

Code of Conduct



iGEM CONCORDIA

ASTROYEAST 2020

Team Code of Conduct 2020

iGEM Concordia Mandate

iGEM (International Genetically Engineered Machines) Concordia is a passionate team of curious young scientists and engineers proud to be affiliated with the Centre for Applied Synthetic Biology and Canada's only academic Genome Foundry.

We are a team of undergraduate students, with graduate mentors, that tackle pressing local and international problems using synthetic biology and engineering principles.

We value diversity and equal opportunity as we promote undergraduate research at Concordia while integrating community involvement and public engagement within Concordia and beyond.

INDEX

- 1 Context- why do we need a Code of Conduct
- 2 Scope-who is bound by this code?
- 3 When/ where does it appear?
 - 3.1 Policy
 - 3.2 Expected Conduct
 - 3.3 Prohibited Conduct
 - 3.4 Academic Honesty
 - 3.5 Misuse of iGEM
 - 3.6 Property
 - 3.7 Complaint Procedure
 - 3.8 Sanctions
- 4 Team Structure
- 5 How is work shared
- 6 Commitment
- 7 Recruitment
- 8 Voting

This is a collaborative document, open to amendment by iGEM Concordia team members at any time as per the voting process outlined in Section 8.





1 Context

Why do we need a Code of Conduct?

iGEM, and science in general, involves a great deal of interaction with others whether through weekly meetings, meetings with professors and mentors, or with the public.

This Code of Conduct is meant to provide guiding expectations for the behaviour of team members with the goal of providing a safe, respectful, and inclusive environment.

Note that this Code of Conduct exists in addition to Concordia University's Academic Code of Conduct, the iGEM Rules of Conduct, and the Concordia Student Union Code of Rights; these three policies are not superseded by our code.

2 Scope

Who is bound by this code?

When/ where does it appear?

2.1.1 All members of the Concordia iGEM 2020 team are expected to read, sign, and follow this Code of Conduct when they join the team.

2.1.2 All members of the team are subject to Laws, Concordia University Code of Conduct, iGEM Rules of Conflict, Concordia Student Union Code of Rights.



3 Policy

3.1 Expected Conduct

3.1.1 General

3.1.1.1 "Upholding iGEM values: Integrity, Good Sportsmanship, Respect, Honesty, Celebration, Cooperation, Effort, Excellence."
-iGEM.org

3.1.2 Communication & Participation

- 3.2.2.1 Regularly check team Slack, Facebook and email during the work week (daily).
- 3.1.2.2 Acknowledgement of receipts of communication for tasks or status update requests via email, Slack or Facebook communications
- 3.1.2.3 Required to communicate with the team of any delay, advance or change in the project (ie not making a deadline).
- 3.1.2.4 Mandatory attendance at weekly team meetings, with video on, for brief introductions.
- 3.1.2.5 Active engagement in team meetings and activities. Responses to questions posed in team meetings is expected.
- 3.1.2.6 Staying up to date with project progress as required.
- 3.1.2.7 Punctuality in responses with external communications.
- 3.1.2.8 Updates for internal and external collaborators if so requested.
- 3.1.2.9 Attendance at iGEM Concordia events.

3.1 Expected Conduct

- 3.1.2.10 Assume good intentions from other people, if you feel offended or uncomfortable ask and see if that's what they meant or ask a team leader or mentor to clarify.
- 3.1.2.11 If any personal issue arises, it is expected that the issue will be communicated to the team leader or mentors in whatever manner is most comfortable.
- 3.1.2.12 If a team member is uncomfortable participating, or unable to fulfill any of the above, a discussion may be had to find a way which works for the team.

3.1.3 Academic Honesty

- 3.1.3.1 To be truthful in all iGEM endeavours
- 3.1.3.2 Referencing all sources
- 3.1.3.3 Attributing all work done to those who do it or collaborate on it





3.1 Expected Conduct

3.1.4 Prohibited Conduct

- 3.1.4.1 Unexcused absence at general team meetings.
- 3.1.4.2 Missing a team meeting without notifying the team.
- 3.1.4.3 Missing two team meetings in a row without notifying the team or an extenuating circumstance.
- 3.1.4.4 Moving forward with an important portion of the project without team approval.
- 3.1.4.5 Addition of team members without open recruitment or without team approval via our voting process.
- 3.1.4.6 Taking or posting photos of a team member without their permission; of people or their research in the shared labs, without their permissions; the Genome Foundry Equipment and labs without permissions.
- 3.1.4.7 Discrimination based on race, colour, gender identity or expression, sexual orientation, pregnancy, civil status or age in accordance with the Quebec Charter of Human Rights and Freedoms.
- 3.1.4.8 Harassment; the act of systematic and/or repeated unwelcome; aggravating conduct directed towards a person.
- 3.1.4.9 Sexual harassment physically, emotionally or verbally.
- 3.1.4.10 Bullying or actions which cause discomfort, affect the sense of welcome and safety in the team or which impede fulfilling work. Including cyber bullying.
- 3.1.4.11 Discrimination or harassment in the form of microaggressions.

*Are you unfamiliar with any of these terms? Ask!
We'd be happy to share.*



3.2 Misuse of iGEM Property

3.2.1 iGEM property is defined as any items purchased with iGEM funds, or obtained through sponsorship or grants.

3.2.2 Redistribution of, or damage to iGEM Concordia property.

3.2.3 Use of iGEM Concordia property for unrelated activities.

3.2.4 Keeping the lab and office space tidy and organized.

3.3 Complaint Procedure

3.3.1 A complaint can be filed publicly at team meetings, privately to one or more team leaders, privately to one or more mentors, to our administrator or to our principal investigator.

3.3.2 Discretion is granted, if so desired.

3.3.3 The complaint will be reviewed by the group who was approached by the plaintiff. If the team or team leaders were approached with the complaint, it is mandatory that the mentors be consulted as well.



3.4 Sanctions

- 3.4.1 Missing two team meetings, without active communication, is terms for review of a team member's participation in the team.
- 3.4.2 Not fulfilling time commitments as accepted upon recruitment puts the team member up for review.
- 3.4.3 All forms of discrimination, bullying, or sexual harassment are not tolerated and are dismissible actions if the complaint is resolved after investigation as being true.



The Dean of Students and Rights Concordia are also available to us as students at Concordia for conflict resolution.



4 TEAM STRUCTURE

4.1 How is Work Shared?

- 4.1.1 Work is shared with the iGEM Concordia team members. Any work shared outside of the team needs to be approved by the current team.
- 4.1.2 All work is open to all team members to learn new skills, flex skills they already have and to have fun!
- 4.1.3 As the project progresses subteams will be established. These teams are fluid in structure and are decided by the team leader and team members.
- 4.1.4 Deadlines and timelines are established and are expected to be met as a team.
- 4.1.5 Attributions and credit for work done through iGEM Concordia is shared by the team as a whole.
- 4.1.6 Gender and other biases are taken into consideration during task selection and allocation. We are aware of self-selection biases (for example Human Practices and Policy in international iGEM teams are mostly women).

4.2 Commitment

- 4.2.1 Core team members are expected to contribute 15-30hrs/wk and have priority to lab work.
- 4.2.2 Support team members are defined as less than 15hrs/wk commitment.
- 4.2.3 Support team members are responsible for fulfilling tasks they have taken on.
- 4.2.4 Team members are able to contribute more or less, and are able to ask to switch teams if their commitment changes.

4.3 Recruitment

- 4.3.1 Open recruitment calls are done by the current iGEM Concordia team as needed.
- 4.3.2 We chose to reach diverse departments by making the promotional materials appealing and accessible, and by also reaching out to many departments and student organizations.
- 4.3.3 Once the main team has been established, team members are added as required. This can be done by voting in one new team member or through another recruitment call at anytime.
- 4.3.4 All new team members must be undergraduates at Concordia and must be voted in by the team as per the voting criteria below. The mentors are always active in any recruitment process.

4.3.5 A recruitment rubric is established before voting opens, with mandatory mentor involvement, and applicants are evaluated based on it.

4.3.6 Transparency: Applicants are offered the option of seeing their recruitment rubric whether accepted or rejected.

4.3.7 We take into consideration our bias when selecting members. For example we may be more inclined to individuals with lab experience.

4.3.8 We spread awareness of financial resources to help team members with financial need.

4.4 Voting

4.4.1 All important decisions are to be made by the iGEM Concordia voting process. This includes, but is not exclusive to bringing new team members into the team, big changes to the project, or undertaking any component that involves representing the team publicly.

4.4.2 A quorum (minimum actively voting) of 60% of the team members is required for a vote to proceed.

4.4.3 A member of the quorum may choose to abstain, this vote will be counted as 'not counted'.

4.4.4 A maximum of two abstain votes are allowed for the vote to count. In summary 60% of the team members must be voting, and 75% of the non-absentia votes are required for the vote to be valid.

- 4.4.4 A maximum of two abstain votes are allowed for the vote to count. In summary 60% of the team members must be voting, and 75% of the non-abstaining votes are required for the vote to be valid.
- 4.4.5 If the voting ends in a 50/50, the issue moves to a team discussion to be re-evaluated and is put to a second vote at a later time.
- 4.4.6 Voting can be done in the main communication channel, in person at weekly team meetings, or online.
- 4.4.7 Voting can be anonymous or not and is decided by team leaders, depending on the sensitivity of the issue. The voting results are documented in team minutes and shared in the main communication channel chosen by the team.



Questions or Suggestions:
igem.concordia@gmail.com

Thank You

Thank you to Anne S. Meyer, Associate Professor at Rochester University representative for the Diversity Committee from iGEM; Anjali Agarwal PhD. Professor, Electrical and Computer Engineering Associate Dean, Dean of Engineering; and our iGEM Concordia mentors (special thanks to Iain Summerby-Murray) for their input in the development of this document. Inspiration was also taken from the Concordia Student Union's Code of Rights (2019).



iGEM CONCORDIA

ASTROYEAST 2020