducting the research, and/or writing the manuscript, and/or providing extensive guidance on execution of the project. Provide all co-authors...."" etc as written."
15. Just a question: I am happy to adopt this code to myself, but I cannot demand that all collaborators subscribe to this code, because most of my collaborations would falter. This is particularly relevant to seabird tracking data. There is an implicit expectation among seabird researchers that they are co-author on any paper that uses their data, regardless of the minuscule contribution to any manuscript. I believe that synthesizing data and writing collaborative papers based on multiple datasets is a huge step forward for the field, but this will not happen if we enforce this code amongst collaborators. It is also somewhat difficult to have >50 co-authors play a 'significant role'. I do not know how this could be incorporated in this bullet point?
16. Only be included as an author of a prof. pub if ONE HAS played...
17. Only be included as an author of a professional publication if have played a significant role in designing and conducting the research, writing the manuscript, providing data and/or providing extensive guidance on the execution of the project. Provide all co-authors with the opportunity to approve the final version of a manuscript to be published.

**[Q8] Avoid deliberately committing scientific fraud including, but not limited to, the following: falsifying or fabricating data, misrepresenting or withholding results, plagiarizing digital or written material, failing to acknowledge contributions of others, and presenting opinions as facts.**

1. I suggest deleting the word "deliberately." All of the fraud you mention in the sentence can only be done deliberately
2. Avoid committing scientific fraud including, but not limited to, the following: falsifying or fabricating data, misrepresenting or withholding results, plagiarizing digital or written material, failing to acknowledge contributions of others, and presenting opinions as facts.
3. This isn't actually a "no".... just wondering if this type of language is in other codes of conduct. Also wondering what the full range of "...including, but not limited to..." covers. How will you tell the difference between deliberately or accidentally failing to acknowledge contributions of others, and is that at the same level as falsifying or fabricating data?
4. Remove "deliberately" after avoid. The goal is to avoid fraud whether deliberate or otherwise.
5. This statement must include some reference to: "Inappropriate and unauthorized use of research/outreach ideas, methods and results of other researchers when these sources of reference are not freely accessible or are part of unpublished information"
6. The word "deliberately" seriously weakens this statement. It is not needed. All of the listed examples require deliberate intention.
7. Conduct your science with integrity.
8. This may be my own opinion (ironically), but the last item ("presenting opinions as facts") strikes me as not really related to scientific fraud, but perhaps a whole separate issue. I wonder if this should be either made into a new statement, or perhaps combined with a different one - the next statement (Be mindful of the scope...) seems a logical place to put it, especially since it already lists a point about offering professional advice and opinions.
9. For such a serious subject, "Avoid" seems feeble. Also, none of the actions listed could be perpetrated accidentally, so "deliberately" seems unnecessary. This needs to be much stronger. How about just saying "DO NOT commit scientific fraud..."?
10. Don't need to define fraud.
11. maybe remove the word deliberately; otherwise agree
12. Need stronger qualifier than 'avoid'. This should be a 'never'.
13. Is 'deliberately' needed?
14. "deliberately committing scientific fraud " deliberately? "presenting opinions as facts" vague, one person's opinion is another's facts

**[Q9] Be mindful of the scope of professional practice or areas of expertise when conducting projects, offering professional advice and opinions, and providing peer reviews of manuscripts and grant.**

1. I'm not sure what is meant by 'mindful of the scope of professional practice or areas of expertise when...'; should it be 'mindful of one's scope of professional....'? Does it mean I should be mindful of my own, or other's expertise, or both? I agree with the concept, I think, but the wording seems odd.
2. It is unclear to me what "the scope of professional practice" refers to. It is not clear.
3. This just seems to be general practice/common sense rather than code of conduct level. It's also difficult to understand the sentence. Who should be mindful of .....
4. I agree with what I think this is saying but could use some rewording. It seems this is basically saying to be aware of your strengths and limitations relevant to the activities listed. "the scope of professional practice" seems awkward to me. "Area of expertise" works pretty well.
5. I just don't understand what this one is getting at - be mindful and respectful of the knowledge (limits) of your colleagues?
6. Not sure I understand what this is getting at--don't overstep one's area(s) of expertise when conducting projects, etc.? "Scope of professional practice" also unclear.
7. This statement seems particularly difficult to enforce. Is it really needed?
8. This is not clear at all. I think it is intended to caution against making pronouncements outside of the scope of one's own actual expertise. This should be made clear. "Be mindful of the LIMITED scope of ONE'S OWN practice or areas of ..."
9. I assume this is with respect to one's own expertise? Possible revision: "Be mindful of one's own scope of professional practice or areas of expertise..."
10. Pretty vague. Covered above - do science with integrity.
11. I don't understand this one. Does it mean "Be mindful of YOUR professional practice or areas of expertise when YOU conduct projects", etc?
12. this one is a little unclear to me Do we mean that we should not offer professional advice for instance in areas beyond our professional scope?
13. I'm not sure what this means. Perhaps a pronoun would help? Is the reader expected to be mindful of 'others' practice or areas of expertise so as to avoid an unnecessarily harsh review of a manuscript because of a language issue, for example??
14. what do you mean by be mindful of the scope??
15. I'm not following the intent here - can it be rewritten more clearly?
16. I am not really sure what "mindful of scope of professional practice" means. Maybe express this in a clearer way?
17. What does 'mindful' mean in this context?
18. "mindful of the scope of professional practice or areas of expertise" mindful? "scope of professional practice"? Maybe "do not offer advice or opinions or conduct reviews unless they fall within your area of expertise. "peer reviews" as opposed to just reviews?
19. 'conducting projects' seems very vague and I am not sure it belongs here as scientific research is always a learning experience and every project serves to expand areas of expertise.
20. It's unclear to me what this means. Be mindful?? Do you mean, don't offer your services if you don't have the expertise??
21. Especially don't opine about things you aren't trained in. This is a pervasive problem with global climate change.

**[Q10] Be responsible for complying with all PSG policies and procedures.**

1. Do we have a PSG policy/procedural handbook? Is it kept up to date?
2. Agree that PSG members should respect organizational policies and procedures, and are responsible for their actions. Not sure about the term 'compliance', especially as the pre-amble description to the proposed Code of Conduct on the website, says that it is voluntary?
3. if PSG policies and procedures should substantially differ or contravene policies and procedures I am beholden to as a member or employee of a research institution or professional organization in my home country, my main responsibility would possibly be to my employer/local organization. This situation may be highly unlikely, but could still represent a problem—mainly when dealing with policies.
4. Agree, tho most helpful to have these handy in a central place on the website (and maybe they are already; if so, ignore this comment.)
5. PSG could change those in the future
6. I am on the fence on this statement. It is too broad in scope. I recommend clarifying/limiting its scope such as: "Be responsible for complying with all PSG policies and procedures when representing or acting on behalf of PSG." My intent is to limit this statement to when members are acting on the PSG board and committees, which i suspect is the intent.
7. Really vague. What does this mean: "be responsible?" "How about " "Ensure that you and your colleagues and research team comply..."
8. All members? All the time? Know all PSG policies and procedures and keep up when they change? Yes for officers and anyone representing PSG, but I don't think I'll personally read all policies and procedures (or even know where to look for them).
9. Not entirely sure what this one is getting at.
10. this assumes that PSG has got it "right" in all ways.... drop this
11. hopelessly vague
12. To some extent, these are guidelines. Compliance seems too strong a term for policies and procedures that are continually evolving.

**[Q11] Respect all PSG assets and resources, financial or otherwise, and not use them for unauthorized purposes.**

1. "Respect" all assets.... what does that mean? Revised: Do not use PSG assets and resources for unauthorized purposes."
2. Isn't this covered in the above?
3. "...and do not use them for..."?
4. maybe "Do not use all PSG assets and resources, financial or otherwise, for unauthorized purposes" what is "respect"?
5. Respect?? How about just don't do it.
6. I was going to say yes but no comments are allied. I would specifically call out not using PSG as an advocate for public policy changes that advance your career. Like listing the only species you have studied as endangered.

**[Q12] Avoid statements through any medium that may be interpreted as representing the PSG without written authorization from the Executive Council, including social media.**

1. This says that I should not read such statements. Also, the final phrase is way out of place, The intention is that I should not MAKE such statements, so this should be made clear: "Avoid MAKING statements through any medium, including social media, that may ..."
2. Isn't this a PSG policy? If not, it should be included in their policy rather than a code of conduct.
3. Really? Have all statements by PSG officials got to get WRITTEN authorization? Be real
4. move "including social media" to just after "any medium"
5. Would this include tweeting screenshots of presentations at conferences? That is a quick and easy way to spread the word about exciting research, but having to obtain written permission would effectively halt that communication.
6. For social media consider including an example. Since PSG has its own accounts those are where PSG's 'voice' is. Social media users have their own accounts and thus that is where their 'voice' is. It seems reasonable and beneficial for PSG members using social media to tag / @PSG and this statement shouldn't preclude that. How does this apply to those posting on PSG's social media accounts? Consider changing 'may be interpreted as representing' to something that refers back to these codes of conduct.

**[Q13] Use PSG's letterhead only with written authorization**

1. To whom does this one apply to? Should you narrow that down? Does everyone including Exec Council members need written permission from the Chair? Seems over the top to me without more specificity.
2. I actually mean Yes, but please make it clear in the policy who can grant authorisation (if you haven't)
3. I agree but had a question. Does this mean we can not include the PSG logo on a poster or presentation to be presented at a PSG conference?
4. From whom? (Executive Committee?)
5. Written authorization from whom??? Make this clear
6. Isn't this a PSG policy? If not, it should be included in their policy rather than a code of conduct. Somehow these 4 items should be included in one statement. The last three should be part of the PSG policies.
7. You need to specify who can give the written authorization (e.g, Executive Council? Chair?)
8. It seems like this could be combined with the above statement.
9. Need to say from whom the authorization must come, as in previous point.
10. Written implies "email" permission as well?
11. State from whom (I assume EXCO or chair?)

**[Q14] Please provide your thoughts or suggestions about what the PSG could do if a member does not adhere to the voluntary Code of Conduct.**

1. I respect their consideration
2. Warning, then removal if further violation.
3. 1 warning and then unsubscribe from the group
4. Offenses are part of a continuous spectrum ranging from minor (letter of warning or reprimand??) to serious (removal ). EXCO should vote on the penalty for violation. To consider removing them from membership should be a high percentage of ECO officers, not a simple majority vote.
5. Formal letter of reprimand from EXCO directly to the offending member. If behavior/offense continues, consider some kind of more public reprimand (letter posted to PSG website, sent on listserv, etc.). For especially egregious offenses, it may be appropriate to ban membership or conference attendance for some length of time, contact the members employer, etc.
6. Start with a letter (from Exco /chair) or meeting (with a designated Exco member). If no resolution (i.e., apology or cessation of bad actions), send formal letter noting that the person is no longer a PSG member. If they show up at meetings following this - I don't know, but certainly if the person is overly aggressive, ask them to leave or have them escorted out? (easier said than done).
7. The Exco should formally censure the individual and require them to correct the misfeasance and acknowledge their unethical behavior.
8. Revoke membership after 2 documented warnings. Keep their name on a list to decline future membership. Remove them from the mailing list.
9. "The code of conduct has such a mixture of major and minor issues, that the response can only be ""it depends"". I would guess that there be a process to bring a formal complaint up against someone, allow the accused to respond, and determine an outcome. Then decide whether to take legal action (for pilfering the treasury, for example) or just to revoke their membership. Will need to be a case by case situation, held in confidence until decision is made, with an appropriate investigative body. Given all that, is it really worth doing a formal code of conduct? Will the internal politics of PSG spill over into this arena??"
10. As noted, I have comments about one of the clauses. I think issues around harassment and courtesy are the more important issues than professional conduct with respect to individual research and publications. As the code is 'voluntary' I am not sure how it would be enforced? But for obvious person to person interactions (as noted above), I think that actions can be taken to deal with people on an individual basis to flag unacceptable behavior in incremental steps before ultimately expulsion?"
11. Educate that person.
12. If a person chooses not to follow the Code of Conduct, then I suppose the person is choosing not to be part of the group.
13. Non adherents name would be mentioned in the minutes and not allowed to present int he year of violation
14. The person or organization or NGO should be spell
15. I would say three strikes and you are out. Give a person two warnings in writing if they do not adhere. If it happens again ask them to resign as a PSG member. If they refuse, remove them from the roles.
16. For less series infractions, a warning system would be sufficient. If the behavior continues or the member knowingly commits a serious infraction, they should be expelled from PSG.



17. This would seem to be a case by case consideration depending on the clarity of the infraction. A range of options should be available to those judging the situation, ranging from simply being admonished to avoid such appearance in the future, to reprimand, to expulsion from the PSG. Who will sit in judgement of a complaint? I suspect action will not be often required (hopefully years between any formal event), but when it is needed, it will be onerous. Maybe each year 3 members of the exco could be identified (as if they need more work)? This is a difficult point.
18. Reprimand at PSG meetings, therefore reducing socail licence for inappropriate behaviour.
19. Good question. I think it depends on the situation and severity of the conduct. I would start with some level of notification to the individual, verbally or in writing (again, depends on the severity of the issue), possibly followed up by a meeting in-person or otherwise to discuss the situation. All should be documented in writing and records kept, in the event that there are additional or continued incidents. If severe enough, could warrant their membership could be revoked, temporarily or permanently
20. I believe it should be handled on a case-by-case basis. Not all points presented are equal, and some would seem to have more serious consequences. How do other organizations handle these matters? To be considered should be the seriousness of the misconduct, its consequences to the organization and, perhaps also, re-incidence in the breach of proper conduct.
21. First offense = warning; second offense = suspension of membership
22. Review conduct and then determine appropriate action - which could lead to removing their membership.
23. Tactfully request a written response (with a reasonable deadline) from them; and if not answered, take them off the PSG membership (with due notification to them). Give them a chance to appeal. Get a lawyer to represent PSG if there are any suspicions of possible trouble. Trust the PSG Executive Committee to do the right thing correctly.
24. The culprit down and have cormorants feast on their eyeballs.
25. EXCO could review the specifics of the case and vote on whether or not to revoke one's membership.
26. Remove memeber
27. revoke membership
28. First have a private meeting to remind them of the rules, if behavior continues, revoke membership (publicly if violation was itself public).
29. Forward to the member an analysis of observed violations of the Code of Conduct from a committee charged with such activity, and request the member participate in session with the committee (conference call?) to convey to the member suggested means to address the proposed violations.
30. Removal from membership with a letter on file. And consider what other actions may be warranted if the actions are considered illegal or detrimental to the organization.
31. Proceed with caution in investigating. The code is written in general terms we supposedly all understand, e.g.the word "respect". Hopefully there will not be incidents that require us to specially define all terms. Human behavior and its interpretation gets into a murky area of perception. Perhaps using group consensus will work.
32. That's a tough one. At very least, member should have a chance to respond to allegations of violations of the Code.
33. Council appoints a standing ethics committee, to whom perceived violations could be reported. Ethics committee studies situation and makes recommendation to Council regarding any possible reprimands.

34. Egregious violations could lead to a loss of membership. The bigger challenge will be "minor" violations. Possibly exclusion from the listserv for a certain amount of time?
35. provide a warning
36. Handle on case by case basis. ExCo should have authority to appoint ad hoc review committee if needed.
37. warn, suspend, expel
38. Revoke membership.
39. Letter of reprimand from ExecCo to member; letter of apology from member, including promise to adhere to code in future; possibly, suspension from presenting at meetings for one year? NOT cancellation of membership, which could result in continuation of unethical activity.
40. 1st, Official letter for communication of misconduct identifying the issue and involved members. 2nd, If not acknowledged and the fault not discussed between the involved members and an appropriate committee, the next step should be a membership suspension (period depending on the fault).
41. If the violation has been clearly documented and there is no ambiguity about it, I'd start with a letter from the EC outlining the offense and requesting concurrence that it won't happen again. If its something like someone using PSG letterhead to publicly express political views, it may also require a public response (e.g., whatever the statement was does not express the views of PSG as an organization.)
42. If on the ExCo, discuss at a full meeting; probably vote them off the board. If other member of PSG, invite them to discuss the conduct with executive committee of ExCo. If the action is egregious and the person cannot understand or change their behavior, expel from PSG?"
43. Revoke membership? not permit on EXCO? anything more might merit a consultation with legal council?
44. I would favor an initial warning to the member, advising them of the violation of the code and that future violations will result in more significant penalties. For those committing multiple violations, would we be able to prevent them from attending an annual meeting? In severe cases, we would need to consider banning the individual from PSG.
45. you would have to conduct an investigation before accising someone, give them a written warning and then revoke their membership after multiple infractions.
46. In the first instance give the member a warning and recommendations on how to improve their behaviour. In the second instance suspend their membership, and do not allow them to register for PSG events.
47. It depends on the situation but perhaps, it could be called attention or in any case expelled from the meeting
48. In extreme cases. the member should be expelled but I can see that 'extreme' is hard to define. Once during my time on The Seabird Group we had to write to a member of the committee where we thought that there had been a conflict of interest and the person had made the wrong choice but the matter was settled amicably. Needless to say this regarded applications for external funding.."
49. 1. Warning and reminder in writing. 2. Expulsion from PSG"
50. It would depend on the infraction committed. Maybe an approach similar to the scaled approach of some companies (i.e. 1st infraction = verbal warning, 2nd = written warning, etc etc.), with zero tolerance for certain infractions (such as sexual assault) resulting in expulsion and/or legal action.
51. I think it should depend entirely on the nature of the misconduct.
52. Barred from membership for a fixed number of years.

53. Remove it from PSG
54. At most, PSG can only make a complaint to the perpetrator, since compliance is voluntary. I don't think PSG has to take on a policing role. These are useful guidelines that should be made very and repeatedly visible to all members, but that is all. Enforcement must be left to journal policies and the courts.
55. A letter of warning for first offense followed by exclusion as a member
56. Allow the member to explain to the EXCO what went on, EXCO votes to retain or reject membership.
57. The Code of Conduct should include a process for addressing this situation, should it occur, to promote fairness and consistency when dealing with a member not adhering to the Code of Conduct. My suggestion would be a formal process for filing a complaint which would be provided to and reviewed by a panel of PSG members (new committee?) who would then determine if a violation occurred. If yes, then that PSG member should lose their membership status and depending on the severity of the violation, an appropriate response. Again, this should all be detailed in the Code of Conduct.
58. Inform the member of the specific concerns and deviations from expected codes of conduct.
59. Possible denial of membership. After repeated offenses?
60. Have ExCo review; if egregious, terminate membership. If lifetime member, return amount paid.
61. Written warning listing violations before further action is taken.
62. Independent review panel in case of a complaint? Could revoke membership (for certain amount of time or indefinitely, depending on issue), and bar from attending or presenting at meeting (again, for certain amount of time or indefinitely, depending).
63. Depending on severity, I think a PSG member could get a warning. If it happens again (or is a more severe violation of the code), maybe excluding that individual from attending PSG annual meetings? Not being allowed to apply for PSG grants?
64. Perhaps the Code of Conduct Committee could continue to exist in some form, and if a member is suspected of not adhering to the code, the committee could communicate those concerns to that member privately first, and then more broadly if necessary. I would think that whatever the policy is for suspected code violations, that should be made clear along with the code, so that members know what to expect.
65. This has to depend on the severity (and for less severe lapses, repetition) of the non-adhering conduct. If a member says something a bit disrespectful to another member one time, they should probably just be reminded of the code. If someone is routinely disrespectful even after reminders of the code, perhaps they should not attend meetings. If a member aggressively harasses another member, or steals someone's research, or something very severe like that, it seems like it would be appropriate to expel them.
66. First violation - Have a designated communicator arrange for a conversation with the member seeking to understand the reason(s) the member transgressed and to provide a clear statement of PGS's policies and how they have been violated. Dependant upon the response of the member, consequences could be a written reprimand or statement of concern that this type of behavior will not be tolerated. If the member refuses to take responsibility for their actions, and if the transgression is agreed by EXCO to be egregious, termination of membership should be considered. a second or subsequent violation should result in termination of membership.
67. Well, this requires a lot of thought. But here what comes to the top of my head. There should be an opportunity to provide an explanation to some group/committee to decide whether a serious breach has been committed. The results of that conversation should be forwarded

- with a recommendation for an appropriate response by PSG to perhaps the EXCO or some other deciding body. If getting into compliance is possible, a timeline to do so should be offered, and if compliance is judged not to be achieved or sufficient, membership should be terminated for an appropriate period of time...this would include inability to present papers at meetings. If the offense is serious, or if there are repeated offenses, membership should be terminated, including inability to present papers at meetings. If the offense is a legal one, membership should be terminated, including inability to submit papers, and the nature of the offense should be reported to the appropriate authority. As I say, just my first thoughts.
68. If a PSG member didn't adhere to the code, he/she needs to explain in a letter all the inconveniences and try to conciliate his/her actions with the code. In the other hand, he/she can not be a member.
  69. 1. Start with communicating with that member about it and see if it is a simple misunderstanding or oversight that the member would be willing to correct. 2. If it is an honest disagreement (the member thinks he/she is in compliance), maybe a committee could hear the arguments on both sides and reach some determination. 3. If it is an intentional breach of conduct that the member is not willing to correct, I don't know what could be done besides revoking membership and maybe advertising, if necessary, that that individual does not represent PSG."
  70. Depends on the severity of the infraction - not exactly sure how to go about this.
  71. A review process should be set up to decide how to manage incidents. Reviews could decide things like exclusion from publishing with Marine Ornithology or attending meetings for a set amount of time. This exclusion could be mitigated through volunteering for PGS meetings or other work.
  72. Verify the event; contact member; explain PSG's understanding of the event (where lack of adherence took place); explain why it was deemed a lack of adherence. From here - it depends on the severity of the event. Maybe you could gin up several examples of events from mild to severe, and the "punishment" should then fit the crime. Mild examples might mean a formal letter and a mark on their membership - sort of like "you're on notice". Medium events - maybe they're suspended from membership for a period of time (could vary the time based on the severity of the event). Severe events - they're kicked out entirely, no way back into the group. Regular reminders are sent to the membership about CoC requirements. One thing I don't see emphasized in your draft CoC is a focus on species conservation. You hint at it when you say "adhere to PSG focus" types of statements. But I've been on a committee and subcommittee that is generating reports and recommendations meant to represnet PSG, where members are entirely too focused on "who they work for and what would be good for that agency/entity" instead of being solely focused on the conservation of the species...which is the reason for PSG's existence. I would like to see a more strenuous emphasis on species conservation along these lines in the CoC. Products that come out of PSG are supposed to be free of agency bias and focused SOLELY on species conservation and how to achieve it -- not bent toward "what's easiest and most profitable for a particular agency." Thanks for your work on this important document.
  73. Tough one! Would probably depend on how egregious their actions are. Maybe they get a warning for a first time issue? Assuming the issues are serious or ongoing... revoke their PSG membership. Remove them from any official PSG position they hold. Make a public statement to that effect. Bar them from attending PSG meetings.
  74. after 3 warnings and opportunities to understand what behavior(s) were deemed inappropriate, the individual should be banned from attending meetings or posting to the Listserv.

75. Panel of peers jury. "Sufficient evidence, insufficient evidence of violation." Research how some universities do this for student plagiarism cases while respecting the panel's and the individual's right to privacy.
76. Thanks so much for making this!
77. The Committee should develop a set of procedures for having the Executive Committee vote on whether or not to expel a member for (gross) violation of the Code.
78. Depending on the severity of the infraction, that member should not be allowed to register for or present at PSG meetings, regardless of the length of their tenure with the society.
79. About the only option is to revoke membership, but there will need to be a very sound review process and a clear policy which includes an appeal option.
80. First violation - issue a warning Second Violation - 2 yr suspension from PSG activities"
81. When a violation of the Code of Conduct is voiced: I would suggest the following 1) A Board of Inquiry should review all documents concerning the event(s), 2) The individual(s) would be interviewed by the Board, 3) The Board would vote on the case and 4) The PSG membership would be informed of the results.
82. If PSG receives reports of a member violating the code of conduct, then a grievance can be filed against the member. It should specify the context of the report, and a date when the member can offer their explanation to their conduct to an unbiased panel. The panel can review everything, then discuss options for measures against the member, with the member. Options can include, depending on the severity of the conduct, barring membership, publication, meeting attendance. If another party was harmed during the conduct, that party can use civil law actions against the offending member, depending on the severity of the conduct. The harmed party can also offer their explanation of the action, but not simultaneously with the accused member.
83. Be removed as a member of the PSG?
84. wow, good question. Maybe a hard copy warning, followed by expulsion if it is repeated? Should probably be a soft warning first.
85. drop them from the membership. Also, post a very terse " \_\_ was dropped from membership for a breach of the PSG code of conduct" in the news letter.
86. Expulsion from PSG membership for a term of ?4? or 5 years. Could be less or more depending on the 'violation'
87. Kick them out of PSG and off the PSG listserve. If illegal conduct turn them into the authorities.
88. Something specific to racial, sexual, gender discrimination
89. First offense results in a "warning" statement, and second offense results in removal from PSG. Depending on the severity of the first offense, perhaps a removal would be appropriate right away.
90. This is wonderful. I am happy to be a part of community that explicitly values good conduct. Thanks for some important work Code of Conduct Committee.
91. Ban from attending conferences.
92. A possible way to promote adhering to the Code would be to reject all presentation abstracts that have been submitted to annual meetings by members who violate the Code.
93. Chair/President should contact directly and discuss with offender. Since the CofC is "voluntary" it is not clear what disciplinary action, if any, is possible or appropriate.
94. Penalize them by restricting their ability to post on the listserv
95. Negotiate. It's only a draft Despite the wisdom of EXCO & legal advice not all situations may be covered.

96. Si algún miembro no cumple con el código, podría quedar exento de exponer en la próxima reunión.
97. 1. Send the Code of Conduct again to be reviewed by the member. 2. If the member still does not adhere to the code invite him/her to leave"
98. Suspend or terminate membership. If public reputation is at risk, public press release (and social media posts) that the person is no longer a member of PSG. For financial damages, seek redress of all financial costs in a court of law.
99. Have a warning and disciplinary system. I.e. first warn, second remove from list serve, third prevent from registering from meetings.
100. NA
101. Cases of harassment, discrimination, and purposefully falsifying scientific data should be treated very seriously. Offenders should not be allowed to attend annual meetings (or maintain PSG membership), and appropriate authorities outside PSG should be notified. All other cases where a PSG member does not adhere to the voluntary Code of Conduct should be 'policed' by a committee that has a formal discussion with the member (and supporting individuals). Penalties should only be applied when an offense is severe (other than those mentioned above) and chronic. Presumably, this would cover things that don't break any laws. Generally, there should be a policy of leniency. The privacy of the offending member should be protected. "
102. Staged response: Warning letter identifying the breach of conduct. Remove the individual from the group."
103. This is the crux of the matter, otherwise the above is teetees. So what did the committee suggest?
104. I can see a lot of work went into this; I really like it! I hope the comments you receive are constructive.
105. Publicize
106. Print actions in newsletter.
107. Give warning once and then exclude the member from the PSG services, depending on which the code did not adhere though.

**[Q15] Please indicate your membership category (optional)**

Answer Choices	Responses	
Regular	82.53%	137
Student	14.46%	24
Corresponding Member	3.01%	5

**[Q16] Please indicate your membership status (optional).**

Answer Choices	Responses	
Lifetime	23.03%	38
Annual	78.18%	129

**[Q17] Please indicate your career status (optional)**

Answer Choices	Responses	
undergraduate student	1.22%	2
graduate student	14.63%	24
post-doc	3.05%	5
early career	10.98%	18
mid-career	29.27%	48
late-career	25.61%	42
retired and loving life	15.24%	25

**[Q18] Do you have any other comments, questions, or concerns?**

1. Thank you for taking the time to develop this.
2. thank you for your service to the group!
3. The is overdue and thank you for due diligence in completing the process.
4. Thank you for setting this draft code of conduct. Needed for all members of our professional society to guide and provide transparency
5. Great work! Thanks to all who have contributed.
6. Although I can read into the language here some teeth about professional conduct, it is not as explicit as I think might be necessary. For example, the Wildlife Society code of ethics ( <http://wildlife.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Code-of-Ethics-May-2017.pdf> ) is a bit more clear on inappropriate professional conduct (see Sec 3 in general, and item 1 in that section in specific). It should not be only professional behavior within PSG (though I strongly support what is in this draft), but must also be extended to all related professional activities that can reflect on the rest of the PSG membership. Hope this helps.
7. Good luck and further much success.
8. PSG has a bright future and I have great faith in all my PSG colleagues and in PSG's future (which means seabirds and marine environments will have conservation spokespersons, and knowledge-producers, scientists) well into the future. A Code of Conduct statement is quiet timely and appropriate--in fact necessary. Nice work.
9. A major issue in psg and science in general is an unwillingness to critique other's science. I would like to see the code of conduct emphasize and encourage active debate.
10. I am curious to know, generally, what are the PSG "policies and procedures", "resources and assets"? But this does not affect my answers in the survey.
11. Not currently
12. I so appreciate why we need to come up with this to cover bases. Hopefully it's not a huge problem and never becomes so.
13. thank you all for working on this!
14. N/A
15. I am VERY pleased that this code of conduct is moving forward. I believe that it is important and strongly hope that no portion of this code is removed during the review process.
16. The draft codes do not allow the Chair to speak for PSG without Exco approval or written permission. The Chair should have some leeway in this regard and be allowed to speak for PSG while following this code.
17. I ticked "yes" for every category because each statement revealed what should be considered as obvious behavior.
18. See above
19. La Paz meeting was great. Thank you.
20. This policy could reference the Conflict of Interest Policy and vice-versa.
21. Great work on this by all involved. It is a necessary document and, especially in this current political atmosphere, it is important to have a clear expression that the rules of civility and professional decorum must be abided.
22. I appreciate the work that has been done, and found the Code sound.
23. Thanks for all the work on this.
24. Hard to imagine anyone said No to any of these questions!
25. Thanks for all you do!
26. Thanks to the committee's efforts on this. Too back we can't just "play nicely". You guys are awesome!



27. Thanks to the Committee for their work on this.
28. A well-done to the committee. PSG is maturing nicely. Keep up the great work.
29. Thank you for your time and effort assembling this document!
30. Add something about not sharing committee draft documents outside of committee or PSG until approved by group. Draft documents from the MMTC have been given to lawyers without MMTC permission.
31. Well done. This is long over due!
32. Good to do this. Would be an opportunity to do something specifically for LGBTQ+ etc folks.
33. No
34. Thank you for working on drafting this conduct !
35. This is a very good initiative.
36. recast as "you shall or you shall not", not vagueness like respecting or being mindful. Keep it simple. And you have to come up with an enforcement mechanism.