

Martha T Muse Prize Committee Meeting

19th, 20th July 2010, Darwin College, Cambridge, UK.

Attendees: Diane McKnight (Chair and Committee Member), Ian Allison (Committee Member), Alexander Klepikov (Committee Member), Daniela Liggett (Committee Member)

Angelika Brandt (Committee Member): present on the 19th, by videoconference on the 20th

By telephone: Rasik Ravindra (Committee Member)

Renate Rennie (Tinker Foundation), Renuka Badhe (SCAR)

Opening Formalities

Mike Sparrow (Executive Director, SCAR), on behalf of SCAR, opened the meeting and conveyed thanks to all the Committee members for their effort and time for the selection of the Martha T Muse Prize winner.

Diane McKnight, the Committee Chair, welcomed the meeting attendees and thanked the committee members and SCAR for organizing the meeting at Darwin College. Diane pointed out that this would be the second such meeting, and the selection process was still evolving, and invited especially the new Committee members to put forward their thoughts. Renate Rennie, President of the Tinker Foundation, also thanked the committee and SCAR, reiterating the point that the organization of the Prize is ongoing and so all the committee should feel free to make suggestions and improvements. Renate also reiterated the Tinker Foundation's desire to ensure a geopolitical, disciplinary and gender balance with regards to the Prize winners over time.

Discussion of Nominations

Initial Short-listing of Nominations

The overall approach taken in reaching a short list of three nominees at the end of the first day of the meeting was similar to the approach taken for the selection of the 2009 Muse Prize recipient. 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 both on the presentation and the complete Nomination package. 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 when a specific question was directed to them.

After the Committee Members had finalized their evaluations, Renuka and Diane presented the results to the Committee. Those Nominees with scores above 75/100 (a total of 8) were considered further. Diane checked if any Committee Member thought any Nominee not in these top eight should be considered further, which was not the case.

The Committee discussed these top eight further and then each member voted by ballot to choose two Nominations to not consider further. The results of the ballot yielded five names. A second ballot was then held where each member was asked to choose one nomination to not consider further, 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 provided the Committee with a short review of the previous day's discussions and decisions. One member of the committee participated in the vote via video conference, and one via teleconference. One committee member did not participate in the final voting because of declared conflicts of interest among the final three candidates. The first vote of the day was held to obtain the final shortlist of two Nominees, as was done in 2009. The Committee Members then revisited the Prize Winner Attributes and the main aims of the Prize.

Two new reviewers were randomly appointed for the final two Nominees. The strong points of the final two nominees were presented again to the Committee. A second ballot was then made for the winner, and Helen Fricker emerged as the second recipient of the Martha T Muse Prize.

Post-meeting activities

Action: Diane and Renuka to work on a short citation and press release for Helen Fricker and to pass it by the Committee and Tinker for approval. The Press Release would have an embargo date.

Action: After letters have been sent out to unsuccessful Nominators, Renuka to email selected Nominators to ask them to update their nominations for next year on the 1st of January 2011 (Please note the suggestion on age limits below, this is important as re-nominations allowed if the Nominee is below 55 at closure of nominations)

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 SCAR Open Science Conference in Buenos Aires as a possible venue, however, the winner is unable to attend the Conference due to the extremely short notice and other personal circumstances. Amongst other possible venues for the Prize ceremony discussed by the Prize Winner and the Chair of the selection Committee, the preference was for the Fall AGU meeting (Dec 13 – 17, 2010).

Action: Diane to check whether this is possible, and discuss with Renuka about further arrangements for meeting, including the Prize Ceremony and a Plenary lecture by the Prize Winner.

The Committee decided that nominations for the next Prize would open on Jan 1st and close on April 30th. The Committee was of the view that it was important to have a rotation of venues for the meeting of the Selection Committee. The Committee would meet on the 2nd and 3rd of June, 2011, venue to be finalized (in order of preference: Chile, China).

Future of the Prize Committee

Ian Allison and Rasik Ravindra rotate off the Prize Committee after two years to allow for the yearly rotation of the Committee and were thanked for their contribution by Diane, Renate and Renuka.

Action: Committee members and Mike Sparrow to suggest to Renuka potential new Committee Members to replace Ian and Rasik. The need for a Committee member with an expertise in atmospheric sciences was underlined by those present.

Procedural improvements to the format of the Nomination package:

During the meeting several issues were highlighted to improve the administration of the Prize in the future. Some of the Nominations received were for people in the latter part of their careers. The Committee suggested that an age limit of 55 years (on the closing date of nominations) be set up. One Committee member suggested adding “only under exceptional circumstances will Nominees above 55 years of age be considered” to the website.

The Committee members suggested several updates/changes to the Nominators instructions and for the Nominations:

1. Importance of supporting letters to be reiterated, and a minimum 2 supporting letters for each nomination to be asked for
2. Addition of Date of Birth to the Nomination process
3. First part of the Nominations to be online, rest to be uploaded as CV and other appendices in a Word Form format. The Word form will be designed using the headers provided by Diane McKnight.
4. These points to be added to the instruction for nominators:
 - a. Prize will be judged on the basis on the information supplied in the nomination
 - b. The Nominations should include details of the activities which from the basis of Nominee evaluation (from the Evaluation form)
 - c. The “Outreach activities” should include multimedia links (e.g. Google video, YouTube) for interviews, workshops, etc if available online.

Action: Diane McKnight to provide the Committee with a new headers for the Nomination package (the CV and Publications list part of the Nomination). A sample of this new format was provided to the Committee members by Diane McKnight.

Action: Renuka to follow up on the rest of the points for the procedural improvements after finalization of the Nomination format.