

Martha T Muse Prize Committee Meeting Report

18-19th November 2009, The National Academies, US

Attendees: Diane McKnight (Chair and Committee Member), Ian Allison (Committee Member), Angelika Brandt (Committee Member), Olav Orheim (Committee Member), Rasik Ravindra (Committee Member), José Retamales (Committee Member), Renate Rennie (Tinker Foundation), Mike Sparrow (SCAR), Jodi Bostrum (US National Research Council)

Opening Formalities

Diane McKnight, the Committee Chair, welcomed the meeting attendees and thanked the committee members as well as the Polar Research Board for hosting the meeting. Renate Rennie, President of the Tinker Foundation, also thanked the committee and SCAR, making the point that the organization of the Prize is ongoing and so the committee should feel free to make suggestions and improvements. She also re-iterated that Tinker has a focus on Antarctica and that this focus will likely be greater in the future.

Discussion of Nominations

Initial Short-listing of Nominations

In order to shortlist the Nominations, each Committee Member gave a short oral presentations (~5-10 minutes) on the Nominees for which they have been assigned Principal Reviewer. The Nominee Secondary Reviewer was then given the opportunity to make any additional comments.

All Committee Members (excluding those who have declared a conflict of interest – see below) then rated the nomination (using the Evaluation forms – Appendix) at the meeting itself based on the presentation and on having looked at the Nomination beforehand. A further opportunity to reconsider scores was given after all the Nominees had been discussed. These scores were then used to shortlist the Nominees.

Disclosures of conflicts of interest had been made prior to the meeting and taken into account in assigning Principal and Secondary Reviewers. The Committee decided that any Committee Member that had declared a conflict of interest would not evaluate that particular Nominee nor voice an opinion. However they would not need to leave the room and could share additional information on request.

Mike Sparrow reminded the Committee that a few select Nominations could be carried forward for up to three years.

After the Committee Members had finalized their evaluations, Mike and Diane

presented the results to the Committee. Those Nominees with scores above 80/100 (four in total) were highlighted in red and those with a score above 75/100 (a further five) were highlighted in green. Diane checked if any Committee Member thought any Nominee not in these top nine should be considered further, which was not the case. The top nine were discussed further and a unanimous consensus for a final shortlist of six was decided upon.

Of the top six Nominees, six different disciplines and five different countries were represented. Two of the final six were female.

The Committee discussed these top six further and then each member voted by ballot to choose two Nominations to not consider further. The results of the ballot were that three names were chosen, leaving a final selection shortlist of three. The meeting then adjourned for the day to give Committee Members time to study the final Nominations in depth.

Final Selection

Diane asked the Principal Reviewers of the final Nominations to re-summarise the candidates. The Committee Members revisited the Prize Winner Attributes and the main aims of the prize before any further decision was made. The Committee also reiterated its desire to ensure a geopolitical, disciplinary and gender balance with regards to the Prize winners over time.

One committee member did not participate in the final voting because of declared conflicts of interest among the final three candidates. A ballot to remove one Nominee from the shortlist was carried out. A second ballot was then made for the winner, but it was agreed that before the final decision could be made the Committee would try to reach a consensus. In the end the vote of the committee was unanimous in nominating Steven Chown as the first recipient of the Martha T Muse Prize.

Post-meeting activities

Action: Diane and Mike to work on a short citation for Steven Chown and to pass it by the Committee and Tinker for approval. Steven Chown should also be asked to check the citation for errors. Diane and Mike to then work with Renate to produce a Press Release (with an embargo date) about the Prize Winner.

Action: After letters have been sent out to unsuccessful Nominators, Diane to phone selected Nominators to ask them to update their nominations for next year.

Location of the Prize Award Ceremony and Schedule of Future Prizes

The Committee discussed possible locations for the Award Ceremony/ Prize winner lecture, noting that it should be at a high profile event with a connection to Antarctic Science and/or Policy. The Committee decided upon the IPY Oslo meeting in June in

Norway, though it was felt that the Prize should also be given a special mention at the SCAR Open Science Conference in August in Argentina.

Action: Olav Orheim to discuss with Steven Chown and Mike Sparrow arrangements for the IPY Oslo meeting, including the Prize Ceremony and a Planary lecture by the Prize Winner.

The Committee decided that nominations for the next Prize would open on Feb 1st and close on June 1st. The Committee would meet around the 19th of July (exact date to be determined) in Cambridge.

Future of the Prize Committee

José Retamales and Olav Orheim rotate off the Prize Committee after only a single year to allow for the yearly rotation of the Committee and were thanked for their hard work by Diane, Renate and Mike.

Action: Committee to suggest to Mike Sparrow potential new Committee Members to replace Olav Orheim and Jose Retamles.

Improvements for the future

During the meeting several issues were highlighted to improve the administration of the Prize in the future. Unless otherwise indicated these are actions on the Prize Administrative organization (SCAR).

Several of the Nominations received were for people in the latter part of their careers. In order to make it clearer that the Prize is intended for an early to mid career person the text in the website will be modified to include a statement that the Nominee should have at least 10-15 years of their career in the future and that they should have enough experience to demonstrate a commitment to Antarctic Science and/or Policy.

The instructions for the Nominators should be modified to include a statement on the number of students that a Nominee has mentored as the Committee felt this was an important indicator.

To make it clear that many candidates may already have taken on a leadership role, the text on the website: "The goal is to recognize the leaders of tomorrow – today, and improve the likelihood of their becoming leaders in their field." should be modified to read "... of tomorrow and to enhance the impact and scope of their leadership in the future".

Mike Sparrow should check that the website allows a nominator to check a pdf of their nomination before making a final submission, since some of the final pdfs included some unwanted characters.

APPENDIX: EVALUATION FORM

Nominee: _____

Evaluator: _____

Date: _____

Scientific/Policy Background and Professional Accomplishments [relative to career stage]			Leadership and Potential			Communication, Interpersonal, and Outreach Skills		International Collaboration	
Total points = 40			Total points = 30			Total points = 15		Total points = 15	
Career experience and employment history.	Outputs and achievements and trends over time. [e.g. publications, presentations, policy initiatives, awards]	Support and/or grants for research and policy proposals; and their trend over time	Leadership experience and demonstrated organizational and leadership skills	Maturity and ability to work with others	Potential for Growth and Development	Communication skills	Ability and willingness to work with diverse groups	Demonstrated commitment to serve the world-wide community	Commitment to globalization of Antarctic science
Max 15 points	Max 15 points	Max 10 points	Max 10 points	Max 10 points	Max 10 points	Max 5 points	Max 10 points	Max 10 points	Max 5 points

Total Points: ___/100

<p>Additional Comments:</p>
