

## 1. Technical Guide to Online Conferencing

### Technical Set-Up (ECAP)

MS Teams was used as the environment for the whole conference. ECAP chose a format in which all talks were pre-recorded. Participants had until August 9 to upload their videos into MS Teams. For each subarea of philosophy (metaphysics, epistemology, logic, aesthetics, etc.) there was a dedicated channel and participants were asked to upload their video into the right channel, and in each channel we had folders for the date and time of the Q&A. This way, conference participants could afterwards use the conference programme to find the videos that they wanted to watch. The conference program was created using EasyChair, it allowed to find abstracts for each paper and an overview by subarea (as a normal conference programme would).

ECAP produced several instruction videos for participants about how to record their talk, how to access MS Teams, how to navigate the conference environment and how to upload their talks. All instruction videos were accessible from the conference website.

Once participants had uploaded their talks, ECAP did a quick quality check to see whether the video was in the right format and whether audio and video was of sufficient quality, and that the talk was of the correct length (20 minutes, in case of contributed papers).

Also, for all talks there was a possibility to have a comment-based Q&A, with a comment-thread for each video. In the comments, people could tag the person they were responding to, so authors and commentators got a notification, when there was a reaction.

### Technical Set-Up (Smaller Colloquia)

All three conferences were held via Zoom using institutional licences. In addition, a detailed website was constructed and a guide to using Zoom was provided to all speakers and participants.

Each institutional Zoom licence type capped participation at 500. For extra cost, Zoom allows for significantly larger audiences -- up to and even above 10,000 people.

A number of measures were in place to deal with possible technical issues: presenters had the option of practicing with a student assistant before the conference, presenters were asked to be ready to present in the session before theirs just in case another presenter had technical difficulties, and IT staff were on hand to help during the conference, but not for DSPPS. There were no major technical issues, and what there was (e.g., recording not working) could be solved with the help of the IT staff.

Attendees used the ‘raise hand’ button to signal to the moderator their intention to ask a question live. The moderator could check the list of hands in the participant list (the list is ordered with those who put their hands up first at the top). The moderator let those attendees ask their questions by unmuting them and spotlighting their video feed. In addition, attendees had the option to ask questions via chat. In this case, the moderator had to read the question out loud, and keep a record of questions submitted in this way to send them, especially those that were not answered, to the speaker at the end of the talk (for instance by saving the chat). Attendees that have Zoom licenses or are associated with institutions with a Zoom license may be designated as an alternative host by the moderator of the meeting.

## Advice

- Have a good website with detailed information.
- Mention the time zone on program pages and communication.
- Provide a guide to using the software. An “online etiquette” guide is also helpful (e.g., to remind participants to keep their microphones on mute).
- Plan communication so speakers and participants aren’t bombarded by emails.
- Have IT support if it’s available.
- It’s a good idea to have student assistants to help, especially for things like assigning people to breakout rooms.
- Consider a cap on numbers if a more intimate event is planned.
- Consider providing different options for registration (e.g., active participant vs just listening, registration for different sessions).
- Consider requiring a password to restrict participation only to registered participants, to prevent raucous intruders.
- If you plan to record discussions, it’s best to ask for permission from participants in the registration form. Make sure all the settings in the software permit recording, and consider having a dedicated person to do the recordings. If the available software version allows it, consider pre-setting automatic recording prior to the meeting for the entire session for which a Zoom meeting room is created.
- If there are parallel sessions, embed into the program links corresponding to the individual session so that participants can enter and leave the conference rooms of their choice. The program of the DSPS offers an illustration.
- Testrun all functionalities of the software that you intend to use from multiple accounts (inside and outside your organisation) and from various platforms/browsers/operation systems and have these test runs early enough so that you can come up with an alternative if something doesn’t work as expected.

## 2. Conference Programs

### ECAP10 Program

Time	Monday, 24.08.	Tuesday 25.08.	Wednesday 26.08.	Thursday 27.08.	Friday 28.08.
10:00-10:45	Opening				
11:00-12:00	Live Q&A	Live Q&A	Live Q&A	Live Q&A	Live Q&A
12:00-14:00	Break				
14:00-15:00	Live Q&A	Live Q&A	Live Q&A	Live Q&A	Live Q&A
15:00-16:00					General Assembly of ESAP
16:00-17:00	Invited paper Sandrine Bergés	Invited paper Isidora Stojanovic	Invited paper Fabrice Correia	Invited paper Cezary Cieslinski	
17:00-18:00	Break				
18:00-19:00	Break				
19:00-20:00			Live Q&A		
20:00-21:00	Keynote Quassim Cassam	Keynote Kathrin Glüer-Pagin		Keynote Cristina Bicchieri	
21:00-22:00			Pub Quiz		

Plenary
Parallel
Social

### EEM Program

#### Thursday, July 2nd

8:30 - 9:00	Meet and greet (with breakout rooms)
9:00 - 9:15	Opening
9:15 - 9:45	Talk
9:45 - 10:10	Discussion
	5 min Break
10:15 - 10:45	Talk
10:45 - 11:10	Discussion
11:10 - 11:35	Coffee Break (with breakout rooms)
11:35 - 12:05	Talk
12:05 - 12:30	Discussion
12:30 - 13:30	Lunch break
13:30 - 14:00	Talk
14:00 - 14:25	Discussion
14:25 - 14:50	Coffee Break (with breakout rooms)
14:50 - 15:20	Talk
15:20 - 15:45	Discussion
	5 min Break
15:50 - 16:20	Talk
16:20 - 16:45	Discussion
	Break
20:00	Drinks (restricted attendance)

#### Friday, July 3rd

8:30 - 9:00	Meet and greet
9:00 - 9:30	Knowledge Café part 1: Talk
9:30 - 10:30	Knowledge Café part 2: Group Work
10:30 - 10:55	Coffee break
10:55 - 12:00	Knowledge Café part 3: Group Present
12:00 - 13:15	Lunch break
13:15 - 13:45	Talk
13:45 - 14:10	Discussion
	5 min Break
14:15 - 14:45	Talk
14:45 - 15:10	Discussion
15:10 - 15:35	Coffee break (with breakout rooms)
15:35 - 17:00	Closing Discussion

DSPS Program

April 17<sup>th</sup> Morning Keynote (9:00 – 10:00am): [Heather Douglas, Michigan State University](#), “Science and Social Justice”

[April 17<sup>th</sup> Morning Panel \(10:20 – 11:40am\)](#)

**Jack Justus, Florida State University and Samantha Wakil, North Carolina University**, “The Algorithmic Turn in Conservation Biology: On Characterizing Progress in Ethically-Driven Sciences”

**Conrad Heilmann, Marta Szymanowska, and Melissa Vergara-Fernández, Erasmus University Rotterdam**, “Sustainability in Finance: Narrow and Broad”

[April 17<sup>th</sup> Author Meets Critics \(12:40 – 2:00pm\)](#): **Matt Brown, University of Texas at Dallas**, “Science and Moral Imagination”

Critics: **Joyce Havstad, Oakland University; Nancy McHugh, Wittenberg University; Sarah Wieten, Stanford Center for Biomedical Ethics**

[April 17<sup>th</sup> Afternoon Panel \(2:20 – 3:40pm\)](#)

**Julia Bursten, University of Kentucky and Catherine Kendig, Michigan State University**, “The Role of Agricultural Extension in the Construction and Communication of Scientific Knowledge”

**Evelyn Brister, Rochester Institute of Technology**, “Whose Values Inform Public Judgment on Conservation Biotech?”

April 17<sup>th</sup> Afternoon Keynote (4:00 – 5:00pm): [Hugh Lacey, Swarthmore College](#), “[Agroecology: Science, Agricultural Practice, and the Values of Social Justice, Democratic Participation, and Environmental Sustainability](#)”

---

April 24<sup>th</sup> Morning Keynote (9:00 – 10:00am): [Wendy Parker, Durham University](#), “[Values in Climate Science: Risk, Storylines and Credibility](#)”

[April 24<sup>th</sup> Morning Panel \(Friday, 10:20 – 12:20pm\)](#)

**Justin Donhauser, Bowling Green State University**, “Is Value-Driven Climate Science for Policy Ethical?”

**Melissa Jacquart and Angela Potochnik, University of Cincinnati**, “Divergence of Values and Goals in Participatory Research”

**Greg Lusk, Michigan State University**, “Too Legit to Quit: A Deliberative Account of Values in Science”

[April 24<sup>th</sup> Afternoon Panel \(1:20 – 4:10pm\)](#)

**Kristen Intemann, Montana State University**, “Making Value Judgments in a Pluralistic Society from a Social Justice Standpoint”

**Drew Schroeder, Claremont McKenna College**, “Bringing Different Voices into Science: Comparing Arguments from Feminist Philosophy and the Citizen Science Movement”

**Karen Kovaka, Virginia Tech**, “How Not to Evaluate Community Science”

**Dan Hicks, University of California Merced**, “When Virtues are Vices: The Weaponization of Scientific Norms”

April 24<sup>th</sup> Afternoon Keynote (4:30 – 5:30pm): Kevin Elliott, Michigan State University,  
“Getting Clear about Transparency in Science”

POBAM Program

**Tuesday, June 23**

Morning sessions

- 9:00 – 9:40 **Aja Watkins**, *Boston University*, “Accommodating Horizontal Inheritance in Phylogenetics”
- 10:00 – 10:40 **Celso Neto**, *University of Calgary*, “Rethinking the Use of Idealizations in Science: The case of Phylogenetic Trees”
- 11:00 – 11:40 **Archie Fields III**, *University of Calgary*, “Using Situated Cognition Modeling to Solve Empirical Relevance and Support Problems in Evolution of Cooperation Research”

Lunch Break-out Room (11:30-1:00)

Afternoon Sessions

- 1:00 – 1:40 Invited Speaker: **Roberta Millstein**, *UC Davis*, “Why you should care about Aldo Leopold’s Land Ethic”
- 2:00 – 2:40 **Makmiller Pedroso**, *Towson University*, “Wicked Nature: Coping with Uncertainty through Redundancy”
- 3:00 – 3:40 **Denise Hossom**, *UC Davis*, “Where the Wild Things are Classified: Consequences of Classifying Wildness and Nonhuman Animals Caught in the Crosshairs”

Afternoon Happy Hour Room (4:00-5:00)

**Thursday, June 25**

Morning Sessions

- 9:00 – 9:40 **Karen Kovaka**, *Virginia Tech*, “Just Leave It Alone?”
- 10:00 – 10:40 **Amadeo Estrada**, *Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México*, “Reconstructing the early evolution of life: epistemological challenges”

11:00 – 11:40 Lightning-round Poster Session

- Charles Beasley**, *London School of Economics*, “Four Errors in the Science of Animal Consciousness”
- Mel Andrews**, *University of Cincinnati*, “Is the FEP Epistemologically Applicable?”
- Hayley Clatterbuck**, *University of Wisconsin–Madison*, “Darwin’s causal argument against design”
- Rafael Ventura**, *University of Pennsylvania*, “Models of Species Metaphysics”
- Jorge Lizarzaburu**, *Emory University*, “Human Nature and the Extended Evolutionary Synthesis: The Dialectical Biologist Redux”
- Daniel Swaim**, *University of Pennsylvania*, “A New Account of Narrative Possibility”
- David Colaco**, *Mississippi State University*, “Believe me, I can explain! Concerns about inferences to the explanandum”

**Fran Fairbairn and Vanya Rohwer, Cornell University, "The Ethical Dimension of Lethal Specimen Collection in Ornithology"**

Lunch Break (11:40-1:00)

Afternoon Sessions

1:00 – 1:40 Invited Speaker: Catherine Kendig, Michigan State University, "Why you should care about how kinds and parts are made"

2:00 – 2:40 Beckett Sterner & Stephen Elliott, Arizona State University, "The Social Epistemology of Data Integration for Global Biodiversity Loss"

Afternoon Happy Hour Room (3:00-4:00)

## **Monday, June 29**

Morning Sessions

9:00 – 9:40 Amanda Corris, University of Cincinnati, "Cognition as a facilitator of non-genetic inheritance"

10:00 – 10:40 Jacqueline Wallis, University of Pennsylvania, "Mate Choice and Sexual Selection: a Philosophical Update"

11:00 – 11:40 Caleb Hazelwood, Duke University, "Evolutionary Causation and Biological Practice: An Experimental Approach"

Lunch Break (11:40-1:00)

Afternoon Sessions

1:00 – 1:40 Invited Speaker: Stephen Downes, University of Utah, "Why you should care about Genome Wide Association Studies"

2:00 – 2:40 Marina DiMarco, University of Pittsburgh, "Unstable Intermediates: Integrating Biosocial Causes"

3:00 – 3:40 David Kinney & Christopher Kempes, Santa Fe Institute, "Epistemic Principles of Astrobiology"

### 3. Descriptive Statistics

<b>Table S3.1. Descriptive statistics in Survey A</b>		
<b>Variables</b>		<b>Overall</b>
<b>N</b>		124
<b>Uni Position [n, (%)]</b>		
	Graduate Students	30 (27.0)
	Junior Faculty	50 (45.5)
	Senior Faculty	31 (28.0)
<b>Previous attendance to ECAPS[Yes (%)]</b>		62 (50.4)
<b>Items measuring attitudes [Mean (SD)]</b> (Min-Max:1-7)		
	Satisfaction Presentation	6.17 (0.99)
	Satisfaction Discussion	5.75 (1.29)
	Online chat in comparison with a physical conference	1.59 (0.94)
	Online Networking in comparison with a physical conference	1.83 (1.23)
	Accessibility of Online conference in comparison with a physical conference	5.62 (1.20)

<b>Table S3.2. Descriptive Statistics in Survey B</b>		
<b>Variables</b>		<b>Overall</b>
<b>N</b>		99

<b>Sex [n, (%)]</b>		
	Male	47 (49.5)
	Female	39 (41.1)
	Diverse/Other	3 (3.2)
	Prefer not to say	6 (6.3)
<b>University Position [n, (%)]</b>		
	Students	30 (34.5)
	Junior Faculty	36 (41.4)
	Senior Faculty	21 (24.1)
<b>Disability Status [No (%)]</b>		80 (92.0)
<b>Registration in the conference [n, (%)]</b>		
	EEM	33 (33.7)
	POBAM	27 (27.6)
	DSPS	38 (38.8)
<b>Presenters [n, (%)]</b>		
	EEM	7 (22.6)
	POBAM	11 (35.5)
	DSPS	13 (41.9)
<b>Positive factors on accessibility [N = TRUE (%)]</b>		
	Low cost	60 (65.9)
	Avoid Traveling	70 (76.9)
	Not worry Venue	24 (26.4)
	Good day length	17 (18.7)
	Recordings	21 (23.1)
	Home office	64 (70.3)

<b>Negative factors on accessibility [N = TRUE (%)]</b>		
	Time Zone	38 (41.8)
	Caring	16 (17.6)
	Work	48 (52.7)
	Internet	19 (20.9)
	Technical Difficulties	12 (13.2)
	Limited Technology	3 (3.3)
	Day Length	32 (35.2)
	Low Video Quality	8 (8.8)
<b>Preferences [N = TRUE (%)]</b>		
	Pre-Recorded Presentation	17 (18.3)
	Live Presentation	89 (95.7)
	Networking Digital Coffee	66 (71.0)
	Networking Speed Date	25 (26.9)
	Networking Group Work	53 (57.0)
	Networking Text Chat	28 (30.1)
	Networking Google Doc	12 (12.9)
	Networking Twitter	14 (15.1)
	Networking Participant-led Activity	25 (26.9)
	Networking No Networking	10 (10.8)
<b>Items measuring attitudes [Mean (SD)]</b> (Min-Max:1-5)		
	Conference was easier to attend	4.41 (0.98)
	Conference met expectations	4.19 (0.83)
	Willingness to attend again	4.28 (1.03)
	General Satisfaction	4.32 (0.82)

	Presenter Satisfaction Online Talk	4.21 (0.79)
	Presenter Satisfaction Digital Poster	5.00 (NA)
	Presenter Satisfaction Text Feedback	3.09 (1.00)
	Presenter Satisfaction Spoken Feedback	3.93 (1.03)
	Presenter Satisfaction Break Feedback	3.67 (1.11)
	Presenter Satisfaction Pre-Recorded talk	2.67 (0.58)
	Attendee Satisfaction Presentation	4.38 (0.71)
	Attendee Satisfaction Discussion	3.98 (0.98)
	Attendee Satisfaction Networking	2.75 (1.32)
	Attendee Satisfaction Poster	4.11 (1.05)
	Attendee Importance Presentation	4.45 (0.70)
	Attendee Importance Discussion	4.58 (0.65)
	Attendee Importance Networking	4.26 (1.04)
	Attendee Importance Poster	2.98 (1.15)